

Steven King

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 April 2025 13:46
To: Steven King
Subject: Planning applications DM/25/0014, DM/25/0015, DM/25/0016 & DM/25/0017.
Land West of Turners Hill Road And South of Huntsland, Turners Hill Road,
Crawley Down, West Sussex

[REDACTED]

> Good afternoon

>

> I wish to object to the above planning applications for the following reasons:

>

> 1. The proposed development of 400 houses would increase the population of Crawley Down by approximately 25% which is unsustainable given that there have been previous developments already, and would significantly change the character of the village.

>

> 2. Traffic is already busy on Turners Hill Road causing congestion, noise and pollution. Given that 500 houses have been approved at Felbridge and more adjacent to the Dukes Head Roundabout, this will make traffic worse before this development.

>

> 3. The proposed junction at Vicarage Road with limited sight lines due to the bridge will make exiting on to Turners Hill Road from Grange Road even more hazardous.

>

> 4. There are no plans to increase infrastructure to support this development or others. No extra hospital beds, no extra school places or GP's. Crawley Down surgery already struggles to recruit GP's so this development will create a risk to local people's health. It is not uncommon to wait weeks for a simple GP appointment and Modality Health group is under special measures causing anxiety for existing residents.

>

> 5. This development abuts the beautiful Worth Way, green land and ponds which support many species of wildlife and biodiversity. For Wates to suggest that the development will contain 13 hectares of open land is cancelled by the larger loss of habitat. I have a concern as to who will be responsible for maintaining the area for 30 years as per government guidelines.

>

> 6. As the local soil is clay, there is a potential for sewage contamination unless there is proper sustainable urban drainage.

>

> 7. There are already huge problems with parking within the small hub of the village and this creates risks for those crossing the road in the centre.

> For Wates to suggest that residents of the new development will walk/cycle to the village centre is not at all realistic as I rarely see people do this.

>

> 8. The development of this area has already been rejected by the High Court previously. I cannot see that concerns have been alleviated since that time, if anything development has increased considerably since then.

>

> This concludes my list of objections and thank you for your consideration. (I have submitted these before but as the applications have been slightly amended, I am sending them again. I note that 'Additional ecology information received 03/04/25' but cannot gain access to this on the council website).

>

> Kind regards

>



>

>

Sent from my iPhone