

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 October 2025 19:37:02 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 08/10/2025 7:37 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:	Ivy Cottage Lambs Green HORSHAM
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Other- Overdevelopment- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	<p>I object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Housing</p> <p>It's the wrong kind of housing in the wrong place. This is basically connected to Crawley and goes towards the coalescence of Horsham and Crawley towns, which is not wanted by HDC.</p> <p>There are no plans for social housing, just a small percentage of so called affordable housing, which will probably be reduced in the final plans as development costs come under pressure and the developers seek to retain their profit margins.</p> <p>2) Transport</p> <p>The planned road changes are just a nonsense. To cut off Ifield Station from Rusper is totally counter productive to minimising traffic and encouraging the use of public transport.</p> <p>The multi-modal new road only makes sense if it actually goes somewhere, and as it neither joins the A23 to the north nor the A264 to the south, it's just a massive white elephant. It won't function as a multi modal route if it doesn't go anywhere either. Nobody will be walking or cycling to nowhere along it.</p> <p>Ifield station is not suited to the additional volume of commuters that this development will supply. The residents will not work locally, they will commute into London, as the only people able to afford them will be on London salaries.</p> <p>The number of additional cars that will be on the development has been underestimated.</p> <p>We know people rely on their cars for even the smallest of journeys, and the idea of more people turning to active transport is unfounded by real world data.</p> <p>3) Heritage</p> <p>Ifield Village Conservation Area will be swamped by this development and leave it an island in a sea of modernity. Its entire character will be lost forever.</p> <p>4) Ifield Golf Course</p> <p>The golf course cannot be replaced once built upon. The people using it do not have viable and appropriate alternatives of equal quality and cost according to</p>

Sports England.

It's not only golfers that benefit from the greenspace of the golf course, but also walkers and wildlife too.

5) Wildlife & Habitat

The destruction of habitat which is designated as Priority Habitat by Natural England can never be replaced. Biodiversity Net Gain is a nonsense that cannot replace the plants and animals directly destroyed by the development. 'Gaining' somewhere else is not helpful to those plants and animals, and is not helpful to the residents of the development or the local people.

6) Landscape

The residents of Crawley are hemmed in on the other 3 sides by Gatwick Airport, the A23 and the A264, so this rural landscape to the west is their only escape. What right to HDC have to cut that off when they have been insistent upon that not happening to their own residents of Horsham town?

7) Health & Wellbeing

This development would add to pressure on East Surrey Hospital which is already strained.

Access to the development for emergency vehicles would seem to be circuitous at best.

Although Homes England have said that a Health Centre will be provided, they are not providing the staff for it, which are in short supply nationally. Why would these workers who are not paid enough choose to come and work and live in such an expensive area?

Homes England have not committed to providing either a Dental Practice, nor a Pharmacy, both of which are over-subscribed locally and nationally.

The loss of the natural green space cannot be replaced by a manufactured green space when it comes to the health benefits of access to open spaces.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk





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