

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 January 2026 23:35  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Reference: DC/25/1312

My apologies - my email just now had a mistake - two google maps locations were the same. Now corrected below.

Dear Linsey,

I'm just reviewing the planning application for a development along Rusper Road in Ifield. A relative in Ifield has just asked me to respond.

I've run through your report - thanks for your detailed response to the planning application.

One observation not directly relate to your work is that there is one main proposed entrance to the site from the North East, a predominantly vehicular route, but one positive of this site for development is the proximity to Ifield Railway Station. To me, there should be a main landscaped entrance that runs continuously from that station into and through the development, to enhance non-vehicular links to public transport. A huge lost potential that could take of advantage of existing features (for example the tree lined streets already exist at Rusper Road (with potential for reducing vehicular access) and Tangmere Road. This has an impact on ecology, in addressing overall impact from the development, and particularly of localised emissions from vehicles and impacts on soil and vegetation.

I'll send that elsewhere as a transport comment.

Also not really considered is connectivity between this development with the Ifield West estate, where the most local retail facility, Tesco, is likely to be used and have an impact on informal routes from the new development to there (and thus, potentially into the woodland nearby). This could be advantageous or not, but it doesn't appear to be a significant consideration in the design.

I've picked up on some of the comments you have made - such as the proximity of sports pitches to the Ancient Woodland habitat, the increased human and light disturbance that may result from this. Apart from anything, hiding leisure features away behind development isn't socially advantageous - when they could be part of the community.

I have family in Ifield, and so I have spent decades exploring that area on visits, and for periods where I lived there whilst caring for relatives. I find it so interesting how habitat and landscape features were retained during the development of the New Town. Though as time goes on, features such as mature oak and veteran trees (some avenues of amazing pollarded willows still being lost at 51.111944, -0.238083 ) So succession of the treescape is at risk. This doesn't seem to be reflected in this development as well as it could have been - the structure of the landscape planting between the golf course fairways largely lost.

I mainly want to highlight to you an exceptional ecological feature, related to the Ancient Woodland nearby. This is an area of natural regen / rewilding that, over three or more decades has developed a mosaic habitat, demonstrating many of the processes of natural regeneration, including distribution of trees seeded from mature trees, meadow succession, low pollard/coppice development as a response to deer browsing, scrub development (variously willow, hawthorn and blackthorn) as a nursery for tree growth, and complex and dynamic vertical structure of ground flora, scrub and canopy. This is the example I quote of habitats being mosaic but also dynamic - this is the example of an ecological kaleidoscope. Reading that there are Brown Hairstreak present (and possibly dormice), this seems to be an extremely valuable feature.

As it is adjacent to the proposed development, and ancient woodland, and the banks of characteristic wide mature treed field boundaries in the area, which in themselves are well structured with coppice and standard, it really should be protected (and I suspect remnant ancient woodland). The ancient woodland (and/or PAWS) to the west of this development is packed with veteran trees (particularly Hornbeams with rafts of cavities, but also ash and field maple), lapsed coppice and laid hedgerows, wet woodland and ponds. I have masses of photos of these areas to demonstrate these qualities.

Can the impact on this be considered, and, potentially it protected through s106 or offsite BNG means. It could be an effective buffer from this development.

So, what I think is an exceptional ecological feature is here, about 200m around this point:

<https://maps.app.goo.gl/FimHyDVx8UGEYCTLA>

51°06'40.0"N 0°14'18.8"W

51.111111, -0.238556

If you look at Google Earth and the sequence of aerial photographs you can see the vegetative development of this area.

<https://photos.app.goo.gl/tRwkVhLi1o6zoe1T7>

The area has limited disturbance now, given that scrub has made it more impenetrable over the past three or so years, but it really would be at risk in itself and as a buffer to adjacent existing and proposed development.

If you have time, go and have a look, it's magical.

Access is best gained from here:

<https://maps.app.goo.gl/bPzLy5QPJu8aQdJ6A>

(from the bus stop head west along the path, When you start to see the field opening on the left, head right/ north into the woodland.)

I had proposed its protection to the Sussex Wildlife Trust, though obviously resources are limited. Whilst rewilding and habitat connectivity is taking off, this is a ready made existing, well connected and important site, so anything you can do to protect it is most welcome.

Thanks

██████

██████████

35 Langdale Road  
Ifield  
Crawley

RH11 0SS

and  
79 Southville Road  
Bradford on Avon  
Wiltshire  
BA15 1HX