

Sent: 14 September 2025 15:05
To: Planning <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: *address* Application DC/25/1312

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Application DC/25/1312

I am writing to object to the proposed development at West of Ifield, which would result in the closure and loss of Ifield Golf Course.

The golf course is a well-established members' club with a long history. The vital role it plays as a community-oriented facility cannot be replaced by incremental upgrades to public sites, a floodlit driving range, or a pitch-and-putt course.

The application proposal seeks to redevelop Ifield Golf Course for housing. While Horsham District Council does not presently have a five-year housing land supply, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, there are significant policy conflicts that must be considered in this case.

1. Loss of a valued sports facility – Ifield Golf Course is a thriving private members' club, offering a high-quality sports environment to its members. It is well used and demonstrably not surplus to requirements.
2. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 99 – The NPPF is explicit that existing sports and recreational land shouldn't be built on unless:
 - o An assessment shows it is surplus; or
 - o It is replaced by provision of equal or better quality and quantity; or
 - o It is replaced by an alternative recreational use which clearly outweighs the loss.

The current proposal fails these tests. No equivalent replacement of the golf course is offered, either in terms of quality or accessibility.

3. Sport England's statutory role – As the statutory consultee, Sport England is expected to object to the loss of this facility without adequate replacement.
4. The tilted balance – Although the Council's housing shortfall must be acknowledged, case law and recent appeal decisions confirm that the protection of valued sports and recreation facilities is a strong policy safeguard. In this instance, the adverse impacts of losing a well-used golf course without suitable replacement would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of additional housing.

Given the points outlined above, I respectfully urge that the application be rejected in accordance with national policy and in recognition of the significant role Ifield Golf Course plays in supporting the health and wellbeing of Horsham's residents.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter, and for your continued support to the residents and the wider district.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Ifield Golf Club member