

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 18 September 2025 15:41:35 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 18/09/2025 3:41 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:	139 Warren Drive Ifield 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>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li></ul>
Comments:	<p>I object to planning application DC/25/1312 West of Ifield for the following planning reasons:</p> <p>Further expansion beyond the 3,000 homes: Although this planning application is for 3,000 houses, Homes England were clear (in April 2025) that the full 10,000-house proposal joining Horsham and Crawley is a "future opportunity" that is being kept under review, ie if the 3,000 houses are approved then the planning will start for the next 7,000. So in effect the 3,000 is the first phase of a much larger "masterplan". To approve a 3000-home application without considering the impacts and infrastructure needs of the full 10,000-home "masterplan" would constitute extremely short-sighted, poor planning on the part of Horsham District Council.</p> <p>Traffic: The proposed development will have a further negative impact on heavy traffic hotspots within the local area. Delays on Ifield Avenue and Ifield Drive are already present and this development will elevate them further, as well as making connecting roads to them busier. The safety of pedestrians around the Ifield Station junction, in extreme close proximity to The Mill Primary School, concerns me, especially as this is a proposed route for construction traffic. The Rusper Road closure will mean much longer journeys for existing Ifield residents to reach Rusper, and for existing Rusper residents to reach Ifield station. Homes England has specifically mentioned Ifield Wood and Ifield Green as suitable routes for the diverted, and hence additional, traffic. These roads will become overly congested and are unsuitable for the amount of traffic this application seeks to allow. All this additional traffic would increase the general noise level in the area which is already elevated due to the close proximity to Gatwick Airport and the area featuring several bus routes that connect to Gatwick.</p> <p>Golf: Homes England suggest there is sufficient local provision to meet the needs of Crawley golfers and that minor improvements to Tilgate Golf Course, Rookwood and Goffs Park pitch and putt is enough to mitigate the loss of 18 holes at Ifield Golf Club. I, in the strongest possible terms, fundamentally disagree with this. Ifield is a well-established, carefully maintained 18-hole course</p>

that has a thriving local membership and is now becoming more popular with younger members as a result of the continued growth of the game in the UK. The claim that current members could be absorbed by other local clubs is extremely misguided, with many of these courses (Cottesmore, Copthorne, Mannings Heath and more) already at their maximum capacity for membership or holding much higher membership costs, making it prohibitive to join. This point is especially relevant to younger members who face increasing financial challenges across all aspects of their lives.

With the approved loss of another 18 holes at Horsham Golf and Fitness, I again strongly disagree with Homes England and their assumption that Crawley golfers are sufficiently served with other local options. Other local courses that have closed in recent years include West Chiltington, Rusper, Redhill and Reigate and Effingham Park. Mannings Heath and Cottesmore both reduced their number of holes in the recent past and Gatton Manor have applied for a change of use so yet another closure is imminent. This represents the closure of 117 total holes of golf in an area already underprovided in a country where the sport is growing. Support for the sport should be encouraged, not stunted.

Water supply:

Homes England have presented various ways in which they believe they can achieve water neutrality, but there are too many uncertainties with all of them. Such a big issue should have been resolved before application.

They believe they can meet the water neutrality requirements by harvesting rainwater and extracting groundwater through boreholes, but the Environment Agency has yet to report on whether this is feasible and sustainable, and whether they will grant a licence for the groundwater extraction. This should have been sorted pre-application.

Undemocratic:

The site is not allocated in Horsham District Council's adopted Local Plan which means the application is "speculative". Homes England had made clear they wouldn't seek to avoid the full and proper scrutiny of the Local Plan process in this way, but they have. This feels undemocratic and not what a government agency should be doing.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge Horsham District Council to refuse this hybrid planning application.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane E aton