

Sent: 05 November 2025 12:15
To: LAMB Peter (MP)
Subject: LETTER TO CRAWLEY MP CALLING FOR THE ABOLITION OF HOMES ENGLAND
Attachments: thumbnail.jpg

Categories: Comments Received

LETTER TO CRAWLEY MP CALLING FOR THE ABOLITION OF HOMES ENGLAND

Dear Peter Lamb - MP for Crawley

Re: Call for the Abolition of Homes England

I write as your constituent and as someone deeply concerned about the future of our communities and the integrity of our planning processes within Crawley, Ifield and beyond.

I urge you to support the abolition of Homes England and the re-allocation of its remits to more accountable, transparent and locally-responsive institutions. My call rests on two key evidential pillars: first, the agency's structural and operational shortcomings; second, its handling of major developments - especially its 'West of Ifield' masterplan within the ancient Parish of Ifield.

1. Structural and operational shortcomings of Homes England

A recent commentary in [HQ Network](#) argued that while the housing crisis demands urgent action, Homes England currently lacks the functional coherence to deliver. The piece states: "the affordable housing crisis would be better served by Homes England being subject to radical surgery instead of the axe" but that ministers should "get the agency's act together rather than breaking it up for the mayors".

This language betrays a lack of confidence in this housing quango's ability to fulfil its mandate as the government's master-developer. A central executive body managing vast budgets and land-holdings (including [REDACTED] affordable housing budget and a large land-bank) yet failing to command trust is deeply problematic.

For an organisation of this scale and remit, accountability to local communities and responsiveness to local planning concerns must be non-negotiable. Yet the existing model appears overly centralised, bureaucratic and somewhat detached from the very localities it is supposed to serve.

Given the magnitude of the housing challenge, the government must ask: is a single large quasi-agency the right instrument, or does it entrench structural rigidity, reduce democratic accountability, and hinder meaningful local engagement? If the answer is the latter, then abolition and redistribution of functions may better serve the public interest.

2. Case example: The "West of Ifield" development and local democracy

Turning to the second link: the blog post from [Gatwick City Times](#) describes a proposed 10,000-home £3bn development in the ancient parish of Ifield Brook Meadows, including Ifield Wood and Ifield Golf Club, being driven by Homes England.

It reports that the agency apparently mis-communicated or mis-represented the local council's position (Crawley Borough Council), who denied support for the masterplan despite statements to the contrary.

For example, the blog states:

"Homes England has agreed to acquire 160 acres at Ifield Golf Club ... first phase 3,250 homes ... masterplan for a 10,000-home village"

And yet:

"Crawley Borough Council have responded: 'This statement is incorrect. CBC have not supported the proposals ...'"

Moreover the masterplan appears to target large swathes of countryside, green-belt/woodland and locally-valued green spaces. Such scale and impact demand scrutiny, strong local democratic oversight and transparency — all of which appear deficient in this case.

This example illustrates a wider concern: when a large national agency holds land-bank, planning influence and funding power, there is a real danger of local voices being side-lined, of community identity and the environment being subordinated to developer-led visions and national metrics and algorithms. That is neither sustainable nor democratic.

3. Why abolition is the logical next step

In light of the above, I propose abolition of Homes England on the following grounds:

1. Accountability: A stand-alone large agency is harder for local communities and elected councillors to engage with meaningfully. Its decisions may bypass or undermine local planning processes and democratic oversight.
2. Democratic legitimacy: Local communities deserve a say in planning and housing decisions affecting them. An agency with national land-bank and power may override local voice. The Ifield case shows how this risk materialises.
3. Operational efficiency and agility: The commentary cited above argues the agency needs "radical surgery". If an agency repeatedly raises questions of effectiveness and trust, a fresh institutional model may be preferable.
4. Local responsiveness: Housing delivery and neighbourhood quality rely on local knowledge, context-sensitivity and place-making rather than one-size-fits-all national approaches. Functions such as land acquisition, site delivery, community engagement might be better handled by devolved/regional bodies.
5. Environmental and community safeguarding: The Ifield case demonstrates that large-scale development can threaten ancient parish landscapes, ecology, community heritage — matters best addressed locally.

Therefore, I urge that a formal review of Homes England is conducted with the aim of dissolving the body and reallocating its powers into a combination of:

1. Regional housing and regeneration boards, accountable to local authorities and communities;
2. A devolved land-agency function but under stronger local democratic governance;
3. A national oversight/regulatory body (rather than delivery body) ensuring standards, transparency, and funding integrity.

During the transitional period, the government should freeze new major land-bank acquisitions by Homes England in sensitive green-belt or community-valued landscapes, pending local engagement and independent impact assessments.

4. In conclusion

The housing crisis is real and urgent. But solving it by repeating top-down institutional models that erode local voice, undermine place-making and concentrate power in a national agency is not the answer. The current design of Homes England is increasingly contested, both in industry commentary and local opposition.

Abolishing Homes England would not mean abandoning housing delivery—it means redesigning how we deliver it: more locally engaged, more democratically accountable, more respectful of community identity and environment.

I respectfully request that you respond to this letter with your views on:

1. Whether you believe Homes England remains fit for purpose as currently structured;
2. Whether the government would be willing to explore abolition or transformation of HE into more locally-governed bodies;
3. Whether new moratoria or protections will be applied to sites such as West of Ifield until adequate local consultation and environmental/community safeguard mechanisms are in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

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

[Redacted contact information]

[Redacted contact information]

Enclosures:

1. [Link to “Opinion: The housing secretary should fix Homes England” \(HQ Network\)](#)
2. [Link to “Grotesque 10,000 West of Ifield housing plan” \(Gatwick City Times\)](#)

**ABOLISH
HOMES
ENGLAND**