

Sent: 23 September 2025 14:49
To: Planning
Subject: *await address*DV/25/1312

Categories: Comments Received

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 disruption to the local residents in their lives will be huge. The noise will be a constant issue, due to building works and the increase in large vehicles delivering materials to site constantly using the only road in. A lot of people work from home, so no doubt would impact their working day detrimentally, as well as the increase in traffic, making the already small Rusper road, even more dangerous to navigate with lorries and larger vehicles using this direct Road from Crawley. As a dog walker who uses this road regularly, the pavements are already very narrow and adding more heavy goods vehicles along here, increases the risk of a pedestrian, animal or child getting hit.

Another big issue with this monstrous development, is the impact it will have on local services, there is one major accident and emergency hospital , East Surrey, that covers a huge and vast area, which is already stretched to capacity, how can adding at least another 3000 households to their patient list, be anything short of ridiculous. It is all well and good saying that there will be doctor's surgery or schools, but the hospital is a major part of the wider community that would not manage all these extra families.

As previously mentioned, I would be living right next door to this proposed site, and regularly there is a huge amount of flooding. The fields next to Ifield meadows are constantly flooded throughout autumn and winter, which leaves it in passable, along with my garden, which was built on one of these fields. There would need to be some extensive drainage system to manage this issue.

My last point is the amount of wildlife that would be affected. As I live directly by the woods the numerous species I see and hear is huge. There are deer, foxes, owls, woodpeckers, [REDACTED] and numerous species of bird. This development would make these vulnerable creatures scared and homeless especially where the Ifield golf course is situated as well as the noise and disruption.

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.

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]
RH11 0GB