

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 12 October 2025 12:06
To: Planning
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 12/10/2025 12:05 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 Kingswood Close, Broadfield, Crawley, RH11 9RU Broadfield, Crawley

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Design

Comments: This is the response on behalf of Active Travel Crawley. Formed in 1995, we bring together the stakeholders and delivery partners involved in Active Travel within the area of Crawley Borough Council and the journeys to and from this area, including walking, wheeling, cycling and multi-modal journeys using Crawley's extensive bus and train network. We include the perspectives of local walkers, cyclists wheelers, bus users etc, elected representatives of West Sussex and Crawley Councils and relevant officers from the councils and other delivery partners such as Highways England. We find much to be commended in the plans. We note that the Transport Strategy Vision aims to follow adopted policy and priorities active travel. However, there are instances where the proposals do not support this. In line with the requirements of the Department for Transport Circular 01/2022 and the Cycle Infrastructure Design LTN 1/20, the West Sussex LCWIP and the Crawley Borough Council LCWIP (including proposed amendments to this reflecting the Kilnwood Vale and the West of Ifield Development), the overall masterplan must recognise the need for a clearly legible active travel corridor across the site, integrated into the wider active travel network. This is vital because this forms an essential part of a planned cycling and wheeling route between Horsham, Kilnwood Vale, Ifield West, this West of Ifield proposal, Langley Green (via LCWUIP route P) and Manor Royal, Gatwick Airport and route to the North. We therefore raise the following major objections

A. We object to the scheme because there is no provision for a direct and legible cycling, wheeling and walking route from the multi-modal corridor into the existing Ifield West neighbourhood. Whilst the Transport Strategy document refers in section 5.8 to a connection to Ifield West this does not form a legible link with routes 1 and 2 referred to in sections 5.6 and 5.7 of that document and the link in the Strategy Document is not reflected in other drawings. In fact, drawings in other documents propose a layout that actively frustrates the provision of a direct and legible link. Further, this cycling and wheeling link must be made available as soon as the multi-modal link and the connection to Rusper Road are established, to ensure that the vision to prioritise active travel modes is adhered to. Ensuring that there is a direct and legible cycling and wheeling route connecting to Ifield West, joining to the multi-modal corridor, would appear to be a zero cost improvement with significant benefits. Given this, it is proposed that it be made a condition of acceptance of this application that housing cannot be occupied until a direct a legible cycling and wheeling link is established between Ifield West and the Multi-Modal corridor.

B. Secondly, we object to the junction design shown in the document "WEST OF IFIELD PHASE 1B HIGHWAY GENERAL ARRANGEMENT SHEET 7 OF 7". This design has made the choice to disconnect the excellent segregated cycling provision on the south side of the multi-modal corridor from the Ifield Avenue Provision. (Travelling east and south using the cycleway and shared use path requires three carriageway crossings) This creates the desire for cyclists to use the carriageway, reducing capacity and introducing conflict. It is unclear how cyclists are expected to move from the carriageway to the shared use path on Ifield Avenue (and vice-versa) and between the carriageway and the dedicated cycleway on the multi-modal road). As cyclists (i.e. not a qualified traffic engineer) we make the following suggestions based on obvious (to us, as cyclists) desire lines. (a) Approaching the junction from the north (travelling south) give provision (drop kerb/ramp, with carriageway markings and signage) for cyclists to transition from the carriageway to the shared use path to continue south. (b) Provide an Advance Stop Line when exiting the multi-modal road from the west (travelling east), and provide a dropped kerb etc to allow cyclists to enter this area from the central refuge. This creates a legible safe route across the junction for cyclists to approach using the segregated cycle lane, use the crossing of the westbound carriageway and then cross the junction on the main carriageway (having used the proposed ASL facility). This would also allow more confident and faster cyclists to safely use the inside lane of the eastbound carriageway of multi-modal corridor for the section where no segregated cycle path is provided. This is of particular benefit if combined with the reduction to 30mph of this section (see below).

(c) For cyclists leaving the junction in a southbound direction, provide dropped kerb and ramp (and signage) for cyclists to transition from the carriageway to the shared use path. This should be south (after) the crossing to avoid conflicts with pedestrians and other users waiting at the crossing.

C. We object to the 40mph speed restriction on the multi-modal corridor.

A lower speed restriction is required to improve the attractiveness of the walking, wheeling and cycling environment, reduce noise pollution, and reduce particulate pollution and maintenance costs (from reduced carriageway wear).

Making this a consistent 30mph throughout the entire length would also reduce the amount of signage (reducing visual clutter and unnecessary poles) and reduce unnecessary accelerating and braking within a very short distance, thereby further reducing noise and particulate pollution, and carriageway wear and fuel use.

D. We note the intention to negotiate a suitable S106 sum to enable Crawley to implement identified improvements to the active travel routes identified in the Crawley LCWIP. We note that the financial amounts mentioned in the LCWIP were indicative, and were current at the time of the LCWIP preparation. We further note that the development sits slightly outside the geographic area covered by this LCWIP, and has therefore not included the costs for required improvements to establish the route from the development to Ifield West and to Kilnwood Vale. It is important that the amount of money agreed as part of S106 negotiations addresses these issues.

As a group, we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the above points, and look forward to seeing these points addressed, so that we may withdraw our objections.

I would like the opportunity to speak at any planning meeting where these proposals are being considered for approval.

[Redacted signature]

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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