

Response concerning west of Ifield HA2

Reason for unsoundness .

Not Positively prepared.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

HDC have failed to appraise noise pollution against any of their large strategic sites in their SA.

Air quality has been appraised against all their large sites and as **Noise** pollution comes second to air pollution in the context of health and wellbeing, this should be a material consideration

Government policy to LIMIT AND WHERE POSSIBLE REDUCE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE . Unless there is no alternative

WOI is 1 km away from Gatwick Airport's runway and aircraft will be below 4,000 ft , the future residents will experience

281,000 flights in 2017–18 to 375,000–390,000 by 2032–33.

Therefore, the inclusion of WOI in this local plan is not justified as alternative sites on noise grounds have not been considered.

The 60dB level adopted by HDC does not address the overall noise that will be experienced by the future proposed residents of WOI and goes against up-to-date evidence .

- 1.The letter submitted by **MATTHEW PENNYCOOK MP Minister of State Clearly indicates that local plans are taking to long .**
- 2. Guidance information , noise should be considered at the pre planning stage to save time late**

Noise is a material consideration on planning where homes should be.

The DCO and Gatwick's other scenario of increasing the number of flights across more hours will both have the effect of more noise on the proposed residents of WOI.

Gatwick do not need planning Permission to increase the number of flights

The government has published many documents on the effects of noise on health and wellbeing and should be considered.

Public consultation response (1186648) has examples of these .

HDC have continued to ignore the second paragraph below ,which must be considered when considering the sheer volume of flight movements every day.

Planning practice guidance

What are the observed effect levels?

Significant observed adverse effect level [SOAEL]: This is the level of noise exposure above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur.

1. *Lowest observed adverse effect level [LOAEL]: This is the level of noise exposure above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected.*
2. *No observed effect level: This is the level of noise exposure below which no effect at all health or quality of life can be detected.*

Although the word 'level' is used here, this does not mean that the effects can only be defined in terms of a single value of noise exposure. In some circumstances adverse effects are defined in

terms of a combination of more than one factor such as noise exposure, the number of occurrences of the noise in a given time period, the duration of the noise and the time of day the noise occurs".

Numerous public consultation responses concerning noise and its affects on West of Ifield were submitted , no mention of these were included in HDC summary of responses.

May I also point out that Crawley is on the government List of towns significantly affected by aircraft **Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs**

noise-action-plan-2019-agglomerations

Agglomeration

Crawley urban area

London Gatwick

Crawley is on this list.

West of Ifield proposed development is closer to Gatwick then 90% of Crawley.

Other points to be considered in judging whether the inclusion of the west of Ifield is justified or positively prepared.

1. Closed windows are not a mitigation option ,
2. The use of air conditioning units goes against carbon neutrality
3. New houses are built to high degree of insulation and overheating will be a problem if windows are kept closed because of aircraft noise .
4. Is the allocation of WEST OF IFIELD justified when residents Will hear ground noise and takeoff from 5:15 in the morning and overflight every two minutes all summer long and also at Christmas, winter holiday season and Easter ?.
5. Whether noise should be of concern with people working from home.

Can I also suggest a site visit in the early morning at this time of year to the fields Opposite Bonnets Lane where the development is proposed to be and imagine that noise every two minutes throughout the day.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Peter Wakeham

IS STRAGIC POLICY HA2 LAND WEST OF IFIELD SOUND

NO

on the grounds stated below .

Q9

Item d

Is the allocation consistent with paragraph 99 of the NPPF particularly with regard to the loss of Ifield golf course?

Horsham have indicated in policy HA2 (g)

The provision of appropriate mitigation for loss of Ifield golf facilities will be required

in the absence of site-specific evidence demonstrating the surrounding area has capacity to accommodate its loss.

In the light of this evidence

NPPF ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The need to achieve sustainable development is a core principle of the NPPF. This means balancing the need for economic growth with social and environmental requirements and ensuring that the ability of future generations to meet their needs is not compromised.

With the populations of Horsham set to increase exponentially and Homes England not intending to replace the golf course like for like and the likelihood of any more golf courses being built in Horsham in the future being zero.

The sustainability issue that Horsham can cope with future golf demand comes into question.

The fact that once Ifield golf course is lost it is lost forever therefore reducing future generations need for golf courses is compromised.

Also consideration should be given to residents having more flexible leisure time in an area where shift work and home working allows flexible use of sports facilities. To encourage healthier lifestyles for all ages(6 to 90) golf facilities should not be closed .

Golf should not be classed differently to any other sport i.e. developers have to contribute to the creation of football pitches ,tennis courts indoor sports etc GOLF COURSES should not be developed on if they are not surplus to requirements .

The lack of the ability to demonstrate that the existing golf facilities will not be needed in the future must be considered in the context of the NPPF on sustainable development.

Regards

Peter Wakeham