



has already created pressure on remaining facilities. The combined effect of these closures, plus the proposed loss of Ifield, would be catastrophic for golf provision across Horsham District and Crawley. This context is not adequately reflected in the applicant's "needs assessment," which presents an artificially balanced picture of supply and demand.

#### **4. Lack of Capacity in Remaining Clubs**

The assessment assumes displaced members from Ifield can easily be absorbed by other courses. In reality, no local club has the spare capacity to take on Ifield's 500+ members. Courses such as Copthorne and Mannings Heath already operate at capacity or with high costs and joining fees that are not accessible to many golfers. Simply claiming there are "vacancies" ignores issues of affordability, accessibility, and suitability.

#### **5. Quantity vs. Quality – Not Just Numbers of Courses**

The applicant's analysis focusses heavily on numbers of courses within a 20-minute drive time. But golf provision cannot be measured purely by quantity. The quality of the offer, the tradition of a members' club, and the role of a stable, community-centred facility like Ifield cannot be replaced by piecemeal upgrades to municipal sites. A floodlit driving range or a pitch-and-putt facility is not equivalent to the loss of a par-70, 18-hole course with nearly 100 years of heritage.

The applicant has not demonstrated surplus provision. Nor is there any like-for-like replacement of equivalent quality and accessibility. The proposals therefore fail the NPPF tests.

#### **7. Homes England's Responsibility**

Homes England, as the applicant, should be expected to provide sports and recreation facilities for a new community of this scale in addition to retaining existing provision. Instead, they appear to be offering the bare minimum of general leisure space while removing a well-loved, well-used, and historic sporting asset. This is mitigation in name only, not in substance.

#### **Conclusion**

The loss of Ifield Golf Course would represent a permanent and irreplaceable blow to sports provision in Horsham District and Crawley. The mitigation proposed is wholly inadequate and fails to address the specific qualities, capacity, and community role of Ifield Golf Course. The closure, taken alongside the recent and pending closures of other local courses, would leave a serious deficit in provision for current and future generations.

#### **8. Congestion & Air Quality**

I am extremely concerned about the extra traffic this would mean, approximately 5000-6000 more cars on our already congested roads. And we know the development will not stop until they have built 10,000 homes. I would like to know how it is envisaged our roads will cope. Not to mention the proposed Gatwick second runway development.

We are constantly being told at local meetings that congestion will not be a problem as people will be walking & cycling but in reality we all know that is not going to happen. Particularly for families and when there is limited provision for weekly shops, doctors surgeries etc.

Yours faithfully



[23 Strathmore Road](#)

[Ifield](#) Green

Crawley

West Sussex RH11 0NT