

## Questions prior to the meeting

On traffic it does appear they are planning mitigations for increased traffic, but there are plenty of questions remaining.

1. Rusper is a small parish and has no designated A or B roads. All roads in the parish are narrow rural roads and unsuitable for HGV traffic. How do Homes England plan to route site traffic so they avoid these roads and the consequential congestion and danger to other road users including riders and cyclists.
2. How do Homes England plan to alleviate the obvious traffic issues by adding the additional traffic to the already overcrowded local minor roads system. The current average number of cars per household in the UK is 1.2. Introducing an additional 3600 cars to the roads from the initial development. What relief roads are planned to filter cars away from the rural network.
3. Homes England were working on a masterplan for 10,000 houses between Horsham and Crawley - of which West of Ifield was seen the first part. There are rumours circulating locally that surveys have and are being carried out on the land from Ifield to Faygate. Are surveys and planning taking place connected to the planning for the other 7,000 houses?
4. When will the Environment Agency report on the sustainability of the proposed groundwater abstraction?
5. Crawley sewage works are almost at capacity as noted in Crawley's Local Plan and acknowledged by Thames Water. The application doesn't address the capacity issues, or discussion with Thames Water to ensure capacity. How are discussions going with Thames Water? What are their plans for investment to increase capacity and how long will this work take to complete?
6. The application gives detail on affordable housing delivery, but how much social housing (at least 40% below market rent or sale price) will the site deliver?
7. The application describes a strategy of "decide and provide" for mitigating traffic impacts – i.e. monitor effects and put in mitigations as necessary so as not to over-provide now, which might encourage car use. As opposed to "predict and provide". This requires installation of a robust monitoring system: *"The impacts of the development will be monitored regularly with a review of observed trips against anticipated trips, and whether junctions are operating as predicted. This will allow mitigations to come forward earlier or later than anticipated"*. What are the plans for this monitoring system, where will it be, how long will it remain in place and who will fund it?
8. During Phase 1, before the main link road is in place, construction traffic will be approaching the site via Gossops Green, Tangmere Road and Rusper Road to the golf course. These roads are the existing access routes for Ifield station and the primary and secondary schools next to it, and are already considered dangerous due to being busy and narrow with very narrow pavements in places. How will the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users be ensured while these roads are being used by construction traffic? How will construction traffic be prevented from approaching the site via the villages of Rusper and Faygate, and via Ifield Wood from the Charwood Road?
9. What are the plans for extending cycle paths outside the development and who is funding the work? In particular: the cycle paths along Rusper Road towards the golf course (and future secondary school); the paths across Ifield Brook Meadows; and the connections to the wider cycle networks in Crawley?

10. It has been decided that following the closure of Rusper Road, Ifield Green should be used as the key route for diverted and additional car travel to Ifield and Ifield Station. But Ifield Green is within the Ifield Village Conservation Area. How does this decision to divert traffic through a Conservation Area reconcile with the protection of heritage assets?
11. What measures are planned to ensure the safety and traffic flow along Ifield Green? It already has speed bumps which are ineffective, and is narrowed to one car-width in many places due to residential parking. How is the risk of gridlock being mitigated?

**Questions from Member of public and councillors at the meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2025**

1. The scheme proposes 10,000 homes, yet only the first 3,000 are being addressed. Why is planning not accounting for the full scale of development from the start?
2. Schools are required for 9,000 homes, so why is provision only being considered for the first 3,000 homes? Can you guarantee a school will be delivered within 5 years?
3. With a target of 35% affordable homes, how will affordability be balanced with “high quality design,” given the risk of profit margins being too slim for developers? What guarantees exist that affordable housing targets will actually be met?
4. The road assessment mentions 10m for Rusper Road, but it is actually only 5m wide. How was this miscalculation made?
5. Hyde Drive (1,005 homes) has not been mentioned in the transport calculations—why not?
6. How will sewage be managed, given that the local system is already struggling and no mitigation measures are included?
7. How can transport plans be realistic when 23,000 lorry movements are included, but worker car traffic is excluded?
8. Ifield Station is only being maintained, not developed—so how can it handle the additional demand?
9. Why are new petrol stations and four new schools excluded from the transport impact assessment, including construction traffic?
10. What specific traffic calming measures are proposed for Rusper village, and why are they considered necessary?
11. With 15 km of new footways and cycleways, where are the bridleways and safe horse-riding routes? How will rider safety be addressed in an equine community?
12. Why is there no mention of Gatwick Airport, despite its proximity to the site and potential traffic/air quality impacts?
13. The development is projected to emit 95,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>, but only 63,000 tonnes are allowed. How will this be mitigated?
14. Building on the golf course nature reserve will destroy key biodiversity and green space—the only major open space in Crawley. How is this justified?
15. The scheme promises a 6.2% biodiversity gain, yet the legal requirement is 10%. How will the legal requirement be met?
16. With wildlife already being pushed towards the village and killed along roads, how will the scheme prevent further ecological damage?

17. Why has Crawley Borough Council formally opposed the scheme, yet it is still being advanced?
18. Why has there been no engagement with the Parish Council (PC) regarding transport, open spaces, and other community issues?
19. Open spaces are supposed to be provided—why has there been no consultation with the PC about their design or use?
20. Promised facilities like the supermarket have been withdrawn—how can residents trust other promises (e.g. schools, transport)?
21. Public transport is not viable if bus routes are empty (Mowbray buses have a maximum of 3 passengers). How can buses be presented as a sustainable solution when residents will not realistically use them?
22. Residents already struggle with electricity capacity—how will infrastructure be upgraded to cope with thousands more homes?
23. Access to schools like Bohunt is already difficult for local children. How will school places and transport be managed for the expanded population?
24. Why has the planning application been submitted when the Local Plan is not yet adopted?
25. Many issues (e.g. water supply, primary care, sewage) depend on Local Plan policy. Isn't the application premature without these being addressed?
26. HDC's own site assessments indicate that some sites in the Local Plan did not meet special policy tests—how can this site be justified?