

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 September 2025 09:37:26 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 21/09/2025 9:37 AM.

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:	Jacaranda Whitehall Drive Crawley
----------	-----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Overdevelopment
Comments:	<p>Formal Objection to Proposed Development</p> <p>I write to formally express my objection to the proposed development of 10,000 residential units in the designated area, on the basis that the plan is fundamentally unsound, inadequately supported by infrastructure, and poses a significant risk to the welfare, safety, and quality of life of existing and future residents. I reside on the border of the proposed development and have firsthand experience of the limitations and deficiencies in the current infrastructure. The following points outline the principal grounds for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Water Resource Constraints <p>The region is already subject to water scarcity. Even minor private developments are required to undergo extensive application procedures to demonstrate water neutrality, often necessitating the importation of water from external sources. It is manifestly evident that the addition of 10,000 dwellings would place an unsustainable and disproportionate burden on local water resources, rendering compliance with water neutrality standards unfeasible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Healthcare Provision Deficiencies <p>Local general practitioners and dental practices are consistently overbooked and unable to meet the needs of the current population. The proposed expansion would exacerbate this issue, resulting in further deterioration of access to essential healthcare services and contravening the principle of equitable healthcare provision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Emergency Medical Services Accessibility <p>Neither Crawley nor Horsham hospitals possess Accident & Emergency (A&E) departments. Residents are compelled to travel to East Surrey Hospital, which is already operating under considerable strain due to the extensive catchment area it serves. The proposed development would intensify this pressure, potentially compromising emergency response times and patient outcomes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Road Infrastructure and Maintenance Failures <p>The existing road network is demonstrably inadequate. Potholes are routinely repaired in a superficial manner, only to reappear following minimal rainfall. In some instances, these defects have remained unresolved for extended periods, prompting local residents to plant flowers in them as a symbolic protest. Vehicular damage is frequent, and the road conditions pose a tangible risk to public safety.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Pedestrian Safety and Lighting Deficiencies <p>Numerous surrounding streets lack basic street lighting, rendering pedestrian travel hazardous, particularly during winter months. These roads are residential in nature, yet there has been a</p>

conspicuous failure to implement measures that safeguard the wellbeing of inhabitants. This issue has been raised previously with the relevant authorities, and it was made clear that there is currently no capacity to address the problem. The absence of lighting poses a serious risk to pedestrian safety, especially in fully dark roads. The justification provided—that the dark skies policy is intended to protect local wildlife—stands in direct contradiction to the proposed development, which would inevitably result in significant light pollution. The introduction of 10,000 new homes would irreversibly alter the environmental balance and undermine the very policy cited to avoid installing essential safety infrastructure.

6. Educational Capacity Limitations

The proposal to construct a single secondary school is grossly insufficient to accommodate the educational needs of potentially 10,000 families. Given the likelihood that the development will attract younger families, there is an existing shortfall in nursery and childcare facilities. This raises serious concerns regarding the ability of working parents to secure safe and reliable care for their children.

7. Inadequate Rail Transport Infrastructure

The local train station is severely limited in both frequency and coverage. Very few trains stop at the station, and the number of routes served is minimal. Services are frequently delayed, and there are often substantial gaps between arrivals and departures. This renders the station unreliable as a primary mode of transport and fails to support the commuting needs of a significantly expanded population. The existing rail infrastructure is manifestly incapable of absorbing the increased demand that would result from the proposed development.

8. Loss of Community Recreational Space

The golf course earmarked for redevelopment constitutes a cherished and well-utilised community asset. It provides vital recreational space and contributes meaningfully to community cohesion and mental wellbeing. Its destruction in favour of an ill-conceived and inadequately planned development is, in my view, ill-advised, misguided, and unwise.

Conclusion

The proposed development is unsuitable, miscalculated, and incompatible with the current and foreseeable capacity of local infrastructure. It will result in the degradation of functional and aesthetically valuable spaces, overpopulation, and further strain on already insufficient public services. The quality of life for existing residents will be adversely affected, and new residents will be placed in an environment lacking adequate provisions. On these grounds, I respectfully submit that the proposal should be rejected in its current form and reconsidered with due regard to sustainability, infrastructure, and community impact.

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