

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 October 2025 19:44:54 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 11/10/2025 7:44 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: 28 Brantridge Road Furnace Green Crawley

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Loss of General Amenity

Comments:

WEST OF IFIELD PLANNING APPLICATION

I object to planning application DC/25/1312 West of Ifield for the following planning reasons:-

Infrastructure shortfalls

There is not enough detail on supporting Infrastructure. Although this planning application is for 3,000 houses, Homes England were clear (in April 2025) that the full 10,000 house proposal joining Horsham and Crawley is a "future opportunity" that is being kept under review, ie if the 3,000 houses are approved then the planning will start for the next 7,000. So in effect the 3,000 is the first phase of a much larger "masterplan". Horsham Council should be considering the impacts and the infrastructure needs of the full 10,000, not just the first phase in isolation

There is already a strain on health services and without significant additional investment in physical and mental health, the town may have extra housing provision, but without health support and the removal of a healthy mental health outlet provided by any sport but specifically a golf course which provides magnificent views and fresh air to walkers and golf players I can see a decline in health and quality of life for all.

The need will be for extra acute hospital facilities, ITU and Critical Care and other acute hospital provision and cannot just be met just through the provision of additional community clinics.

The Plan mentions in the Strategic Policy HA2: Land West of Ifield f) Through liaison with the NHS Sussex Integrated Care Board (ICB) or any updated organisation with responsibility for health care provision, ensure that development facilitates, the delivery of local healthcare facilities which as a minimum, meet the needs of the new occupants of the development. This may include the appropriate provision of land, buildings and/or financial contributions.

The inclusion of the word 'may' here is much too vague on such an important issue.

Housing tenure

It's claimed that the houses are needed for Crawley residents. But there's no mention of any of the social housing (40% cheaper than market price or rent) that Crawley Council needs. The so-called "affordable" housing will not help. Secondary school One of the main justifications for the site is that it delivers a secondary school, but is this really needed? The numbers of primary school pupils is now falling, which will obviously affect future secondary numbers.

Water supply & Sewage

Water supply Homes England have presented various ways in which they believe they can achieve water neutrality, but there are

too many uncertainties with all of them. Such a big issue should have been resolved before application. They believe they can meet the water neutrality requirements by harvesting rainwater and extracting groundwater through boreholes, but the Environment Agency has yet to report on whether this is feasible and sustainable, and whether they will grant a licence for the groundwater extraction. This should have been sorted pre-application. The application ignores the fact that Crawley sewage treatment works are almost at capacity, and that Crawley Council and Thames Water have raised this as a concern. HE's various documents contradict each other about whether Thames Water have been consulted. This poses a huge risk of more sewage overflows polluting the River Mole. Thames Water Identify existing FOUL WATER network does not have sufficient capacity to support the proposed development and request conditions are imposed

Traffic

I remain concerned that the negative impact on local traffic hotspots will be severe even with the suggested mitigations of traffic lights, chicanes and speed bumps. There will be: more congestion and delays on Ifield Avenue; rat running through Langley Green, Ifield Green and Ifield Wood, with associated safety issues; congestion and cyclist and pedestrian safety concerns at the Tangmere Road, Overdene Drive, Ifield Drive, Ifield Station junction, especially as this will be the route for construction traffic. We also believe that the impacts on nearby villages such as Rusper, Faygate and Charlwood have been underestimated. We welcome HE's aspiration to move to more sustainable travel, but we're concerned that the models may be overly optimistic about the extent to which residents will shift away from car use towards walking, cycling and using public transport. The models assume that this shift will also apply to existing Crawley residents. The Rusper Road closure, will mean much longer journeys for existing Ifield residents to reach Rusper, and for existing Rusper residents to reach Ifield station. HE has specifically mentioned Ifield Wood and Ifield Green as suitable routes for the diverted, and hence additional, traffic. 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. I note the Highways agency recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period - Require missing and further information

Golf

My objection relates to this with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 99 and Homes England's inability to find Ifield Golf Course surplus to requirements and the inadequate mitigation in relation to this in supplying equal or better-quality alternative facilities. Improvements at the Tilgate and Rookwood courses are proposed but it is not specifically

referenced how these 'improvements' will increase capacity which is the key issue, golfing for 500 members being taken away with these plans. It is not satisfactory that the final mitigation package will be confirmed as part of ongoing discussions and negotiations. Planning permission should not be granted in advance of this. In addition there is loss of another 18 holes at Horsham Golf and Fitness along with other recent golf course closures in our area at West Chiltington, Rusper, Redhill and Reigate, Effingham Park. The reduction in holes at Mannings Heath and Cottessmore. Gatton Manor have applied for change of use so yet another closure is imminent. In total this represents the closure of 117 holes of golf in an area already under provided therefore sufficient other local provision is needed to meet the needs of Crawley and surrounding areas golfers if the planning provision is approved and needs to be agreed before the approval. The plans for minor improvements to Tilgate Golf Course, Rookwood and Goffs Park pitch and putt are not sufficient mitigation, and a like-for-like facility is needed. As a well-established members' club with a carefully maintained 18-hole course, Ifield is distinct from municipal, short course, or mixed-use venues. It has a thriving junior section, and offers affordable memberships and coaching. Ifield provides both high-quality golf experiences for all, as well as playing an important community role. The claim that displaced members could be absorbed by other local clubs is unfounded. Clubs like Copthorne and Mannings Heath are already at capacity or have high costs and joining fees that many golfers cannot afford

Heritage

Ifield as an ancient village will be spoilt by a housing development of this size.

Historic England say the proposals cause harm to the significance of the Medieval moated site at Ifield Court (scheduled monument) and St Margaret's Church (Grade I listed). The ES identifies significant adverse effects to these assets

Undemocratic and speculative.

The site is not allocated in HDC's adopted Local Plan which means the application is "speculative". Historic England had made clear they wouldn't seek to avoid the full and proper scrutiny of the Local Plan process in this way, but they have. This feels undemocratic and not what a government agency should be doing.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge Horsham District Council to refuse this hybrid planning application.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

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 Eaton