

From: [Bridgen, Elizabeth](#)
To: [Mosinghi, Richard](#)
Cc: [Bridgen, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: FW: Comments on the Crawley 2035 documents
Date: 02 March 2020 09:30:27

[REDACTED]

Sent: 01 March 2020 17:24

To: Forward.Plans <Forward.Plans@crawley.gov.uk>

Subject: Comments on the Crawley 2035 documents

Which document would you like to make a representation on?: Crawley submission draft Local Plan

Which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate to?: Paragraph 17.22

Legally compliant?: Yes

Sound?: No

Compliant with the duty to co-operate?: Yes

Please give details explaining your response. : The maps showing an 'Indicative search corridor' for the Western Link Road (policy ST4) suggest that the WLR would cut right through the middle of the Willoughby Fields Nature Reserve. Is this necessary? Could the road not be sited to the north of this valuable habitat, eg run along the current Charlwood Road immediately south of the runway?

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issues you have identified above. : I accept that the word 'indicative' is being used, and that nothing has been decided, but could the text of the Plan document (and the Map) be changed to make clear that the WLR would be sited so as to respect Crawley's rural fringe, and in particular the Willoughby Fields Nature Reserve.

[REDACTED]

From: [Brigden, Elizabeth](#)
To: [Mosinghi, Richard](#)
Cc: [Brigden, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: FW: Comments on the Crawley 2035 Plan
Date: 02 March 2020 09:30:41

Sent: 01 March 2020 17:43

To: Forward.Plans <Forward.Plans@crawley.gov.uk>

Subject: Comments on the Crawley 2035 Plan

Which document would you like to make a representation on?: Crawley submission draft Local Plan

Which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate to?: Paragraph 12.72 Policy H3g

Legally compliant?: Yes

Sound?: No

Compliant with the duty to co-operate?: Yes

Please give details explaining your response. :

My comments relate to the question of 'urban extensions', particularly by neighbouring authorities. I have in mind the potentially enormous Homes England development West of Ifield, and my comments are aimed at both Horsham and Crawley authorities:

1. I was interested to note from the SHMA that 'In both authorities, population growth is expected across a range of age groups, but with the strongest growth expected in those aged over 65 linked to changes in the population age structure and improving longevity.' In fact, the assumption is that 60% of the 24% increase (or 14pp of the 24%) is due to growth in the over 65 population. What does this mean for the types of housing and facilities being proposed by Homes England? The provision of health care, public transport, etc.?
2. Homes England haven't considered the question of employment for the working-age residents of West of Ifield. Particularly given Crawley Borough Council's limited capacity to create jobs by developing land for industrial or business use, due to Gatwick safeguarding.
3. Similarly, the problems associated with building and living on a floodplain, on heavy clay, have not yet been addressed.
4. How do Homes England propose to respect the fact that Rusper Road is an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC)? This means that proposals should '... respect or preserve the character of the area and be designed with regard to the areas existing character and appearance. Proposals should be of an appropriate scale, design and massing, and should not result in significant adverse impact on the locality, its setting and important or valued views. All development within an ASLC should demonstrate, as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment, how the proposals have regard to the area's designation and the character and appearance of the area.'
5. Similarly, Crawley residents and their Borough Council consider West of Ifield is an

area of 'locally special rural fringe, its nature conservation and recreation value, its positive relationship with the urban edge and links to the wider countryside will be encouraged.' How does the proposal for 10,000 new homes accord with this?

6. Lastly, at a time when biodiversity is being lost at a phenomenal rate, I feel it would be very sad to lose or threaten the rich flora and fauna found in the areas of ancient woodland, Ifield Brook Meadows, and abundant hedgerows of the area. According to detailed ecological surveys carried out by local residents over recent decades, the area supports species of national importance such as longhorn beetles, not to mention those previous residents which are now seen only occasionally, such as the Barn and Little Owls, Kingfisher, Skylark, Nightingale, and Hedgehog. We should be nurturing these ecosystems for future generations.

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issues you have identified above. : Para 12.72 as currently worded feels a bit blinkered/naive given the scale of some of the developments being considered by neighbouring authorities. I would like to think that 'Crawley and [Horsham] will engage in a process of robust negotiation to ensure that any siting of a significant new-build development is matched by investment in infrastructure and facilities to serve the needs of new and existing residents.'

[REDACTED]