

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 08 September 2025 13:30:09 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 08/09/2025 1:30 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:	7 Sharphorne Close Ifield Crawley
----------	-----------------------------------

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	<p><b>SUMMARY (DECISION REQUESTED)</b></p> <p>I object to the West of Ifield hybrid application and ask HDC to refuse permission. The scheme conflicts with the NPPF and local policy, pre-determines strategic transport choices, worsens congestion and air quality, places people and property at flood risk, damages biodiversity networks, and causes harm to designated heritage assets and to the setting of Ifield Village. The adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p>

### APPLICATION CONTEXT

This is a first phase of a much larger new settlement. It relies on an "enabling" spine road (the so-called Western multi-modal corridor) that would lock in a strategic growth pattern outside an adopted, sound Local Plan. That is the wrong way round and contrary to the plan-led system.

### POLICY CONFLICTS

3.1 Local Green Space (Ifield Brook Meadows & Rusper Road Playing Fields) - The proposal urbanises and erodes the tranquillity, recreational function and wildlife value of designated Local Green Space protected by Crawley policy.

3.2 Pre-determination by road - Putting the corridor in by application, ahead of a cross-boundary transport strategy, would pre-determine strategic choices and divert resources from more effective solutions.

3.3 Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land - The site includes BMV soils. The application fails to demonstrate avoidance and minimisation at the strategic level, contrary to national policy.

### FLOOD RISK - SEQUENTIAL/EXCEPTION TESTS NOT PASSED

Significant areas fall within the River Mole/Ifield Brook floodplain or act as functional storage. The scheme has not shown that vulnerable development is steered to the lowest-risk land, nor that it will be safe for its lifetime without increasing risk elsewhere when climate-change allowances and access routes are considered. On that basis alone the application should be refused.

### TRANSPORT - SEVERE RESIDUAL IMPACTS

The A264/A2011 corridors already operate under heavy stress, with unreliable peak journey times and bus delays. Thousands of new trips plus a distributor road will worsen congestion, rat-running and accidents, especially around Ifield, Crawley Avenue and the A23 approaches. Rail capacity at Ifield station is constrained. The Transport Assessment does not demonstrate a deliverable, funded package that prevents severe residual impacts or protects existing Air Quality Management Areas.

#### **NOISE - GATWICK CONTOURS AND FUTURE EXPOSURE**

Parts of the site lie within Gatwick noise contours, with expansion scenarios likely to increase exposure. Designing to today's marginal thresholds risks sub-standard internal and external amenity and future complaints-poor planning for a community intended to last generations.

#### **HERITAGE HARM**

The proposal harms the setting and character of:

Ifield Village Conservation Area, whose significance depends on its rural meadows and separation;

St Margaret's Church (Grade I), whose exceptional significance relies on its tranquil rural setting;

The Scheduled medieval moated site at Ifield Court, vulnerable to hydrological change and setting erosion.

Great weight must be given to their conservation. The public benefits claimed do not clearly outweigh the harm.

#### **BIODIVERSITY & STATUTORY BNG**

The Ifield Brook/River Mole corridor, nearby ancient woodland and bat foraging/commuting routes form a sensitive network. The road and estate layout would fragment habitats and dark corridors. The application has not credibly shown delivery of at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain based on robust baselining, nor that significant harm is avoided rather than offset with paper units. Irreplaceable habitats cannot be compensated.

#### **OPEN SPACE & HEALTHY COMMUNITIES**

Loss and degradation of valued open space, including the role currently played by Ifield Golf Course and the meadows, undermines local access to nature and active lifestyles. Proposed green space is not an equivalent replacement for the character, accessibility and tranquillity of what would be lost.

#### **SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE & UTILITIES**

GP, school and wastewater capacity are already stretched. There is no binding, phased mechanism to ensure real, staffed capacity before occupations. Without it, the scheme will degrade service levels across Crawley and Horsham.

#### AIR QUALITY & CLIMATE

Additional traffic flows toward/within existing AQMAs are likely. The scheme does not secure the mode shift, bus priority, or network management needed to prevent deterioration. Construction emissions and operational traffic are under-mitigated.

#### PLANNING BALANCE - WHY REFUSAL IS NECESSARY

The application is not plan-led, fails key NPPF tests on flood risk, heritage, biodiversity, and transport, and undermines designated Local Green Space. Housing delivery does not trump these conflicts. The harms are certain and near-term; the supposed benefits are speculative and contingent on later phases. The only defensible outcome is to REFUSE permission.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

---

**Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**  
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton