

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 October 2025 13:04:17 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 16/10/2025 1:04 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:	46 green lane northgate 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"> - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	<p>I am writing to register my strong objection to the Planning Application DC/25/1312 Land West of Ifield</p> <p>My objections fall into the following headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of supporting infrastructure Loss of Green space and public views Lack of sufficient mitigation for Ifield Golf Club closure Impact on Heritage assets Permanent loss of ecology and wildlife Inappropriate concentration of building in north of Horsham district <p>Lack of supporting infrastructure</p> <p>1. Transport.</p> <p>Roads.</p> <p>There appears to be a severe underestimation of the car usage that will be generated by the 3000 house development, which will in turn increase the already severe congestion on many of Crawley's streets, and ratrunning on unsuitable residential roads and surrounding villages, together with associated safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists, including increased air pollution.</p> <p>Also have the effects of delivery vans (Amazon/supermarkets etc) to/from the estate been accounted for?</p> <p>This underestimation appears to stem from Homes England's attempt to portray the development as a 15 minute neighbourhood, and in order to support this claim overestimate their active travel assumptions/use of public transport.</p> <p>Poor active travel assumptions</p> <p>Assumptions made about people walking or cycling outside of the development itself seem questionable. Active Travel England recommends that local amenities should be within an 800m walking or wheeling distance of residential and staff entrances, utilising well-designed routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Much of the West of Ifield development is outside of the recommended 800m distance. For example, the walking /cycling route from the Golf Club entrance to Ifield station is 0.7 miles or 1126 metres. And many parts of the development are further away than that. - Many of the routes to key destinations outside the development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Currently have no continuous cycle paths - particularly in the case of the Charlwood Road junction o Are busy, and in some cases the roads narrow (e.g. Rusper Road, Ifield Green) and in some cases with residential car parking on roads (e.g. Ifield Green, Tangmere) o In the case of Rusper Road have very narrow pavements - the combination of which

taken with road width makes walking unsafe - and how could a cycle path be accommodated?

- The above considerations would imply that active travel would be unattractive to most, rendering active travel modelling questionable, thus leaving people reliant on cars, increasing congestion and air pollution and impacting road and pedestrian safety.

Overambitious public transport usage assumptions

Ifield Station

Ifield Station has short, narrow platforms, a poor service, no car parking and is not (currently) reachable by any cycle paths. These factors combine to make the station quite dangerous for its existing users, and add congestion to the Overdene Drive/Ifield Drive junction - dangerously close to The Mill School entrance - at peak times, without adding an additional tranche of commuters from the proposed West of Ifield development.

It does not appear that any of the proposed mitigations (from 'Planning Statement' 7.8.30 In addition, the draft Heads of Terms sets out a commitment on improving facilities at Ifield Station. Early feasibility work has identified potential to improve waiting facilities, cycle storage opportunities and public realm) have the potential to make the station any safer. See <https://youtu.be/-9ck8lQlQEg>

Platforms

Ifield's platforms are short (5 carriages) and narrow, forcing commuter to have to walk outside of the 'yellow line' at peak times. Its placement, abutting residential and commercial property, Ifield Drive and Craigans (Road), and with the Overdene Drive road bridge to the east would appear to make extending them extremely problematic and expensive. Plus, this mitigation is not proposed.

Poor service

A recent BBC report showed that Ifield station has the highest percentage of cancellations IN THE COUNTRY

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c9dx656v547o?fbclid=IwY2xjawNPEA9leHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHoc47QmVDy0kwrgLFczpVvKXpnuwP95i2s2A4pTDivpEp9h-de8bGd6Uz0pB_aem_4zp3W-hDthh_CLmwMYkPwA

Impacts of this could include:

- Further overcrowding on platforms as people have to wait for the next train
- People drive to their destination instead - impacting active travel modelling
- People drive/get taxis to Crawley or Three Bridges stations - again impacting active travel modelling

Buses

Living in the real world, would someone going to work on a winter morning walk to a bus stop, then get a bus to work, or a parent walk their child to school then get on a bus to work when they had a nice warm dry car they could use?

Especially when those buses, unless dedicated bus lanes can be made available end to end, will get caught in the same traffic congestion as cars.

I note several of the consultee responses consider bus usage estimates highly ambitious, as do I.

2. Sewage

It is widely known that the Crawley wastewater treatment works are at capacity, and without considerable upgrades - which would need to be provided by the troubled Thames Water - will not be able to cope with the output from another 3000 houses. Thames Water have said this much themselves in their consultation response.

Less known is that Thames Water's existing pipework and infrastructure clearly can't cope with the current load.

A resident next to the proposed West of Ifield site has suffered for decades with untreated sewage regularly flooding their garden. Thames Water eventually discovered that their plans were wrong and the main sewer was not in the adjacent field, but in fact ran through their rear garden which contained a long-buried access manhole. Following multiple visits from engineers, camera surveys and "jettings", Thames Water put the flooding down to blockages and "hydraulic overload" of the main pipes.

How will Homes England and Horsham Council ensure that sewage and the toxic run-off from all the new roads won't pollute our gardens, streets and the River Mole?

Loss of Green space and public views

I walk my dogs in Ifield Brook meadows and surrounding fields daily, and value their tranquillity and open views to the countryside as imperative for my physical and mental health, as do many other local residents. Homes England's claim of retaining greenspace is just greenwashing for concreting over hectares and hectares of Crawley's last remaining rural fringe and it being lost forever.

Lack of sufficient mitigation for Ifield Golf Club closure

The mitigations proposed to compensate for the closure of Ifield Golf Club, which has been found to be well used/not surplus to requirements are entirely insufficient and in conflict with the NPPF.

Tilgate - whatever upgrades are made to it - is public land. I could sit and have a picnic in the middle of a green whilst letting my dogs run around if I wanted to - how does this compare to the quality of the golf offering at Ifield?

Rookwood - A pay and play, council owned - not a private club - not comparable to Ifield Goffs park Pitch and Putt - is a 9 hole pitch and putt and a 9 hole footgolf with limited opening times.

So. Not only are these facilities in no way better or even comparable to the quality of golf Ifield offers, but the fact cannot be escaped that in an area where several courses have closed in recent years and Horsham Golf and Fitness course is about to be lost, if Ifield were to close these mitigations provide NO EXTRA golfing facilities. The area will become a golfing desert compared to the population.

And the issues do not stop there. The 'alternative' sporting facilities Homes England claim as part mitigation are really just there to serve the population of the new development, and whilst Ifield has a mixed demographic in terms of membership, will not serve the needs of the older section. An 80 year old golfer may be able to play golf for fitness but could not play football for example.

Plus - it is not just about the physical health of the members - as a private club (that welcomes visitors) the social side of the club provides for the mental health of members also.

Impact on Heritage assets

As identified in the Historic England response to the consultation, the development cannot fail to have a negative impact on the Ifield Village Conservation area, Grade 1 listed St Margaret's Church and the Moat Historic Monument. A disappointing aspect of the application is that in suggesting Ifield Green as a route to the Ifield Station, Homes England are ignoring the fact that part of the route is within the conservation area and will have a direct negative impact on it.

Permanent loss of ecology and wildlife

The value of the habitats across and surrounding the site are downplayed in the Homes England Environmental Statement. The extreme diversity and mosaic nature of this Low Weald area is not acknowledged, and neither is the extent to which the site is bordered by

designated wildlife sites (LWSs) and ancient woodland. 75% of the site has been identified as a biodiversity opportunity area, the site and surroundings have significant biodiversity value, and are home to rare species (Bechstein's bats, Great Crested Newts, brown hairstreak) red and amber listed birds, patches of ancient woodland, valuable hedgerows, and is close to the SSSI House Copse. It also borders LWS Ifield Brook Meadows. Concreting over the site cannot help but deplete the area's wildlife, with losses that cannot be mitigated. It is no wonder the Sussex Wildlife Trust opposes the development in principle.

Inappropriate concentration of building in north of Horsham district
There seems to be a concentration of development in the north of Horsham district, with Kilnwood Vale and the Mowbray estate still being built out. The cumulative effect of these, taken with the West of Ifield proposal seems to be being ignored. Especially taking into account the extreme likelihood of the West of Ifield development being extended to 10k houses in the future. This will certainly lead to coalescence of Crawley and Horsham, counter to HDC policy.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: 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 Chief Executive: Jane E aton