

Objection to planning application DC/25/1312 West of Ifield

From: [REDACTED] former CBC Councillor for Ifield & Ifield West and CBC Cabinet member for planning. Currently Chair of Crawley Active Travel Forum.

Address 7 Parker Close, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 7WT

I wish to register my objections to planning application DC/25/1312 for the following planning reasons:

1 Transport modelling

- The start point is current traffic volumes - but the existing road network is overloaded with existing volumes at peak times, particularly Cheals roundabout, Ifield roundabout and Tushmore roundabout. This situation is worsening.
- Expectation for the West of Ifield development proposals is to see increases in traffic on both Major and Minor roads
 - This will particularly affect rural areas where the roads are less suitable for increases in traffic volumes
- Modelling is based on additional vehicle movement predictions and, as such, is simply an educated guess. Current traffic volumes and congestion in the Crawley area demonstrate that the modelling, and subsequent mitigations (if any), do not deliver an adequate road network.
- Will the proposed Crawley Western Multi Modal Corridor (CWMMC) road be able to handle the traffic generated by 3,000 new homes?
- Will Ifield Roundabout, Cheals roundabout etc be able to handle the traffic generated by 3,000 new homes? They don't cope very well with the existing traffic experienced today.

2 Existing traffic congestion

- Cheals roundabout
 - Daily morning & evening congestion now
 - Very poor Cheals roundabout design – it should be noted that the additional lane from Horsham turning left to Manor Royal was implemented as a Kilnwood Vale solution. This has made Cheals roundabout quite dangerous for most users, including many car drivers, as well as extremely unsafe for people crossing the A23 on foot or bicycle.
 - There are **No** crossings for school children/pedestrians & cyclists (on 3 spurs)
- Ifield roundabout
 - Regularly congested now
 - Frequent accidents
 - Limited crossings for school children/pedestrians & cyclists
 - Pedestrian subway to West Green floods regularly (there was a fatality recently when a young person crossed the dual carriageway because the subway was flooded).
- Pease Pottage roundabout
 - Regularly congested now
 - Poor and confusing design that has caused difficulties for drivers using the roundabout

- Consumes a huge amount of space
- Has **no** pedestrian crossing points from the Woodgate development to/from K2 etc yet people walk this route
- Horsham road – A2220 / A264
 - Will become main connection Horsham <> Crawley
 - High volumes of traffic use this route
- A23
 - Will need to carry additional traffic at peak times
- Conclusion: the major road elements likely to be affected by additional loadings from the West of Ifield development are already under stress due to existing traffic volumes. There is little or no adequate support for active travel users, especially at the major junctions making active travel an unattractive option.

3 Increase in Car volumes

WSCC Residential Parking Demand (Parking Behaviour Zone 3): The West of Ifield site is considered to best reflect Parking Behaviour Zone (PBZ) 3. The standard parking demand for PBZ 3 is as follows:

1 Bedroom (1-3 habitable rooms): **0.9** spaces per dwelling.

2 Bedrooms (4 habitable rooms): **1.3** spaces per dwelling.

3 Bedrooms (5-6 habitable rooms): **1.8** spaces per dwelling.

4+ Bedrooms (7 or more habitable rooms): **2.5** spaces per dwelling.

West of Ifield Interim and Legacy Parking Standards: The WSCC guidance allows for flexibility in applying these ratios to reflect sustainable travel aspirations. For West of Ifield, a reduction in parking demand is proposed, with an initial 10% reduction for interim standards and a 30% reduction for legacy standards. These reductions are based on the provision of sustainable travel options, car clubs, micro-mobility, and a good range of services and amenities, which are expected to reduce the desire for car ownership

Interim West of Ifield Parking Standards (10% Reduction):

- 1 Bedroom (1-3 habitable rooms): **0.8** spaces per dwelling.
- 2 Bedrooms (4 habitable rooms): **1.2** spaces per dwelling.
- 3 Bedrooms (5-6 habitable rooms): **1.6** spaces per dwelling.
- 4+ Bedrooms (7 or more habitable rooms): **2.3** spaces per dwelling. An indicative masterplan unit mix for 3,000 homes would result in a total of **4,501** parking spaces under these interim standards, averaging **1.5 spaces per dwelling**. This average is similar to other developments aiming to reduce car use, such as Elmsbrook, Poundbury, and Northstowe.

Initial plans suggest limited parking provision

Where will residents park their cars if they exceed their provision?

How many households will exceed the predicted cars by house – leading to higher car use in practice than the traffic modelling predicted?

There will also be delivery vehicles etc to the new housing

And traffic/vehicles to/from the Hotel

Conclusion: it is highly unlikely that these car usage objectives will be achieved in practice. The house designs will not support adequate parking places on the development (compare this to the large space available in the Wood gate development). The application should be refused for this reason. Failure to achieve these targets will impact Crawley residents and businesses.

4 Impact on existing roads in Ifield

Hyde Drive/Tangmere Road/Rusper Road

- Rusper road from Hyde Drive, past Tangmere Road to Ifield Green has narrow pavements and high usage for School and other pedestrian access including people with children and buggies and people in wheel chairs, but will be subject to high traffic volumes during the construction period
- Construction traffic will use Tangmere road and Rusper Road until the CWMMC is built
- Conclusion: This will impact negatively on the existing residents and road users with increased traffic, noise and large vehicle movements along a road that is unsuitable for carrying this amount and type of traffic

5 Reduced access to Rusper Road for most people

Crawley Western Multi-Modal Corridor - Transport Link

Impact of blocking off Rusper Road

Car traffic from residents in the new development

Car traffic to and from the development (when finished) can access the section of Rusper Road going towards Rusper using one of the primary roads which joins it near Pound Cottages. They cannot access the section between the golf course and Hyde Drive roundabout. If they want to drive to Ifield station, they must drive north along the CWMMC and are advised to turn right into Ifield Green to access the station. The new roundabout at the north end of the CWMMC will effectively be a four signalled junction as they propose to put traffic lights at the entrance to Ifield Green. These residents will, of course, be able to access the station by foot, cycle or bus (Route A) via the Hyde Drive roundabout.

Car traffic from people living on the Rusper Road between Hyde Drive roundabout and the CWMMC

These legacy residents will not have car access to the CWMMC nor any of the roads within the development. They will, however, be able to drive in and out to the Hyde Drive roundabout and use their old routes to Ifield Station. However, if they want to go to Rusper they have to drive out to Hyde Drive roundabout and then go north on the Rusper Road and turn left where it joins Ifield Green - and then onward to the new roundabout. Here they have a choice of either going

south along the CWMMC and winding their way through the new estate or going along Ifield Wood and joining the Rusper Road further along.

Note that the means of stopping these people going into the development is the electronic gate which will be at the golf club entrance but on the golf club land (i.e. not on the road itself). What stops them joining the CWMMC going north is that their section of road will become a cul de sac just before the CWMMC.

6 Ifield / Faygate Station – will they cope?

Stations/Trains

The outline planning application refers to Ifield station as the main station serving the development. This is despite much reference to using Faygate station to service Kilnwood Vale. It is understood that this proposal has been dropped (increasing the traffic congestion issues in the neighbouring area i.e. Ifield, West of Ifield!)

- Ifield station
 - Has NO parking at all
 - Has NO pick-up/drop-off area leading to cars stopping in the area blocking access for other vehicle users and exacerbating congestion and journey times
 - Has NO bus stops (although only a short walk from Ifield station the Ifield Drive/Tangmere road bus stops block the road – Ifield Drive - in both directions when a bus stops)
 - Limited cycle parking
 - No active travel links to/from West of Ifield development
 - Short platforms
- Faygate station
 - Limited parking
 - May be used more if 10,000 homes scheme happens but will not support the West of Ifield development

7 Pollution

Crawley already has two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in the East of Town

Will additional vehicle use driven by 3,000 new houses create further AQMA areas/problems? Much of this vehicle generated pollution will occur on Crawley's already heavily used roads impacting Crawley residents air quality.

8 Active Travel Approach

8.1 Active Travel approach - will it work?

- Active Travel requires infrastructure in Crawley to work not just 'paths' within the development site

- To attract people to cycle infrastructure needs to be adequate and safe i.e. comply with LTN1/20
- Connectivity will be required to major Crawley trip attractors if people are expected to not use cars.
 - Town Centre
 - K2
 - Leisure park
 - Manor Royal
 - Gatwick airport
 - Three Bridges station
 - Etc, etc
- These routes mostly do not exist in a complete end to end form, to an adequate and complete standard presently
- Default will be for residents to use their cars
- Will adequate funding to rectify the routes in Crawley be made available and in a timely fashion i.e. at commencement of the development?
- When would the improvements be done and by which organisation?
- Note that no routes have been developed in Crawley for the Horsham District Kilnwood Vale development in Horsham (there is a need for a cycle route from Kilnwood Vale into Bewbush and Ifield West – which would then link to other Crawley destinations e.g. Manor Royal, Town centre etc). Why would the Ifield West development be any different?

8.2 Walking

Some residents may walk to/from Ifield station

Some may walk to/from Ifield parade

It is likely that walking will only be appropriate for limited activities within the immediate locality of the site.

8.3 Cycling

Cycling is a good transport option for West of Ifield

But how many people will actually do it?

The **key driver is the adequacy of the infrastructure** i.e. segregated from vehicle traffic, safe paths, controlled crossings of major roads - See comments on infrastructure provision

Local shopping in the development

Local school if the residents children get a place there

Local leisure facilities : play areas etc

Not expected to significantly reduce additional vehicle use, congestion and pollution

Unlikely that there will be a large take-up in cycling based on the proposals in the West of Ifield planning application as they are not comprehensive in terms of trip-attractors and suitable routes for people to use safely

8.4 Buses

Will there be sufficient bus routes?

Homes England's application suggests two bus routes

one will go to all three stations (Crawley, Ifield, Faygate) and then up to Manor Royal and Gatwick the other to Manor Royal and Gatwick via Langley Green.

One of them will also probably serve Ifield West

Need to see regular buses going to Town Centre, Manor Royal & Gatwick etc

Some routes involve two buses? This makes the bus option less attractive

And buses to Kilnwood Vale and Horsham...