

[REDACTED]
Sent: 24 September 2025 14:09

To: Planning <planning@horsham.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Your Ref: DC/25/1312 letter dated 4 September 2025

Your Ref: DC/25/1312 letter dated 4 September 2025

Direct line: 01403 215162

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

“West of Ifield” proposal

As a long time Ifield resident (3 Plough Close), please take this as my objection to the proposed “West of Ifield” development

The “Save West of Ifield” campaign and Crawley’s own Planning department have comprehensively detailed why such a proposal has concerns for amongst others “traffic congestion, environmental impact, water resources, social and affordable housing availability, sewage, noise and power supply”

Additional concerns, in no order of priority

Gatwick expansion

This week’s cynical waving through of the use of Gatwick’s spare runway will cause additional disruption

Use of the second runway for short haul flights and to free up the main runway for additional long haul flights (besides environmental damage) is similar to enabling the emergency hard shoulder safety lane on motorways to be used as an additional traffic lane

Homes for England

This body looks to be an additional mechanism to circumvent what by right should have been the responsibility of the government. Their cynical and opportunist land grab further confirms “West of Ifield” being considered as a done deal

Relevant planning considerations

Traffic - in the immediate time, the volume of construction related traffic and henceforth increased public traffic on existing and new roads and public transport will be unwelcome

Parking - currently there is no attempt to prosecute the many cars that park on verges despoiling green spaces and obstructing pedestrian rights of way. Some have even co-opted to carve out their own parking presumably without local planning permission
Holiday makers are parking up on public roads rather than use pay at one of the massive airport parking lots. Gardens are being converted into parking leading to a further reduction of green spaces

Noise - an indication of future additional aircraft noise can be gauged by what is currently being experienced at Heathrow

Disturbance - years of heavy building with attendant traffic

Smells - aircraft pollution will be increased and money better spent on technical innovation to reduce emissions

Design - the recent ongoing developments (e.g. Kilnwood), again in very close proximity, are ugly, badly thought out and disruptive. A higher quota of social housing would enable a more settled, confident workforce

Irrelevant Considerations

Why not? These have an impact on existing residents if not for interested parties for example, but not exclusively "Effect on value of property", "Personal and financial circumstances", "Loss of view" and especially "Moral" which includes "Values"

Other factors to be taken into consideration

The letter is dated 4 September with a closing date of 25 September - is this an arbitrary or agreed closing date for consultation

Take lessons from other overly ambitious projects e.g. HS2. A better approach would be to scale back and deliver small changes incrementally overseen by qualified local planning starting with social rather than private housing, rather a big bang approach

"No brainer for growth"

This quote from "a government source" is presumably an unintended ironic, description of both the Gatwick and Horsham proposals

In short, please take this as an objection to the proposed expansion in the Western part of Horsham and request an alternative location(s) be considered

Additionally please take into account all of the feedback being co-ordinated by "Save West of Ifield" and Crawley's own Planning department