

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 October 2025 20:50:54 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 8:50 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, Rusper 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>1) Housing</p> <p>The plans do not include social housing which is the most pressing requirement for Crawley, so-called affordable housing is not helpful, can be kept to a minimum by the developer and is certainly not affordable for the resident in need. This development will provide more housing for London commuters.</p> <p>2) Transport</p> <p>The planned road changes are poorly thought out, inappropriate and destructive to the local environment. To cut off Ifield Station from Rusper and surrounds is completely contrary to the aim of minimising traffic and encouraging the use of public transport.</p> <p>The multi-modal new road is planned as a highway to nowhere. It is constructed with multiple lanes through the estate joining small country and estate roads at either side which are already oversubscribed and will only serve to exacerbate the pinch points on Ifield Avenue and create rat runs through Ifield Green and Langley Green and increasing the commuter traffic through rural Ifield Wood and Rusper/Lambs Green/Faygate. Negatively impacting the surrounding rural area, and these impacts appear not to have been modelled (HE representatives admit to not having even driven there to view it).</p> <p>Furthermore as the road joins neither the A23 to the north nor the A264 to the south, it serves no function to create a useful route for local use. Nobody will be walking or cycling to destination nowhere along it. The number of additional cars that will be on the development has been underestimated. We know people rely on their cars for even the smallest of journeys, and the idea of more people turning to active transport is unsubstantiated by real world data.</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>3) Heritage</p> <p>Ifield Village Conservation Area will be swamped by this development and the historical link between village, Ifield Court Farm and Ifield Wood will 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. There are no viable and appropriate alternatives for the users of equal quality</p>

and cost according to Sports England. Other local clubs have a waiting list, no other local club provides the same junior development (where are our future golfers to come from) and the loss of Horsham Golf and Fitness's 18 holes only increases this issue.

Many others also benefit from the greenspace of the golf course, including walkers and wildlife contributing to local health.

5) Wildlife & Habitat

The destruction of habitat designated as Priority Habitat by Natural England, and Homes England's own ecological surveys, is inevitable under the development plans. Rare and threatened species which should be legally protected have been recorded and once lost can never be replaced. The new road will divide the various habitats and the destruction of hedgerows and mature/veteran trees will remove the wildlife corridors we know are so key. The solution of Biodiversity Net Gain (replacing the lost habitat here elsewhere) will not mitigate the impact of what is lost here for 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. How can HDC justify cutting this off, especially when they have been insistent on 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.

8) Secondary School

One key justification for the development is the delivery of a secondary school. Firstly the numbers of primary school pupils are falling so is there a future need for additional secondary places. Furthermore the need in Crawley is for additional places on the other side of town due to other closures.

9) Sewage

The application ignores the fact that Crawley sewage works is already practically at capacity and both Crawley Council and Thames Water have raised this as a concern. Homes England can provide no evidence that this situation will be mitigated.

10) Water Supply

The ability to achieve water neutrality has not yet been

demonstrated, the proposals include the use of boreholes to extract groundwater which the Environment agency has not yet been confirmed.

11) the initial proposal is for 3000 houses, however HE have made it abundantly clear that they fully expect this permission for this if it were granted to automatically lead to the further complete development of 10000 houses they ultimately aim for. This application should therefore be considered in light of this aim and not simply on 3000 alone. Anything else is disingenuous.

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