

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 25 September 2025 08:30:18 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 25/09/2025 8:30 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:	57 Kingscote Hill CRAWLEY
----------	---------------------------

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><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>I'm objecting to DC/25/1312 (West of Ifield). I accept the need for homes and schools. I do not accept a car-led urban extension that erodes a historic village setting, removes a sports facility without like-for-like replacement, leans on speculative transport promises, and can't prove water neutrality or flood safety up-front.</p> <p>Cutting to the point:</p> <p>1) Countryside &amp; coalescence (conflict with adopted policy)</p> <p>This site sits outside settlement boundaries and is not allocated. It narrows the gap between Crawley/Ifield and the Horsham/Rusper villages, contrary to the countryside protection and anti-coalescence aims of the adopted Horsham District Planning Framework. If you approve this, you're functionally redrawing the settlement edge without a plan-led process.</p> <p>2) Heritage harm - Ifield Village Conservation Area &amp; St Margaret's (Grade I)</p> <p>Ifield's value isn't just buildings; it's the rural setting and approaches to the village and church. Buffers and a thin landscaping strip are not enough. The proposal urbanises that setting, which is a statutory heritage harm that carries great weight. At minimum, there must be a permanent green gap, tight height caps on the edge, and verified view assessments from key approaches. Right now, that protection is not convincingly secured.</p> <p>3) "Tilted balance"</p> <p>I'm well aware of the five-year housing land supply position. But per the applicant's own phasing, the early years are roads and a school; first occupations are years away. Near-term supply benefits are negligible, yet the land take and environmental/heritage harms are immediate. The tilted balance doesn't rescue a scheme that can't carry its own weight now.</p> <p>4) Transport</p> <p>Half a link is not a network. Everything hinges on a "Crawley</p>

Western Multi-Modal Corridor." Approving one segment to the boundary without binding, cross-authority delivery of the rest is how you bake in congestion and severance. Bus promises reliant on short-term subsidy are not mitigation. If this ever proceeds, you must secure before occupation:

A tripartite, time-bound programme (HDC/CBC/WSCC) for the entire corridor and river crossing(s), with triggers tied to occupations.

10-15 years of ring-fenced funding for minimum-frequency bus services and enforceable bus priority.

Continuous, LTN 1/20-compliant cycle tracks on all strategic links, delivered up front - not as a "phase later" drawing.

Without the above, residual cumulative impacts on Charlwood Road, Rusper Road and the A264 remain at real risk of being severe.

#### 5) Flood risk & drainage

No built development should sit in Flood Zone 3, with 8-10 m undeveloped buffers to all main watercourses, strict greenfield runoff rates, mapped exceedance routes and no culverting. Downstream risk on the Mole and Ifield Brook must be tested conservatively, independently reviewed, and secured before consent, not deferred to conditions.

#### 6) Water neutrality

"Offsets later" is not good enough. Occupations must be contingent on proved neutrality for each phase, with on-site demand reduction (e.g., dual-plumbed greywater/rainwater) to cut the offset burden, and named, deliverable offsets locked in by legal agreement before starts on site. Anything less risks legal and delivery gridlock.

#### 7) Loss of Ifield Golf Club (NPPF tests not met)

You can't just say "other courses exist." NPPF requires either a demonstrated surplus or equivalent/better replacement in quantity and quality in a suitable location. That must be secured (and opened) before the course is lost - via S106 and conditions - not left to aspiration. Right now the test isn't met.

#### 8) Biodiversity & the river corridor

"10% BNG" is the legal floor. I want to see the published metric baseline, exclusion of designated habitats from uplift calculations, connectivity maintained across the Mole/Ifield Brook corridor, and a 30-year funded management plan via conservation covenant. Token pocket parks divided by new roads won't cut it.

---

9) School delivery. Don't use it as a Trojan horse

If a new secondary is an existing need, bring it forward as a standalone full application, funded and deliverable without pre-committing 3,000 homes and a distributor road. At the very least, apply Grampian conditions: no occupation until the school is actually built and opened.

10) Claimed economic benefits must be guaranteed, not assumed

If you put weight on jobs and local centre floorspace, secure them: local labour/apprenticeship obligations; fit-for-purpose units; a sequential/impact approach so we don't cannibalise Crawley town centre.

11) Affordable housing - hold the line

Given need and public-land context, this should deliver ≥40% affordable, social-rent-led, without viability backsliding. Nail that down now, not after consent.

To conclude; on the evidence provided, the adverse effects significantly and demonstrably outweigh the claimed benefits. This scheme conflicts with adopted countryside/coalescence policy, harms designated heritage settings, carries unresolved transport, flood and water-neutrality risks, and fails NPPF tests on sports facility loss. Please refuse DC/25/1312.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

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



**Horsham  
District  
Council**