

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 24 September 2025 21:33
To: Planning
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 9:33 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: winterfold tweed lane ifield green

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity

- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

I Object to the application DC/251312 on the following grounds.

Horsham DC local plan has not been adopted yet so this is a speculative application submitted by Homes England that has been fielded in an unprofessional and purely speculative way. If HDC can not bring sites forward for the local plan then they are broadly inviting wholesale speculative applications put forward by developers who will argue that if HDC can't identify sites within an adopted local plan, then developers can submit an application based on the theory that they can identify sites and submit applications at free will with no tangible plan to try to adhere to.

This is akin to Mid Sussex district council and the application for Heathy Wood at Copthorne. Here the council had failed to put sites into an adopted plan and so developers speculatively (and successfully) applied to build 550 homes on the periphery of Copthorne Village despite vehement local opposition.

This application bears striking similarities.

HE have also failed to acknowledge that the Crawley sewage treatment works has already been identified as operating at capacity and will not be able to cope with the extra load from this application. Does this mean that the proposed development will utilise a private treatment works paid for by the occupants?

It has been identified on 24/9/25 that the biggest obstacle to owning a home for young adults today other than the initial deposit for a house is the soaring cost of running a household (Skipton finance), so I fail to see how private treatment of sewage (if adopted) will enable the homes to be affordable to the occupants.

The proposed western modal relief road will result in the loss of numerous veteran trees and many metres of ancient hedgerow- if it follows the route as depicted in the HE documentation. Veteran trees and ancient hedgerows are recommended to be protected , and my entire lane where I live borders the application site with a blanket Tree preservation order in place, so surely the route of the proposed western relief road will have to be completely re thought if the application is permitted to avoid the destruction of the ancient trees and hedges, which it openly appears to plough straight through on the HE graphics.

There are numerous archaeological features yet to be fully investigated that would also be otherwise lost to this development, Ifield Court Farm has a 12th C moated site, there are also possible Iron Age and roman features yet to be fully investigated and again any investigative works will only add to the costs for potential buyers.

The junction of the new western relief road where it meets the Ifield - Charlwood Road hasn't been modelled correctly, and the large influx of new traffic leaving the development onto the Ifield Charlwood Road will cause a serious bottleneck for any traffic heading back into Crawley. The suggestion that a two lane carriageway such as the proposed western relief road can discharge onto the single carriageway road will cause serious delays.

My property is located next to the application boundary having been built in 2024 and I had to meet strict new noise guidelines via planning conditions, these were determined from acoustic survey stemming from concern over the airport noise, nothing was mentioned about a western relief road passing within 100m of my home at the time which will undoubtedly increase the noise and there are no mentions of any acoustic bunds/ fencing / or other noise abatement features. Not a single member of HE ,nor HDC has been to my property to discuss how I might be affected. I have asked several times at the various public open evinces but have yet to have had a satisfactory answer.

The local train station at Ifield which has been put forward in the application as the recommended railway connection ,it has been identified as the worst performing station in the country this week (Network rail Aug 23- Aug 24) with over 10% of scheduled trains cancelled or delayed. How can this be a credible rail link to accommodate the hundreds of extra users this application would inevitably bring ?

The density of the proposed development seems to be far to great , and I refer to a previous application at Ifield Wood for agricultural barns DC/07/0812 that were refused in 2007 due to the proposed height , which is far lower than some of the proposed buildings in the HE application - so this would be a case of double standards should the HE application be approved.

The loss of Ifield golf course completely contradicts the guidance from Sport England that recreational assets are to be preserved and I note that Horsham golf and fitness has been earmarked for development despite HDC refusing the application which was overturned at

appeal. Ifield golf course is a thriving asset to the local area and has to be retained. Water supply has yet to be resolved satisfactorily, with the area being in an identified high water stress area, yet HE have sought to secure water through carrying out borehole tests, but there is no guarantee these will yield enough water consistently and the treatment required to make the water potable will also add yet more expense to any prospective occupants. Another example of the application not carrying enough supporting evidence. The wholesale loss of green space around the western side of Crawley will harm the local populations mental health, with numerous public footpaths having to be closed, or re routed, not to mention habitat loss for numerous species, while I doubt the area has a high degree of biodiversity due to intense farming over the preceding decades it does support bats, [REDACTED] and barn owls to name just 3 protected species.

Kilnwood vale, also another HDC development has still to be provided with suitable local amenities and residents have to travel to other neighbourhoods for their groceries, despite the first occupations being almost 8 years ago, this seems to be a failure by HDC to ensure that residents are provided with local amenities by the developers- how will this be mitigated in the West of Ifield application? or will the potential residents here also be waiting for 7 years plus for a local shop. By design alone if this is the case the residents will have to drive into Ifield for groceries and this can hardly be deemed to be environmentally friendly adding many short traffic journeys

The proposed traffic routes have been ill thought and Ifield Green especially is a single carriageway road with cars parked all along one side for many hours of the day, often causing a traffic bottle neck so the suggestion for this route again shows poor/incorrect traffic data. Rectory lane will then become a rat run and this is a very narrow lane only wide enough for one vehicle to use at a time and currently there are zero hard standing recognised passing places in this road.

for the reasons stated above I strongly oppose the application and feel HDC would benefit from completing Kilnwood Vale and North Horsham before speculatively developing this ancient parish.

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 Eaton