

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 June 2025 18:44:47 UTC+01:00
To: "Joanne Fisher" <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1129

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 08/06/2025 6:44 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Land At Foxhole Farm Foxhole Lane Bolney West Sussex

Proposal: Outline application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved), for the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings, including affordable housing; a community building (use class F1) encompassing land for education provision, together with associated access, ancillary parking and landscaping; the creation of a vehicular access point from the A272 Cowfold Road, and pedestrian and cycle only access to The Street; and creation of a network of roads, footways, and cycleways through the site; together with the provision of countryside open space, children's play areas, community orchard, and allotments; sustainable drainage systems and landscape buffers.

Case Officer: Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Fir Trees Top Street Bolney

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Application DM/25/1129 - Foxhole Farm development

I OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:-

1. This site was considered and rejected for inclusion in the Bolney Neighbourhood Development Plan. The final plan received overwhelming support from villagers and land earmarked for development in the plan at that time should be fully utilised before other sites are considered. For example, The field alongside London Road has had 2 development to date. There is plenty of available capacity to build further homes without the Foxhole Farm development.

2. Policies BOLBB1 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy DP6 of the adopted District Plan recommend development should take place in larger towns within the current built-up area. The proposed development would not meet that criteria and should not be permitted to proceed.

3. Policies BOLE12 and DP12 protect the countryside. This is a greenfield site on the edge of the AONB and if it proceeds it will irreversibly damage the green field site and should be rejected.

4. Policies BOLD1 and DP26 protect the village's identity and character. Building 200 houses will double the size of the village. Its construction as a "parallel village" without being spread around the existing settlement via infill building or smaller developments of say 20/30 units, could create a "them and us mentality" which would not be helpful to a cohesive village life.

5. The proposal fails to meet the Transport policy DP21 sustainability criteria. Bolney's location and poor local transport services means 200 homes will probably result in 350-400 cars being owned by those living on the development. This will substantially increase the number of vehicle movements and cause significant additional congestion.

6. Access to and from the development via the A272 is a very significant concern. Access will be by the Colwood crossroads, just a few meters from the exit of the busy petrol station and within 100 metres or so of a pedestrian crossing. The road is single carriageway, fast moving and accidents and incidents which already occur, will inevitably increase.

7. The developers traffic survey is not representative of typical traffic expected at peak times and underestimates the impact the development would have on local roads and the A272.

8. Public utilities will struggle to cope with additional demand. In particular the water supply will be under significant additional pressure to supply the additional properties. Today, 7th June, we have, at the time of writing been without water for 7 hours.

9. Accessing local services such as doctors, schools, dentists, supermarkets will require occupants to travel to either Burgess Hill or Haywards Heath, circa 5 miles away. Train travel will also require travel to stations at either of these towns. The proposal is not therefore sustainable.

10. The proposed development would damage the local area, impact the AONB and reduce the green field space in the village.

It is out of proportion to the size and character of the current village community and will irrevocably ruin its feel and character.

For the reasons noted above the development should be rejected.

Kind regards