



Horsham
District
Council

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Land West of Ifield Charlwood Road Ifield West Sussex
DESCRIPTION:	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 separable way.
REFERENCE:	DC/25/1312 (Design Code)
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / More Information / Modification
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: Please note this is the third set of comments (V03) and focus on the Design Code. Where needed, other documents have been crossed referenced to fully understand the proposals.	
MAIN COMMENTS: 3.3.2 Accessible Natural and Semi-Natural Green Spaces <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The vision is to transition to a historic parkland character around Ifield Court? How?2. The code refers to key views along the River Valley at the entrance of the site should be protected – how?	

3.3.5 Allotments

3. Proposed allotment located near Ifield Court House, to the north of the site, is not conveniently located in relation to the proposed development. While it may meet the 1000m walk, this is only to a very small number of residents.
4. We also query the split location of the 2 allotment sites located within the meadow park. Being it fenced secured facilities, it's important that these appear well integrated within the park and not seen as segregating the space.

3.3.6 Youth Areas & Facilities

5. Vision and objectives: please include sheltered seating to the dedicated activity areas box
6. Please add to the OPA coding box a bullet point that ensures the needs of young people, including girls and young women under 18, are reflected in the design and creation of these spaces. Girls and young women like to socialise while playing and exercising, so equipment should reflect this. Seating areas should allow people to face each other, whether it be through curved or modular benches, scramble nets or stepping stones/logs. Outdoor gym and exercise equipment should be arranged to encourage conversation, rather than in a line.

3.3.8/3.3.7 Play Spaces

7. Add: due to clay soil, steel footings must be specified for any timber street furniture and play equipment, for added longevity.
8. The locations of LEAP's and NEAP's shouldn't overlap and shouldn't be combined.
9. We recommend that the NEAP identified adjacent to the Grove sports hub focus on the delivery of outdoor gym and equipment more suited to target young people.

3.3.9/3.3.10 Key Landscape Interfaces/Buffers & Summary table

10. It is recommended that these buffers are identified as areas to be delivered as advance planting within the parameter plan.
11. Remove reference to footpaths within ancient woodland buffers and particularly Hyde Hill, as these are highly sensitive areas and the greater buffer size (over and above minimum standards), part of the ecology mitigation measures and agreement with NE.
12. Remove reference that allotments can be incorporated within ecological buffers all together.
13. The zones of 'minimal human disturbance' must be reviewed as these do not seem to align with the mitigation measures proposed within the ES Biodiversity (Chapter 8) and Appendices: Biodiversity (part 12). Based on the mitigation requirements for the bats, our understanding is that the minimum human disturbance should be 20m for the Ifield brook LWS, and the full 35m, as no human disturbance near Hyde Hill.
14. With regards the badgers setts [*please note these had the input of HDC's ecology officer*], badger trust recommendation is stated below. Please amend table accordingly:
 - Use of heavy machinery within 30m of any sett entrance. The proposals refer to 25m15m.
 - Use of lighter machinery (particularly for digging) within 20 of any sett entrance. The proposals refer to 10m.
 - Use hand tool such as hand digging or scrub clearance within 10 m of any sett entrance. The proposals refer to 5m.
15. Page 61 – it is assumed the section A-B refers to Ifield Meadow and not Hyde Hill as stated. In this section, it is understood that 'minimal human disturbance' area is 25m, not 10m suggested within the summary table.

3.3.11 Hyde Hill Nature Conservation Area

16. Points 2 and 4 seem to be contradictory as one states that no recreational routes allowed within 50m of the AW, and the latter suggests a 15m zone of minimal disturbance, free from paths and SuDS. Please clarify

3.3.15 Trees and Hedgerows/3.3.16 Planting Guidance Table

17. Street Tree Size: primary streets must include 20-25cm girth trees (as opposed to 18-20cm), secondary streets (18-20cm girth) and tertiary 16-18cm girth. Further, 30-35cm girth trees are expected at key locations and to be used as features.
18. Soil Volume: minimum rooting volumes for large tree must be 24m3 (as opposed to 15m3 proposed)

4.2.7 Key Areas – Market Square

19. Play: in addition to table tennis, it is considered that the square and its relationship with the schools, would create a good location/opportunity for the provision of contemporary sheltered seating.

4.2.8 Sub Character Area 2 – Urban Living

20. OPA Coding – point 3 must state the softening of the public realm with the use of soft landscape features.

4.2.13 Key Areas – The Grove Sports Hub

21. Lighting is to be limited to 3G pitch and tennis/padel courts
22. Play: please add that the NEAP is to include the delivery of an outdoor gym and focus particularly on the needs of young people.
23. Sample Plan: does the indicative plan makes allowance for the 3m run off to sides required to be applied for multiple pitch layout?

4.3.6 Key Area – Ridgeway Park

24. Play: NEAPS/LEAP should not be delivered in close proximity as shown and should rather be spread more evenly around the site. Further, so far there is no indication of what youth provision is being considered and whether the space requirements for each use can be met (i.e is it a skate park, a bmx track, ball courts, sheltered seating or a mixture?). This must be identified within the design code. Further, the Muda identified in Ridgeway Park, must be detailed and considered as a bespoke, open sided Muga for inclusivity and to cater for the needs of young girls too.

4.3.6 Key Area – Ridgeway Park

25. Play: as above re proximity of NEAPS/LEAPS and provision of more detail on Youth areas so that we can be satisfied that the location is suitable for intended use. In this particular area, it is considered that the open space adjacent to the public right of way and marked as play space should be considered as amenity greenspace and particularly earmarked as a large grassed area suitable for kick about.



26. We have raised concern (under the DAS set of comments) with the constrained nature of the sports pitches design and relationship between these and split allotments. This is further accentuated by the fact that the allotments are facilities that will require high fences and given the proximity of the sports pitches to SuDS and pedestrian/cycle routes, likely to require boundary fencing as well.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: N/A

NAME:	Inês Watson CMLI Specialists Team Leader (Landscape Architect)
DEPARTMENT:	Specialists Team - Strategic Planning
DATE:	21/11/2025