

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 October 2025 14:14:14 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 19/10/2025 2:14 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:	1 Merlin 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">- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Other- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	<p>Highway access and parking</p> <p>I would strongly encourage councilors and planning officers involved in this application to visit this site to see what a fantasy HE transport plan is.</p> <p>The idea that people living on the new development will exclusively use public transport or walk would seem to be at odds with what we have seen in all other developments in this area and national trends.</p> <p>Also at odds with a recent review from Transport for New Homes that found 39 of 40 large scale developments reviewed left residents no other option but to rely on cars despite developers promises of active travel.</p> <p>Simply - more people equals more cars</p> <p>For the few people that do not have cars they will still increase traffic with home deliveries, taxis etc.</p> <p>The roads in the area are already gridlocked at peak times and always busy at other times.</p> <p>The roads are narrow and in places its difficult for two normal sized vehicles to pass. Should a larger vehicle or lorry try to pass traffic must almost stop and for two large vehicles to pass traffic must stop so the vehicle can maneuver past.</p> <p>There are turnings on the proposed main routes both in Ifield and Rusper that traffic must stop completely in both directions and make a space to allow lorries, buses and larger vehicles to access the turn.</p> <p>HE claim to be able to put in cycle paths on the Rusper Road. If you view this road for yourself you will see there is no space for cycle paths on this narrow road.</p> <p>The narrow path from Hyde Drive / Rusper Road is already well used by pedestrians to access schools and the station, they are already at risk from lorries who regularly mount the pavement to pass other vehicles and cyclists. There is no space for cycle paths or to improve pedestrian paths which cyclists use as the roads are too dangerous.</p> <p>Other roads which will be used by the increased traffic and some are actually part of HE plan for construction traffic are residential, narrow and have cars parked on both sides as they were built with the understanding that not everyone would have a car. Sadly wrong then and even more so now with most homes having access to more than 1 vehicle. This will significantly increase</p>

traffic on roads barely coping now with the ever increasing traffic. If the schools are built the proposed catchment area includes areas well away from Ifield. People will use their cars to take children to school. As much as it becomes more and more difficult (and people coming across Crawley will have quite a difficult journey) it is still deemed better than attempting to use public transport which can be unreliable, expensive and hard to make timings work. There is of course, if you have more than 1 child, a chance they will both will not get in to the same school in this over subscribed area as was recently highlighted by Romesh Ranganthan. How do you think people will manage to get children to school/s and then get themselves to work using public transport. They will use their cars.

The same for shopping. I wonder how many of us will be happy to take our children on a bus or buses to carry out a weekly shop ? Then drag children and the shopping home on the bus ?

Trips to the Gym ? Again people will simply use their cars.

And what about the proposed facilities/services on the site ? A Hotel, businesses, shops, Healthcare facilities, sports facilities and Travellers pitches.

All of these will increase the traffic coming in and out of the site. Its impossible to say that people using a hotel or visiting a business will not use cars or have deliveries using vans /lorries. Also impossible to say that the business sites and hotels will only employ people that live within walking distance. Healthcare facility will only offer services to people within its own postcode? It's a nonsense.

Blocking off the Rusper Road will create a massive cul de sac for significant number of residents of Ifield West, parts of Rusper Road, Summerwood and Drughorn Way Estate (still being built) and people from the new development until the proposed by pass is built. Giving 1 narrow road in and out for a significant number of people. Its worth noting that the Rusper Road regularly has road works and has done for years which currently causes significant traffic tail backs, increasing the traffic and giving no alternative will make this a very difficult situation.

Even if the by pass is built (already mocked locally as the road to nowhere and built at huge cost) it will not be available for the majority of these people and people will chose not to use it. It will encourage even more traffic to race through the streets of local neighborhoods as they do now to avoid the congested main roads.

If the by pass is built the traffic that uses it will end up on B roads in either Charlwood or Ifield . Neither of which can accommodate this traffic as they are already congested.

Ifield and Faygate stations are small and have no room to be improved with no pick up drop off space and definitely no parking. There is no rail link to Manor Royal which is still a major employment hub so people will use cars.

Both stations will struggle to cope with the additional passengers HE envision will be using them.

Loss of general amenity

Ifield and Rusper are rural/ semi rural areas with historical landscapes. Ifield has a conservation area. These have already been impacted by the ongoing developments around Ifield and Rusper but to build an addition 3,000 and potentially 10,000 houses will devastate the area completely changing it forever. The environmental impact of losing this valuable green space cannot be measured.

The statement from HE that they can 'mitigate' this somehow by 'off setting ' is difficult to understand. How can creating an urban sprawl with a dual carriage way through the middle be seen as mitigation?

Ifield and Rusper provide invaluable wildlife corridors in an ever reducing area this development will destroy areas identified as important in Sussex Nature Recovery Network. In addition in an area that already has poor air quality and is accepted as a flood plain to remove countless trees, hedgerows and fields seems like a foolish plan. Especially while increasing pollution and traffic from an ever expanding airport.

People who live in Horsham and Crawley have seen the green spaces available to them disappear over the years and to build all over the few remaining areas left will further deprive the people for no good reason. There are other places that will have less impact on the environment.

This will effectively create Crawsham, an urban sprawl completing the circle created by Kilnwood Vale, Bewbush and Mowbray. How can merging Horsham and Crawley together be seen as a good thing ?

Other

HE vision that people living on this development will not need cars is reflected in the number of planned parking spaces on the site. This will clearly cause issues. People will find places to park and potentially parking further away in existing roads or abandoning vehicles anywhere as we see on other new build estates where this myth was accepted.

Development

This is poor planning which will put even more strain on existing infrastructure.

The claim that it will support Gatwick growth is questionable. Jobs at Gatwick are reducing through automation and significant numbers of people who work there are not permanently employed or are on minimum/low wage. These people will simply not be able to afford the houses that will be built.

Expansion will not necessarily increase jobs.

We all agree that this area needs more houses but the right houses in the right place. Not enough social housing just more houses for people from outside the area or investors.

There are so many houses being built and so many approved but

not being built because demand is low. Local people are being pushed out. HDC admitted that the majority of new houses in the area are not going to local people.

Loss of Ifield Golf Club and provision of Sport

I am deeply concerned at the way HE have presented the case for building on the golf course.

Firstly, the course has never been owned by to 500 members so they could not have promoted the sale of the course to HE as implied in the documentation.

So many local golf courses have been lost to housing or reduced the size of the course its hard to understand how HE can justify saying it is excess to capacity. Just this week Horsham Golf were successful in their application to turn their site to housing further impacting the availability of golf and sporting facilities.

Rusper Golf closed a few years ago.

Crawley is the. 10th most populated town in the south east. To say that it only can support 1 club (Tilgate) and that Ifield is surplus is a bit surprising.

Even more surprisingly is that HE feel Tilgate Golf Club and Goffs Park can accommodate Ifield Golf

Ifield has 100 year old course, is a members club with good social facilities, well regarded by golfers. Recently featured in a golf publication that described it as a truly exceptional golf experience and one of the best courses in the region. Tilgate is a community course with very limited facilities. Even access and parking is limited at Tilgate.

I would question how the 500 members plus all the green fee players and social club members will be able to get to and park at Tilgate who currently support about 100 members. And I presume members of Horsham Golf will be looking for a new club (450 members)

Of course, everyone would have to drive again across Crawley/Horsham increasing yet again traffic.

Ifield hosts a number society days many raising money for charity and casual golfers. The people who attend these events are unlikely to travel to a club like Tilgate as the course and facilities would not be at the same level.

HE include Goffs Park golf as mitigation, this course is a 9 hole pitch and putt course mainly used by children and to include this shows exactly how seriously HE have looked at this.

Golf is changing, its being played by all sorts of people and more young people who want enjoy the environment and play sport.

If this proposal goes ahead a new golf club of the same level must be offered.

HE have also proposed a sports hub. It looks on the plan a smaller version K2. Anyone who has used K2 will tell you parking is a massive problem. A similar facility on this proposed site will cause chaos for local residents, the amount of traffic it will generate and parking.

This site has been turned down for development on many occasions and nothing has improved in fact quite the opposite. It should not go ahead.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: 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 Chief Executive: Jane E aton