[redacted] [redacted]

Sent: 23 September 2025 15:59
To: Planning
Subject: DC/25/1312

Categories: Comments Received

To whom it may concern

I am writing to register my firm and unequivocal objection to the proposed West of Ifield development. I live immediately behind the site and the proposals will have a severe and wholly unacceptable impact on my home, my family and the wider community.

This development should not proceed at all. It conflicts with both existing and emerging planning policy, and will cause extensive harm that cannot be mitigated.

Policy Conflicts

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and the emerging Local Plan 2023-2040 both require that new development protects the amenity of existing residents, safeguards open space, minimises traffic impacts, and supports sustainable transport. This proposal fails on all these fronts.
Environmental and climate policies in the Local Plan require reductions in carbon emissions and air pollution. Cutting off local roads and forcing longer car journeys will have the opposite effect.
Open space and biodiversity policies require protection of existing green land and corridors. This development destroys valued green space, including well-used dog-walking areas.

Legal Principles

Case law (including Aldred's Case (1610), Sturges v Bridgman (1879), and Wheeler v JJ Saunders Ltd (1994)) recognises that noise, odour, dust and similar interferences can amount to a nuisance, even where permission is granted. These issues cannot simply be "designed out" of a development of this scale and location.

Specific Harms to My Home & Area

- **Traffic and Commuting**: My existing commuting route will be severed, increasing journey times, petrol costs and emissions.
- **Noise, Dust, Disturbance and Smells**: Construction and subsequent increased activity will make it impossible to keep windows open or spend normal time in my garden, directly harming my health and enjoyment of my home.
- **Loss of Green Space and Dog-Walking Areas**: The development will destroy informal open space crucial for exercise and wellbeing.
- **Loss of Privacy and Character**: The new buildings will overlook my property, fundamentally changing the appearance and character of what is currently a quieter, open environment.
- Proposed Gipsy Site Area: I am particularly alarmed that the plans indicate a gipsy and traveller site directly in front of my house. This is wholly inappropriate in such a location and would cause disproportionate harm to my residential amenity, security, privacy, and the character of the area. If such provision is required under planning policy, it should be

located in a more suitable, less intrusive location that does not directly front existing homes.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, this proposal is wholly contrary to the Horsham District Planning Framework and the emerging Local Plan, will cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity, the environment and local infrastructure, and fails the basic test of sustainable development.

I therefore urge Horsham District Council to refuse planning permission for the West of Ifield development in its entirety. No amount of mitigation can address these fundamental conflicts and harms.

Thank you for taking my objection into account.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]
10 Rhodes drive RH110GJ Ifield Crawley
Sent from my iPhone