

# Land at Foxhole Farm, Bolney

## Conservation Consultee Response

Date: 28/07/2025

---



## Introduction

- 1.1. This note provides a summary of our position in relation to the conservation consultee comments, received in an email dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2025 from Ms Emily Wade, Conservation Officer.

## 2. Comments

- 2.1. Although we do not agree on all matters, there appears to be relatively little ground between us on most issues.
- 2.2. It should be noted that Conservation Officer's response is clear that she is providing a **possible range** for harm (with further detail needed on such matters as the detailed design of the open space at reserved matters), whereas we have provided an anticipated level, based on the masterplan provided. This may account for some of the apparent difference between us.
- 2.3. With regards to the Church of St Mary Magdalene, we characterise the harm as less than substantial and very low, the Conservation Officer as within the low-mid range, and with regards to the Grade II Listed Well and Walnut Cottage, we consider the harm to be low, and the Conservation Officer within the low-mid range. As such, it may be that there is little or no difference between us on these assets, subject to reserved matters application detail.
- 2.4. Furthermore, we appear to be close in our assessments with regards to the former post office, for which we assess a very low level of harm, and the Conservation Officer a low level of harm.
- 2.5. It should also be borne in mind that the Conservation Officer appears to consider that some of the harm is inevitable with the provision of housing and public open space, and this should be considered in the context of the allocation of the site for residential development. Such inevitable impacts of residential development must have been considered acceptable for the allocation of the site.
- 2.6. In this regard, whilst there is disagreement on the level of harm to the Conservation Area (with us characterizing the harm as low less than substantial, and the Conservation Officer within the mid to high range of less than substantial), it should be noted that residential development was considered acceptable at allocation, that the scheme has been modified specifically in response to requests from the Conservation Officer (for extra planting and for the realignment of the road), that the officer recognizes that this has lowered the harm, and that no further specific scheme *changes* have been requested (although further detail is required at a reserved matters stage).
- 2.7. It should also be noted that the Conservation Officer considers that the 'public open space' within the site would 'transform' the central agricultural field. The detailed design of this area can be controlled through a reserved matters application, but it is envisaged that this area will have an open grassland character.



- 2.8. Likewise, there is disagreement between us with regards to the impact on the Providence Chapel and Bolney Place non-designated heritage assets, with our assessment being a low or very low level of harm, and the Conservation Officer harm within the mid range. Again, no further changes to the scheme were requested, and development should be considered in the context of the site's residential allocation.
- 2.9. There are a group of heritage assets which the Conservation Officer considered the site is potentially visible from (for some as access was not gained to these properties during the site visit). These comprise the Grade II Listed Daltons, Durstons, Brookers Lodge and Cottage, Brookers Farm and Barn and Tanglewood. The assessment of potential intervisibility of these assets from the site concluded that they were not visible from the site, and the site was not visible from them. Nevertheless, for some of these assets, Ms Wade considers that the site contributes to significance as part of the rural surrounds irrespective of intervisibility. Ms Wade considered that the heritage significance of these assets would be harmed, whereas we do not, as set out in the Heritage Statement. Irrespective of the differences between us, I would draw attention to the allocation of the site for residential development.

### **3. Conclusions**

- 3.1. Whilst there are differences between us on the assessment of harm, this must be considered in the context of the residential allocation of the site. Furthermore, in light of the ranges of harm provided by the Conservation Officer and the control that the LPA will have over the development through a reserved matters application, there may be less actual difference between us than that apparent from the broad ranges.

**Bristol**

First Floor, South Wing  
Equinox North, Great Park Road  
Almondsbury, Bristol, BS32 4QL  
T 01454 625945  
Bristol@pegasusgroup.co.uk  
Offices throughout the UK and Ireland.

# Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



All paper sources from sustainably managed forests

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT

We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



Pegasus\_Group



pegasusgroup



Pegasus\_Group

**PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK**