

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 September 2025 22:20:17 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1312
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 14/09/2025 10:20 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Land West of Ifield Charlwood Road Ifield West Sussex

Proposal: Hybrid planning application (part outline and part full planning application) for a phased, mixed use development comprising: A full element covering enabling infrastructure including the Crawley Western Multi-Modal Corridor (Phase 1, including access from Charlwood Road and crossing points) and access infrastructure to enable servicing and delivery of secondary school site and future development, including access to Rusper Road, supported by associated infrastructure, utilities and works, alongside: An outline element (with all matters reserved) including up to 3,000 residential homes (Class C2 and C3), commercial, business and service (Class E), general industrial (Class B2), storage or distribution (Class B8), hotel (Class C1), community and education facilities (Use Classes F1 and F2), gypsy and traveller pitches (sui generis), public open space with sports pitches, recreation, play and ancillary facilities, landscaping, water abstraction boreholes and associated infrastructure, utilities and works, including pedestrian and cycle routes and enabling demolition. This hybrid planning application is for a phased development intended to be capable of coming forward in distinct and separable phases and/or plots in a severable way.[cr]

Case Officer: Jason Hawkes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 56 Burlands Langley Green Crawley

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments: I strongly object to the proposed development for a number of reason.

3000 homes - This application 'bolts on' 3000 homes to the side of a town but in a very rural setting with poor amenities and communication links. If anyone intends to leave the development they need to effectively drive. Since there is no legal obligation on the developer to provide schools/shops/doctors/sports facilities these will isolate the existing residents forcing them to drive. While we all know Homes England will outline grand plans to have sustainable transport facilities we know that the reality is that using any other form of transport apart from cars is very restrictive. If you look around any area of Crawley and Horsham cars are the primary mode of transport.

10000 homes - Reading this application it's clear that this will be the start of a significant development beyond the current application. The infrastructure being proposed is in excess of the actual needs of the proposal. For example a Hotel in the middle of a rural location is not in keeping with the proximity to a local requirement.

Dual Carriageway - Kilnwood Vale development is of a similar size, they don't have a dual carriageway leading to the development. Homes England fully expect to move on to a second Phase. While this is not covered in this application much of the consultation in this proposal will be pertinent for that application. Water neutrality, sewerage, flooding etc are all at the limits of their capability for the area. A dual carriageway is way in excess of what's required and will create a significant amount of noise pollution and light pollution blighting a very rural area.

Traffic - The expected traffic both during development and after on to Charlwood Road/Bonnets lane will be significant and exceed the current roads capacity. These roads are single carriageways in rural settings. They do not have the capacity to absorb the increase in capacity. Installing a dual carriageway but terminating on to a B road will generate significant noise/traffic pollution. As these roads are currently single carriageways there will be an increased risk to pedestrians at peak times crossing to attend

schools etc.

Traffic - Part 2. Ifield Wood (the road) is a very narrow country road that suffers from high rates of traffic. I can only see this increasing with the development when Charlwood Road/Bonnets lane is overwhelmed with traffic due to congestion.

Water Supply / Water Neutrality - Homes England have stated that much of the water demand will be met by Bore holes. The water table in 2025 has been significantly reduced due to the significant period of dry weather 6+months. Where water availability will be significantly reduced from this source. In conditions water will therefore be drawing from Southern Waters limited resources.

Flooding - Ifield Golf course provides a significant area to absorb rainfall. We have seen this past winter that Ifield Brook floods. With this new development all the rainfall will immediately be diverted to the River Mole and flood both local communities/farmland and areas further down the river.

Loss of sporting facilities - While the application mentions the availability of additional golf facilities in the areas. The loss of a long standing facility will be a significant loss the local area. Homes England are proposing to remove an extensive facility with the comment. 'Don't worry there are facilities you can drive to'. We want this golf course to remain. The assessment that other facilities are available doesn't take into account that this is a community, people play together and socialise together. By removing it many people will not see their fellow golfers as they will be dispersed, some not wanting to start again in another facility.

Loss of sporting facilities - Part 2.

National planning policy provides specific protections against the re-development of sports facilities - including golf courses - for other uses. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework explains that sports facilities should not be built on unless:

- they are clearly surplus to requirements,
- there is new provision of at least equivalent quantity and quality, or
- the development of is for alternative sports and recreation provision.

Without one of those three requirements being satisfied, a planning application for new homes is likely to be refused. Recent appeal decisions to see how those requirements are being interpreted in practice.

I do not see that the applicant can justify an application on these grounds ie it fails the NPPF test. In addition while Homes England

own the course, closing it to justify the points above is not a valid proposition to meet the criteria.

BNG - Submitted Calculation has the loss of a veteran tree with compensation to be agreed. Why is this not included in the submission.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane E aton