

**Sent:**  
**To:**

03 January 2026 05:25  
Jason.Hawkes

**Subject:** FURTHER OBJECTIONS/REASONS FOR REFUSAL TO HOMES ENGLAND'S WEST OF  
FIELD PLANNING APPLICATION - IN THE LIGHT OF IAN MULCAHY'S FORENSIC  
ANALYSIS OF ITS DESIGN CODE

**Categories:** Comments Received

## Dear Jason Hawkes

### REASONS FOR REFUSAL

(Explicitly Cross-Referenced to the NPPF)

#### Reason for Refusal 1

##### Inaccuracy and Unreliability of Submitted Information

The application is supported by a Design Code and associated documentation which contains numerous factual inaccuracies, errors of description, and misrepresentations, including incorrect distances, misidentified administrative boundaries, and inconsistencies between text, figures, and diagrams.

These inaccuracies materially undermine the reliability of the evidence base relied upon to assess the proposal and prevent the Local Planning Authority from making a properly informed decision.

The proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraph 35, which requires plans and decisions to be based on proportionate, justified, and effective evidence, and paragraph 38, which requires decisions to be based on early, meaningful, and accurate engagement.

#### Reason for Refusal 2

##### Internal Contradictions and Lack of Certainty in the Design Code

The submitted Design Code contains internal contradictions and inconsistencies relating to building heights, housing densities, spatial character areas, buffers, and

coding diagrams, resulting in ambiguity as to the development parameters that would apply at reserved matters stage.

This lack of clarity fails to provide a coherent and reliable framework for future decision-making and undermines the purpose of a design-led approach.

The proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraphs 126 and 129, which require design policies and codes to be clear, robust, and unambiguous, and to paragraph 130, which requires developments to function well and add to the overall quality of an area.

## **Reason for Refusal 3**

### **Failure of Enforceability Owing to Non-Binding Drafting**

The Design Code relies extensively on discretionary and non-binding language, particularly through repeated use of the term “should” rather than “must”, in relation to matters necessary to safeguard residential amenity, environmental quality, and community wellbeing.

This inconsistent drafting creates uncertainty as to which measures would be enforceable and fails to secure essential mitigation.

The proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraph 56, which requires planning conditions and controls to be precise, enforceable, and effective, and paragraph 11(d), which requires development proposals to be demonstrably sustainable.

## **Reason for Refusal 4**

### **Reliance on Unsubstantiated and Aspirational Benefits**

The application advances numerous aspirational claims regarding employment provision, retail and commercial uses, health facilities, cultural provision, energy generation, and long-term stewardship, without providing binding agreements, funding mechanisms, or confirmed delivery arrangements.

In the absence of such evidence, these claims carry no material planning weight and cannot be relied upon to justify the proposal.

The proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraph 8, which requires the economic, social, and environmental objectives of sustainable development to be demonstrably met, and paragraph 11(a), which requires proposals to accord with the development plan.

## **Reason for Refusal 5**

### **Failure to Demonstrate Deliverability and Long-Term Management**

The application fails to demonstrate how key elements of the development, including community facilities, public spaces, landscape buffers, and ecological mitigation, would be funded, delivered, and managed in perpetuity.

This creates a significant risk that features relied upon to justify the development would not be delivered or would degrade over time.

The proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraph 7, which defines sustainable development as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the future, and paragraph 174, which requires development to protect and enhance environmental assets.

## **Reason for Refusal 6**

### **Highway Safety and Operational Impacts**

The Design Code proposes restrictive parking and access arrangements, including in relation to school facilities, without demonstrating that these measures would operate safely or effectively in practice or without resulting in displaced parking and highway safety risks on surrounding roads.

The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would provide safe and suitable access for all users.

The proposal is contrary to NPPF paragraph 110, which requires developments to provide safe and suitable access, and paragraph 111, which requires that development should be prevented where residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

## **Reason for Refusal 7**

### **Loss of Confidence in Applicant Competence**

Taken cumulatively, the volume of inaccuracies, contradictions, ambiguous drafting, and unsupported claims demonstrates a lack of due care and professional rigour in the preparation of the application.

This results in a justified loss of confidence that the proposal could be delivered in a coordinated, policy-compliant, and sustainable manner.

The proposal is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraph 11, which requires decision-makers to approve development only where the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

The Ifield Society

2 Lychgate Cottages  
Ifield Street, Ifield Village  
Crawley, West Sussex  
RH11 0NN

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

•