

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 24 September 2025 20:37:32 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 24/09/2025 8:37 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:** The Orchard, Rusper Road Crawley

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	<p>Objection to Planning Application DC/25/1312 - West of Ifield</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed development on the following planning grounds, supported by factual evidence:</p> <p>1. Housing Need and Policy Conflict</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The proposal is positioned as meeting Crawley's housing needs. However, Crawley Borough Council itself has stated that "the West of Ifield is emphatically not that place" for new housing.</li><li>- Horsham's own planning policies (HDPF) specifically warn against the coalescence of Crawley, Horsham, and rural settlements such as Rusper and Ifieldwood. The application ignores these policies and undermines the distinct identities of local communities.</li><li>- Furthermore, the scheme provides only "affordable" housing as defined by market discount, not the social housing Crawley has identified as a real requirement.</li></ul> <p>2. Employment Mismatch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The scheme delivers disproportionately more housing than employment opportunities. Only 1,400 FTE jobs are proposed, which is inadequate compared with the housing scale.</li><li>- Gatwick and Manor Royal cannot realistically provide sustainable employment to match the demographic attracted by this development. Current trends show offices in Manor Royal are being replaced by warehouses with low employment density and low-paid roles, mismatched with the planned housing mix.</li></ul> <p>3. Water Supply and Sewage Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Crawley sewage treatment works are already close to capacity and red-flagged by Thames Water. The application fails to demonstrate that this critical constraint can be mitigated. In fact, the documents are contradictory as to whether Thames Water was consulted at all. This omission raises the risk of legal unsoundness.</li><li>- Proposed measures for water neutrality (rainwater harvesting, borehole extraction, water credits) are unproven at the required scale and carry unresolved uncertainties, including whether the Environment Agency will even grant an abstraction licence.</li></ul> <p>4. Healthcare Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The application makes reference to Crawley Hospital but fails to acknowledge it has no A&amp;E provision. East Surrey Hospital, already under significant pressure, is omitted entirely.</li><li>- A shortage of GPs is well-documented locally; new premises do not address the underlying recruitment crisis. The application</li></ul>

therefore fails the test of realistic deliverability of essential services.

#### 5. Biodiversity and Environmental Loss

- Homes England's own ecological surveys confirm the site has high biodiversity value, including legally protected and priority species. Destruction of mature trees, hedgerows, and wildlife corridors cannot be offset by a nominal 10% Biodiversity Net Gain calculation.

- Sussex Wildlife Trust has raised serious concerns about the loss of functionality at Ifield Brook Meadows within the district's wider ecological network. These issues remain unaddressed.

#### 6. Heritage Impact

- The rural setting of Ifield Village Conservation Area will be permanently lost. Ifield Green, part of the conservation area, is identified as a route for diverted traffic, directly undermining its heritage status.

- The historic landscape relationship between Ifield Village, Ifield Court Farm, and Ifield Wood-integral to the parish's history-will be erased.

#### 7. Golf Course Loss

- Ifield Golf Club is a heritage course designed in 1927 and recognised for both its sporting quality and biodiversity. Its loss cannot be mitigated by reliance on other oversubscribed facilities such as Tilgate or Rookwood.

#### 8. Scale and Phasing Concerns

- The application for 3,000 homes is clearly the first phase of a 10,000-home strategy, with road layouts already designed to extend further into countryside.

- This piecemeal approach circumvents proper Local Plan scrutiny, as the site is not allocated in Horsham's adopted Local Plan. This undermines democratic planning processes and creates significant risks of inadequate infrastructure planning for the true scale.

□

#### Conclusion

This proposal is speculative, contrary to Horsham District Council's own planning framework, environmentally destructive, and based on unproven assumptions about housing need, water supply, and employment. It fails to provide credible evidence that it can deliver a sustainable, well-serviced community.

For these reasons, I strongly object to planning application DC/25/1312.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



---

**Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**  
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton