

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 June 2025 15:43:01 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 07/06/2025 3:43 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: Tall Timbers The Street Bolney

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

I am writing to formally object to planning application DM/25/1129 for the proposed development of approximately 200 homes at Foxhole Farm, Bolney. My objection is based on several material planning considerations, as outlined below:

1. Conflict with the Adopted Development Plan and Local Policies
The proposal is fundamentally contrary to Policy DP6 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy BOLBB1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. Bolney is designated a Category 3 settlement, where only limited development is supported to meet local needs. The Foxhole Farm site lies outside the defined built-up area boundary and represents a clear encroachment into open countryside.

Crucially, this site was considered but explicitly not included in the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. Although the emerging District Plan proposes this site for future development (as DPA14), this Plan is not yet adopted, and as such should carry limited weight in the planning decision.

2. Contravention of Countryside Protection Policies
This proposal is in direct conflict with Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside) and Policy BOLE2 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. DP12 makes clear that development in the countryside should only be permitted where it maintains or enhances landscape quality and where there is a clear justification, such as agricultural need.

No such justification exists for this application. The development would erode the rural landscape, extend the urban footprint of the village into open fields, and degrade the character and setting of Bolney in a way that is inconsistent with both local and district-level policy objectives.

3. Adverse Impact on Village Character and Scale
Policy DP26 (Character and Design) requires development to reflect the distinctive character and scale of Mid Sussex's settlements. Bolney currently comprises around 259 households with a population of under 650 (2021 Census). Adding 200 new dwellings, potentially doubling the population, would be wholly out of scale with the existing village and risk undermining its historic rural character and community cohesion.

This would not be a modest expansion, but rather a dramatic transformation of the village's identity and physical form, directly contradicting the aims of Policy BOLD1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

4. Unresolved Transport and Sustainability Issues
While the application includes a Transport Assessment, I am convinced that the development does not offer a genuinely

sustainable transport solution, as required under Policy DP21 (Transport). The proposed site has very limited access to essential services, including shops, healthcare, and employment, making it certain that future residents will be dependent on private vehicles.

The suggestion that residents could safely cycle to Cuckfield or Cowfold is unbelievable, given the lack of dedicated cycle paths and narrow rural roads. The current bus service (273) is very limited, and the proposed enhancements are not sufficiently detailed or guaranteed to reduce car reliance meaningfully. These issues raise serious highways safety concerns, particularly with increased traffic volumes on already constrained roads. The proposed junction with the 272 is at a dangerous position.

5. Concerns About the Proposed Community Hub and Infrastructure Contributions

While the inclusion of a "community hub" is presented as a benefit, its purpose and beneficiaries are not clearly defined. It is unclear whether this facility is truly for the existing residents of Bolney or primarily for the new development. If the latter, it does not mitigate the development's wider impact and may in fact intensify traffic and parking pressures.

Additionally, the draft Heads of Terms for the proposed Section 106 agreement offers insufficient detail on the scope and scale of infrastructure contributions. The impact on local school capacity, medical services, and recreational spaces remains uncertain. Given the scale of the proposal, this lack of clarity is deeply concerning.

In summary, this proposal is:

- In clear conflict with multiple adopted policies at both district and neighbourhood levels;
- Out of scale with the existing village and its infrastructure capacity;
- A significant intrusion into protected countryside with no compelling justification;
- Reliant on car-based travel and unlikely to deliver a genuinely sustainable community;
- Lacking adequate assurances on infrastructure contributions and public benefit.

For these reasons, I urge Mid Sussex District Council to refuse planning application DM/25/1129.

Kind regards