

[REDACTED]

56 PEVEREL ROAD
IFIELD
CRAWLEY
WEST SUSSEX
RH11 0TH

Jason Hawkes
Horsham District Council
Planning Department
Albery House
Springfield Road
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 2GB

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

28 September 2025

Dear Mr Hawkes,

Re: planning application DC/25/1312

I OBJECT to planning application DC/25/1312 for the following reasons:

1. **TRAFFIC:** The plans for the site show no western relief road joining the A264 at Faygate with the A23 at Lowfield Heath, as originally suggested, but just a central spine through the estate which discharges onto Ifield Avenue close to Bonnetts Lane with an apparent exit onto Rusper Road roughly where the current Golf Club entrance is. This is wholly impractical and will prevent existing Ifield residents, as well as those moving into the proposed new homes, from going about their normal daily business unhindered.
 - a. Those who are familiar with the area will be aware that the Ifield Avenue/Bonnetts Lane area is already incredibly busy, particularly at peak hours, with queues to join the A23 (Crawley Avenue) at the Ifield Roundabout regularly stretching back several hundred metres along both Ifield Avenue and Ifield Drive.
 - b. The second exit, onto Rusper Road at the Golf Club which may just be for the proposed schools, will discharge onto roads that are already operating well beyond capacity, causing considerable frustration for those living in and visiting Ifield West. It should be noted that the need for secondary school places is in the east of Crawley, not the west. The traffic generated by parents driving their children across town to access the school, as well as the traffic from 3,000 new homes, will compound this frustration, particularly given the following sub point...
 - c. The Homes England plans show Rusper Road will be blocked at Furlong Farm. This will isolate access to the Village, the administrative centre of the Parish to which my neighbours and I belong and where our children go to school. We will be forced to travel to Rusper via the new Bonnetts Lane junction or via the A264 and Faygate (if we are able to fight our way through the queues in the area of the Rusper Road/Tangmere Road junction). This road is also used by many Ifield residents who travel to Horsham and beyond and this traffic will be pushed through Gossops Green and Bewbush or via Cheals roundabout – further areas whose roads are already operating beyond capacity. Increasing length and time of journeys is contrary to Government and local council policies aimed at reducing motorised journeys and pollution.

- d. The closure of Rusper Road at Furlong Farm will turn the whole of Ifield West into one giant cul-de-sac. How do we enter or leave the estate when the section of Rusper Road between Tangmere Road and Hyde Drive is blocked, either by accident or design, as it often is? More importantly, how is it proposed that emergency services access Ifield West in this situation? This development will risk the lives and property of Ifield West residents.
 - e. During their consultations, Home England confirmed that the main road through the estate would not be constructed until after the Golf Course has been developed and that construction traffic would enter the site via the current entrance to the golf course. Indeed, section 3.2 of the document *Phase 1 Construction Traffic Management Plan* confirms this to be the case. The section of Rusper Road between Tangmere Road and The Millbank is incredibly narrow with no scope for widening and is therefore completely unsuitable for large amounts of construction traffic. When buses meet in this section of road, one often has to bump up on the pavement in order for them to pass, a pavement that is used by many children walking to and from the local Primary & Secondary schools. This development will place the lives of children in danger and further encourage car use and congestion as parents drive their offspring to school out of concern for their safety.
 - f. The claims by Homes England that the residents of the 3,000 new homes will walk, cycle or use public transport are, as we all know, an absolute nonsense and should carry no weight in the decision making process of any rational person who has even the slightest understanding of normal human behaviour.
 - g. These fantasy claims are further refuted by the referencing in previous documentation of 'Northstowe', a flagship development by Homes England in Cambridgeshire which, six years after people started moving in, still have no shops, no health provision and no community facilities. People will not walk or cycle several miles to access these facilities; they will get in their cars and drive to the back of the nearest traffic jam, further exacerbating the existing congestion seen around the Crawley area.
2. **WATER:** The problems with water on this site are threefold:
- a. **Supply:** The environment agency have halted all development within the Arun supply area due to concerns about water being extracted from Pulborough brooks SSSI, among others. This requires an assessment of water neutrality, which cannot possibly be achieved by constructing 3,000 houses, all of which will use water. This means you **MUST** refuse any development in this area
 - b. **Sewage disposal:** The Thames Water treatment plant at Tinsley Green is already operating at capacity with regular spills of raw sewage into the Gatwick Stream, a tributary of the River Mole. My understanding is that Homes England have not consulted with Thames Water and there are no plans on the part of Thames Water to facilitate treatment of the sewage produced by West of Ifield.
 - c. **Flooding:** The area west of Ifield Brook Meadows is a flood plain. A representative of Homes England, who came from Birmingham, told me that it wasn't, but I have lived in this area for over 40 years and have seen the fields either side of Ifield Brook flooded numerous times, including during several recent (not unusual) storms. The developers solution will, of course, be to build the land up and shift the problem elsewhere, but you have a responsibility to consider the interests of all homes and businesses downstream, including Gatwick Airport, which will be adversely affected by flooding, flooding which will be exacerbated by run off from the newly concreted land which currently absorbs lots of rainfall, keeping it out of Ifield Brook and the River Mole.

3. **RECREATION & LEISURE:** Claims have been made that there are adequate facilities for golfers in the area, but those who made these claims have only taken courses in the Horsham District into account when Ifield is predominately used by Crawley residents. Also contrary to claims made, Rusper golf course has shut and Cottessmore is now just a 9 hole course (which is also at risk from ill-considered development). The imminent closure of the Horsham Golf & Fitness course near Hop Oast, to facilitate more housing development, will further reduce golf provision in the area. Despite those pushing the West of Ifield scheme saying otherwise, there is a high demand for the facilities at Ifield and they hold a waiting list for membership and have a thriving junior section. I believe that a full study has been made and submitted in this respect, and I would urge you to take it into consideration. Tarting up Goffs Park Pitch & Putt does not constitute mitigation. However, leaving a well used and well loved golf course just as it has been for almost a century will.
4. **HEALTH CARE PROVISION:** East Surrey Hospital is already running beyond capacity, with 7+ hour waits in A&E being common. Local doctors are not taking on new patients and dentists are nigh on impossible to find. A further 6,000 – 8,000 residents trying to access these services is not sustainable. Homes England claim that they will be making provisions for healthcare, but they do not have the remit to build and staff medical facilities; that is the responsibility of the local health care trust. Setting aside land for a surgery to be built is NOT making healthcare provisions. Kilnwood Vale, for example, still has no doctors surgery and residents are having to travel to Horsham to access basic healthcare. This does not fit with Homes England's claims of a '15 minute neighbourhood'. With no commitment from healthcare providers, this development **MUST** be refused in the interests of public health.
5. **STRATEGIC HOUSING AND ECONOMIC LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: HOUSING REPORT 2018:**
(https://www.horsham.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/66221/SHELAA-2018-FINAL-v7-App1MSDC.pdf) In a Horsham District Council produced report in 2018, a later report than your current (2015) Local Plan, you stated that ***"This site would be contrary to policies 1, 4 and 26 of the HDPF in particular. The site is therefore assessed as 'Not Currently Developable'."*** These are your words and nothing has changed during the intervening years; Sustainable Development, Settlement Expansion and Countryside Development remain considerations and concerns which means that this site must remain as 'Not Currently Developable'.
6. **RUSPER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN:** On 6 May 2001, the electorate of Rusper overwhelmingly voted to accept the neighbourhood plan, which DID NOT include the West of Ifield as a development site, by a margin of almost 9 to 1. This is a clear mandate to refuse the West of Ifield site. When democracy fails, anarchy prevails; something that Councillors, elected to represent their constituents, should take heed of.
7. **WILDLIFE:** I know little about wildlife beyond the harm that it would suffer if this application were to be successful – it doesn't take a genius to work out that wildlife will be lost for ever if hedgerows are ripped out, trees felled and fields dug up - so I would refer you to, and urge you to digest and understand, submissions made by the experts in this field.

Yours sincerely

