

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 June 2025 15:16:18 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 3:16 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: Redbrae The Street Bolney

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

I wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1. It conflicts with Adopted Planning Policies - DP6 and BOLBB1
The proposed development directly conflicts with Policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy BOLBB1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. Bolney is designated as a 'Category 3 - Medium-Sized Village', where only limited development to meet local needs is appropriate. Foxhole Farm lies outside the defined built-up area boundary, in open countryside, and is not allocated for development in the current adopted Plan. It was considered and rejected in the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan. As such, this proposal represents unjustified encroachment into the countryside, contrary to both local and neighbourhood planning policy.

While the site may be identified as DPA14 in the draft Regulation 19 Plan, this plan has not yet been adopted and should carry limited weight. The absence of a demonstrable five-year housing land supply does not automatically justify approval of a scheme that is otherwise non-compliant with adopted policy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2. It poses potential harm to the Countryside - Contrary to Policy DP12 and BOLE2

Policy DP12 requires development in the countryside to be necessary and to protect or enhance landscape character. This application does neither. It proposes a large-scale housing estate on unallocated open countryside land, with no agricultural or policy-supported justification. Similarly, the proposal undermines Policy BOLE2 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to maintain the rural character and appearance of the area.

3. It will negatively impact the Village Character - Contrary to DP26 and BOLD1

The proposed scale of development is excessive and inconsistent with the established character of Bolney, contrary to Policy DP26 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy BOLD1. Bolney is a small village of under 650 residents in 259 homes (2021 Census). The addition of 200 dwellings - potentially increasing the population by over 60% - would overwhelm the existing community, disrupt village identity, and fail to respect local scale and distinctiveness. This scale of change is not sympathetic to Bolney's character and setting.

4. There are significant Transport and Sustainability Concerns - Conflict with Policy DP21

Policy DP21 promotes sustainable communities with access to services and sustainable transport options. The applicant's Transport Assessment fails to demonstrate that this site is genuinely sustainable. Key concerns include:

Lack of safe, practical alternatives to car use. Residents are likely to remain car-dependent due to the distance from shops, GP services, and schools.

Unclear or inadequate proposals to improve the 273 bus route, which is currently infrequent and unlikely to support daily needs. Cycling routes to nearby villages such as Cuckfield or Cowfold are

either unsafe or unrealistic for regular use.

Increased traffic volume raises serious concerns about road safety, particularly at local junctions and within Bolney village.

5. Unnecessary Community Hub - Added Traffic and Unclear Benefit

The inclusion of a community hub is likely to exacerbate traffic and parking problems, especially if used by non-residents. There is insufficient evidence that the facility is needed or wanted by the existing community or that it would be viable.

6. Questionable Evidence and Lack of Detail in Application Documents

If there are specific inaccuracies or assumptions in the submitted documents - such as the Transport Assessment, Design and Access Statement, or Housing Need justification - these must be scrutinised. I would urge the planning authority to please assess the robustness and reliability of the applicant's evidence.

7. Section 106 Contributions - Insufficient Clarity

The draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 agreement provide little detail on infrastructure contributions (e.g. school places, affordable housing, play areas). Although 30% affordable housing may meet policy minimums, the type, tenure, and distribution remain unclear. The lack of transparency at this stage adds to the uncertainty about whether the proposal can deliver meaningful benefits.

All round, my objections are on the basis that this is a wholly unsustainable proposal, which will negatively impact on the services to the village and the character of the countryside and potentially dangerously increase traffic in a location that is already a RTI hotspot.

Kind regards