

Crawley²⁰²⁹

August 2013

Additional Sites Allocation Consultation Report Appendices

Contents

[Appendix A - Housing](#)

[Appendix B1 - Gypsy and Traveller Sites](#)

[Appendix B2 - Gypsy and Traveller Sites](#)

[Appendix C - Cemetery](#)

[Appendix D - Historic Parks & Gardens, and Local Green Space](#)

Appendix A – Housing

Comment made regarding the development of housing on identified sites within Crawley

Breezehurst and Bewbush West Playing Fields Comments

Positive Comments

- Already housing is being built nearby at Kilnwood Vale and extending the housing in Bewbush would to me seem more appropriate than some of the others being suggested. I understand that developers have to undertake to provide a percentage of so called ""affordable housing"".....I believe the percentage of these houses should be higher, although I was shocked to learn that ""affordable housing"" is not for 1st time buyers to try and obtain a home... as there is no possibility of them going on the housing list...but affordable housing is for the council to house people on the housing list! *Langley Green*
- Bewbush has a large amount of open space for development and transport service etc. It is much better than in some other neighbourhoods. The community centre and shops have been developed and this will further support the new housing. *Langley Green*
- Both the site at Bewbush and Goffs Park are already being developed and more houses could be built here. *Langley Green*
- Breezehurst Drive seems ok for 100 houses as long as the football teams are happy to relocate as Buchan Park is close enough for the local community to enjoy. *Pound Hill*
- Breezehurst Drive - the area where Crawley FC have their training ground has never been used and could be developed. *Bewbush*
- Breezehurst Drive would have easy access to all main roads without affecting the community. *Northgate*
- Bewbush sites should be used for housing where possible - unfortunately these sites are greener areas. *Ifield*
- I believe if the Breezehurst Drive development is considered, it should be on a smaller scale than proposed - the abundance of trees and green spaces is one of the nicest things about living in Crawley, I'd hate to lose that. *Tilgate*
- I am saying yes to more home as long my daughter get one as you made her private rent. *Broadfield*
- I think both the Bewbush sites would be good for a few home but not as many as proposed as with more houses comes more children and pets i.e. dogs and they all need somewhere to run free and be together as a community. *Broadfield*

- Q3 This area seems to be entirely suitable for housing development.
Ifield
- Q1: The community do have Buchan Park. *Three Bridges*
- Q2: Only if the football club won't use it i.e. If the area is not fenced off to stop it being soiled by dogs, used by motorcycles etc. *Gossops Green*
- Q3: Buchan Park is across the road. *Gossops Green*
- The field(s) off Breezehurst in Bewbush are totally unused and would make perfect sense to build on since the new area is being developed around the corner there is no reason not to. Due to the lack of homes possible at Kilnwood Vale it's not worth disturbing the local residents & wildlife or ruining the landscape/views from the golf course. *Pound Hill*
- The site at Breezehurst drive is ideally located for the local shops and the playing fields being partly retained would maintain an even balance.
Bewbush

Negative Comments

Green space is well used and valued

- As per comments already provided I strongly oppose the proposed development of the green area of the Breezehurst Drive playing fields. One of the main reasons I purchased my home was the fact it bordered directly onto the fields and my family has made regular use of the fields. Especially my children growing up it has been an area where they have played with friends and family. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush has two primary schools so they need this recreation space. Children need somewhere to go after school and local clubs/sports need somewhere to play. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush is already overpopulated with flats and maisonettes and houses with tiny garden please don't take away any more green space it's much needed. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush needs its playing fields and should keep them especially it's losing the countryside on its border to Kilnwood Vale. Bewbush playing fields are the only open space in the area, and there is already massive development further up the road at the new Faygate neighbourhood.
Broadfield
- Bewbush playing fields are our 'Green Belt' between us and Kilnwood Vale. This space is used all the time, be it for football, rounders, picnics, dog walkers, general ball games and kite flying. There are two parks that are enjoyed by families that should also remain. There all sorts of wildlife that would be disturbed and they include foxes, rabbits, hares, frogs, newts, duck, hedgehogs and even eels and crayfish in the stream. Please do not build on this area - instead recognise it as a village green as it has been enjoyed this way since 1988 - 25 years! Bewbush is already congested (try to park at Bewbush shops of a lunchtime and you will see) Bewbush already gets gridlocked in the mornings. Trying to get out onto

the A264 Horsham road at the roundabouts is a nightmare! Kilnwood Vale is already going to make it a lot worse; it is just too many houses in this area! *Bewbush*

- Bewbush playing fields should be left so that Crawley can still retain a green border. It will devalue houses backing onto these areas and they are used by families for recreation. They are important areas for wildlife. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West and Breezehurst Drive playing fields are used by the local residents on a daily basis. These areas provide children and families a safe environment to be together outside playing sports and picnicking in an area where many people do not have their own gardens or very limited outside space. With the development of Kilnwood Vale the local wildlife would also be greatly affected. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West fields is lovely open fields which is used by dog walkers to meet up with other dog walkers. Also the local children get to gather and play football and some local teams also play competitive football with their families and friends supporting them. I myself use the fields with my dog like to watch the wild life which excludes birds foxes and indeed dogs ,it also nice to look out over the fields and see beautiful trees and green grass. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West is the only place we got to walk our dogs, play with the kids and grandkids, with all the animal life here. Plus we will have Kilnwood Vale being built 2500 homes so why do we have to build 60 more on this land now Kilnwood Vale will be Crawley's next neighbourhood. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West playing fields are used for sport (and walking the dog). My son and his friends use it often to play football. Housing is very important but so is leisure. Housing could be put in West Green (opposite the former nursing home which used to be a garage). No decision should be made before all of Bewbush residents in the proposed housing area site have been informed. I didn't receive a letter from the Council, a friend told me. Please arrange for a public meeting on this so we can ask questions. Thank you. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West Playing Fields are used for sport and waling, the walk along the very edge takes you through to lfield, several deer live here. STOP building office space!!! That stays empty for YEARS!!! *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West playing fields is the only green space available for the children in our location to play safely all space within the courts is paved and is taken up with residents parking and not a safe environment. We feel closed in enough with no green areas in front of our houses which is why the children and residents of the surrounding courts make good use of this area. *lfield*
- Bewbush West playing fields should be kept for the children. *lfield*
- Bewbush West playing fields should not be used for development because it is the only green space separating Bewbush from the massive Kilnwood

Vale development which is already close enough to the properties that back on to these fields. Many of the properties that face or back on to Bewbush West playing fields do not have gardens and the fields are the only place that the local children have to go and play. They provide a safe environment for the children to enjoy a healthy and active lifestyle. The fields are also used by local football teams, joggers and dog walkers.

Bewbush

- Bewbush west playing fields should NOT BE USED TO BUILD ON. It is a lovely beautiful green area where children and adults play and walk their dogs etc. Also as a resident of Nesbit Court we only purchased our maisonette because it had the lovely green view of the green park and little stream opposite. We had other houses to look at but chose to live here because of the lovely view and green space opposite with the little bridge and stream. When we bought our house 2 years ago and the new Kilnwood Vale development was in planning we went to the council and were promised that they would not build on the Bewbush west playing fields as children needed that green space. If you do this now the Council has lied yet again to its residents. In fact we were told they couldn't build on it because of the little stream that runs here on the edge, we do not suddenly want our lounge view blocked by building houses right on our window and doorstep it is disgusting to even think of it in the Bewbush west playing fields where children play safely and adults play football etc. where else will the children play safely around here and I thought Britain wanted to stay green these days and protect the environment and trees. It is disgusting to even plan this. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West Playing fields will be the valuable green corridor before Kilnwood Vale. The fields and tree-lined public footpath are a peaceful haven for wildlife and people alike. I've even seen deer there during the night. These and Breezehurst playing fields are the only we have here as the field on Gasson Wood Road is often used for cricket. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush west playing fields, these fields are being used continuously by local and other residents of Crawley if you build houses on this site it will ruin this part of Bewbush. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West - This land was designated by Town Planning to be used by Bewbush and Gossops Green as open space. Gossops Green has never had enough open space as was hoped. This land was to make up this this deficiency. *Bewbush*
- Breezehurst Drive playing fields are used a lot for families to play with their kids.... where will they go now? *Bewbush*
- Leave the area to the West as football fields and play area. *Bewbush*
- Local kids already use Bewbush West to vent their energy and this must remain. To build on this site would force them to make their play areas as into the houses and car parks in the area, no doubt with vandalism to follow. *Bewbush*

- Crawley town train on Breezehurst field and CTFC are a big part of our community and neighbourhood so it wouldn't have a good impact on the town to force them to move. *Ifield*
- Do not build on Bewbush West as this area is used for sport and children and dog walkers and walkers. *Bewbush*
- For those living by Bewbush playing fields the land provides the only real garden for many families as most have just small yards. The playing field in front of Skelmersdale Walk is in constant daily use for dog walkers and children playing. I believe it would be a great loss to the community for it all to go. The land by the old pavilion is used much less so it could be that a compromise would be to put housing on that land and leave some of the open green space in front of Skelmersdale Walk. Furthermore for those of us living with the field in front any additional housing would severely compromise both the value of our houses and the amount of light let into our houses. When we moved into the house the environmental report showed that the field is a run off area for excess water from Buchan and local streams. It concerns me that building on this may leave the houses in Skelmersdale at greater risk of surface flooding. *Bewbush*
- Having lived in Bewbush for 32 years, I feel very strongly against the playing fields being developed into houses. These fields are an integral part of the Bewbush community. They are used every day by different groups, adults and children football training, families having a general kick about or playing cricket. Many families responsibly walk their dogs around these playing fields. I have walked on these fields every day, come rain or shine, for 32 years. I have met many different people and become firm friends with them. There are very few areas like this. The allotments where Meridian Close now stands, were not used, which was why the land was developed, but the fields are part and parcel of Bewbush. *Bewbush*
- I am certainly against building houses on Bewbush West playing fields, the reasons being are, with Kilnvalle estate being built, this strip of land will act as a barrier for us residents who overlook this estate and give us some breathing space. For you to build more houses on this land it will take away habitat for all the wildlife that lives there, i.e. badgers, foxes, deer, snakes, field mice and all the wild birds. You say this open space is under used, visit it at weekends and during the week when the evenings are light, you will find a lot of people using this open space from children flying kites and playing football and adults playing football and walking dogs. *Bewbush*
- I am not familiar with the west side of town and its needs. A lot depends on open space created by Kilnwood Vale as to whether the land should be built on but taking any public space or playing fields for building is never a good. *Langley Green*

- I am passionately against the development of the West Bewbush Playing Fields. This is a fantastic community with a large number of children and dog owners. This beautiful green space provides a safe a secure area for children to play sports and ride their bicycles, as well as an area for dog walkers to meet and socialise. Both of these activates create the ideal opportunity for the creation of a tight-knot and friendly community. There are few places left with this opportunity and would be a great shame and a criminal mistake to replace greenery and life with concrete and desolation.
Bewbush
- I am not sure about the sites in Bewbush as they will be taking away green spaces from the communities. *West Green*
- I have put I don't know on the Broadfield and Bewbush because both use of playing fields. Are they used? Would we lose the look for the town which is open, airy and room to breathe feeling???. *Tilgate*
- I live at 2 Pegasus Court Bewbush we are a family with children who use the park behind our house every day as do lots of other children who live in the area .there is no other descent park in this little area as well the playing fields which are used by dog walkers and football teams. Where would all these children play if you built more houses on these playing fields with more children living in this area we could not disagree with your plans to build any houses on the Bewbush west playing fields.*Bewbush*
- I live in Bewbush near the new Kilnwood Vale site and it would be a travesty of justice to remove the open fields where young and old play football, walk their pets and use the area for general recreational activities. Where else would the youth of today be able to play? I understand new housing is required, just not here! *Bewbush*
- I was born in Crawley and I've seen it change so much. There are not many open space left in Crawley especially for kids to play. This is why so many children stay indoors watching television and playing computer games. My kids love playing outside as did I when I was young. I live on Skelmersdale Walk. When I bought my home I was told that the playing field could never be built on. The gardens in Skelmersdale Walk are very small but the field makes up for it. This is the only reason why I bought this house. *Bewbush*
- I wasn't given the option of choosing the reduced playing field site at Breezehurst Drive which I may have said yes to but, I think Bewbush is so vast already that it could put local services such as schools and GP surgeries under further pressure. Additionally, Bewbush is known to have areas of social deprivation that I think additional housing could only exacerbate. If developments have to go anywhere then nearby to Kilnwood Vale is more contained and makes more sense as the green space going is not quite so vast and there is additional green space in the centre on the green. But, I do think that a balance should be struck between retaining green areas and meeting additional housing

requirements and I think developing the whole area at Breezehurst would disrupt this balance. *Gossops Green*

- I would object to any further loss of playing field land even if it's been leased to Crawley football club. Building close to Kilnwood Vale which in my opinion is Horsham's way of keeping a new housing estate as far away from Horsham as possible and also not having to worry much about schools transport and work. *Northgate*
- In my opinion, the town is already too big. However, history suggests that it will continue to expand. This means that either the density within the borough will increase or new development will take place outside of the borough or a combination of both. Development is already taking place outside the borough (Kilnwood Vale) and these proposals and others that have come up recently, will lead to us ending up with the worst of both worlds. In the case of Bewbush West, I understand that a consultant's report said it was under used, and that Bewbush is said to have too many parks. Has Crawley as a whole got too many parks? I have sat alone in Rupser Road playing fields, and very nice it is too. This is being 'protected' yet the Bewbush Parks are not! Is the council chambers underused? The new town had its opponents, but I think it was nicely laid out with a good amount of open spaces - please leave them alone. Since I read about these proposals I have glance across at Bewbush West (a small part of it is visible from my house) and all bar one evening (in about the last two weeks) has seen teenagers playing football there. The development of Kilnwood Vale will lead to increased use at Bewbush west. Breezehurst Drive should be kept as a park, but is unsuitable for housing due to traffic noise. I don't want the town to expand, but any expansion should take place outside the borough. If this is not possible, then it is not possible. *Bewbush*
- Keep Bewbush playing fields; we have a high population of children that need playing areas! *Bewbush*
- Leave green spaces alone, in particular Bewbush playing fields, my daughter and her friends play there regularly, and it remains important for our children to enjoy some greenery during their childhoods. Leave our playing fields green!! *Bewbush*
- Per Crawley council planning documents Bewbush is going to be below the minimum green space as it is very shortly so removing more green space is obviously not a very sensible way of moving forwards!!!! *Bewbush*
- Q2 Limited housing only. Keep as a pleasant green space between Bewbush housing and potential estates on nearby Horsham D C Land. *Ifield*
- Q1: This area is in constant use by locals as a recreational area. *Bewbush*

- Q1, 2 & 3: All of us who have bought our houses bordering on this proposed area did so because we enjoyed the view towards Faygate. Brown Bros business ruined this and now you wish to take the last vestiges of peace & quiet away as well! I will fight this proposal every inch of the way!! Added to this, the area has for some years been populated with all sorts of birds, bats (protected species) & other wildlife which should not be changed or reduced in any way. *Bewbush*
- Q4: This area is a valuable recreational resource & will be a visual and audible 'buffer' zone between us & the Horsham Road development. *Bewbush*
- Q4. Bewbush playing fields site forms a useful green corridor linking from the Buchan park area (if Horsham retain a green area on its side of the boundary) towards the Ifield Mill Pond Meadow. *Southgate*
- Regarding Bewbush West playing fields. There is an abundance of wildlife that uses the field as well as many children. Also I think there may be a risk of flooding. Please do not build here. *Bewbush*
- Starting with the Breezehurst drive idea, the field designated for american football is possibly Crawley's only one, therefore this should be kept for this purpose, mainly to sustain a more diverse range of sports on offer for the town. Not only that, but the field opposite, being Crawley Town's training ground should be left until the football club finally decide whether they want to improve it as a training ground. *No neighbourhood stated*
- Bewbush West playing field. With already having Kilnwood Vale being developed, these small playing fields are prime recreation areas for children and adults alike to enjoy, things such as football. Dog walking, tree climbing and just enjoying a bit of peace and quiet. It's a corridor from Buchan Park to Waterfield gardens and the Mill Pond for wildlife i.e. bats, hawks, owls among many others. Football and many recreation activities is a huge hit around that area, helping younger people keep fit and enjoy Bewbush, it would crowd the area and make it more boring for everyone living in the area if the council were to build. It should be kept for conservation and recreational purposes. *No neighbourhood stated*
- The area of Breezehurst playing fields should be retained as an open space. These are the only playing fields for the area. *Bewbush*
- The Bewbush sites should not be built on as they offer valuable space for the many young families that occupy the area. ie giving children the space to breathe. The houses immediately adjacent the fields will suffer from noise and dust pollution, however I believe that the old leisure centre site on Breezehurst drive is an adequate compromise to be built on. *Bewbush*
- The Breezehurst Drive Playing Fields and Bewbush West Playing Fields developments seem incredibly short sighted. While there is a genuine concern for the future housing need, this seems to be at the expense of future generations needs for green open spaces. Both developments are

- on playing fields, will future generations not need to play outdoors and exercise? Or has the countries obesity problem been solved? *Broadfield*
- The consultation shows how short CBC is of land. Breezehurst Drive and Bewbush West - both are recreational spaces and we would be reluctant to see them go, especially if they are used by the community as a whole. Breezehurst Drive site also acts as a barrier between housing and the traffic noise on the main road. *Ifield*
 - The green on Bewbush West is used by children in the two parks all the year round the football fields are used constantly. The government wants people to exercise more with their children as so many overweight???? Why take the playing areas away. You do know this is also classed as a flood plain. ??? *Bewbush*
 - The green space in Bewbush is already too small and no more housing should be allowed on an estate with little green space for the residents as it is. The children of Bewbush will have no green spaces to play in and this is an infringement of their basic human rights. Let children be children and play like children should, get them off computers etc. and out in the open spaces if you decide to leave any. *Bewbush*
 - The green spaces in Bewbush are disappearing -children need somewhere to play - adults too! What a boring grey place Crawley will become if all this development goes ahead. Are there no sites towards the airport? *Southgate*
 - The site at Bewbush West playing fields is not ideal as the fields are in regular use by junior football teams, dog walkers, wildlife enthusiasts such as bird spotters, and the local children from the top end of Gassonwood Road, as they are regularly unable to use the playing field down the road. The Green, due to its use as a cricket pitch during the summer months, and not to forget the fact that being closer to their homes the parents can easily keep an eye on them . *Bewbush*
 - The two areas in Bewbush detailed above; Breezehurst Drive playing fields and Bewbush West playing fields are areas that are constantly used on a daily basis by the local community. If these areas were to be developed for housing it would result in a strain on resources and a lack of outside space available for the community to enjoy. It will also cause a huge amount of disruption to the community if this were to go ahead. These areas should be protected, not developed on. They are bailey able assets to the community and they should remain that way. *No neighbourhood stated*
 - There are already enough houses being built in Bewbush, it is nice to see some fields left green, there are already houses being built in Dorsten and also loads more on the Horsham road. Let us have some areas that are house free please !!!!!!!!!!!!!*Bewbush*
 - We live in a maisonette that faces onto Bewbush West playing fields. None of the properties in Nesbit Court have gardens and so all of the

children use the playing fields instead. It is the main area that they go to play after school and during the day, to take this away would prevent them from enjoying an active and healthy childhood - surely something that the council should be trying to protect and encourage. It is also used regularly by dog walkers, and enjoyed by all the local cats. This space is also used for football at the weekends. The location of Bewbush West playing fields was one of the main reasons why we as a family moved to Crawley as it made us feel that we were not living in the middle of a built up housing estate and we felt that it was the perfect environment to raise our family in.
Bewbush

- We thought Crawley had a green area strategy that preserved green corridors (when John Palmer was the relevant council officer). Bewbush houses have little personal space in back or front for play and recreation. With Horsham building against the Bewbush border it is vital to keep Bewbush playing fields for recreation. 19.06.05 we were told that open space along the A264 was necessary for the approach to the town - to prevent ribbon development - later when Bewbush was developed it was said that Bewbush would provide play and recreation space for Gossops Green which already was short on such space. How can the Council ignore its earlier policies in this way? *Southgate*
- Whilst I appreciate the need for more housing in the borough, I chose to live in Bewbush because of the open space that is near my home. The development of Bewbush West playing fields would in my opinion merge Bewbush with the new Kilnwood Vale development and eventually the creation of "Crawsham" *Bewbush*
- Why build more homes in a neighbourhood like Bewbush that is already overcrowded with properties. By building on the two proposed sites takes away the whole of West Bewbush's green playing space. Children have little places to go as there is only 1 park near the Sullivan Drive end which has to be accessed by a main road!!! Building on this land would mean there is nowhere for local children to play and playing in the road would be their only option! The Government are always going on about exercise and losing weight and someone in their infinitely wisdom decides to take away the only other 2 places in Bewbush with playing fields to build more houses. Where are the kids going to play that will be living in these houses? On the A264? You've already taken away the leisure centre, basketball courts, paddling pool and replaced it with a little park. Does someone there really believe that this tiny park can cater for the whole of Bewbush? It can't cater for it now! *Bewbush*
- With the problems of obesity in society it seems irresponsible to drastically reduce the area currently designated for playing fields in Breezehurst Drive and Bewbush West for further housing development. *Southgate*

No further development within Bewbush

- Areas such as Bewbush already have a high concentration of housing which results in traffic issues. To build additional large volumes of homes will only increase these issues. If smaller numbers were suggested I might have said Yes. *Ifield*
- Bewbush does not have the facilities to cope with further houses being built. If more houses need to be built within Crawley's borders then we should look at other parts of the town rather than just adding them to an already overpopulated estate! *Bewbush*
- Bewbush is too full. Too many people per hectare than any other neighbourhood. *No neighbourhood stated*
- The main road is a busy bus route which is made worse by heavy traffic from the Horsham bypass as a cut through by drivers trying to avoid the main roads more housing will only add to this congestion. With the new estate being just across the existing playing field consisting of 2,500 homes we will be living in a sea of bricks and concrete, packed in like sardines. *Bewbush*
- Breezehurst Drive development would make the Horsham to Crawley road much busier so shouldn't be used. *Ifield*
- Bewbush West playing fields - You have already developed Kilnwood Vale. The land between should be left as a barrier and play area for the community. Is it the council's intention to turn estates into overcrowded areas as they did with the development of Broadfield. These areas turned into ""mugger's alley"" with their design of walks and closes. *Bewbush*
- The building on Bewbush West Playing fields is strongly opposed.
 - It will devalue our property substantially and I will demand compensation.
 - We have no garden area and this is where our children play
 - You will be destroying valuable green space.
 - You will damage wildlife, including the bat colony.
 - You will destroy the only redeeming feature of this neighbourhood.
 - Bewbush is enough of a ghetto without more urbanisation.
 - I will oppose and fight every step.
 - How about the other side of Crawley such as Maidenbower playing fields and green space round Worth? Why is it always the west side of Crawley that is continually made worse? *Bewbush*
- Bewbush is highly populated - many living there on lower income - to build on either or both suggested area in Bewbush would increase disturbances and anti-social behaviour taking place. A long term solution may be to build on part of the 2 mentioned areas above at the same time pulling down some of the earlier builds in Bewbush where properties are close to each other. This however would not create extra housing just spread the current housing with 'green/leisure' space in between. *Pound Hill*
- Breezehurst and Bewbush development continue to close the gap to Horsham and put the population in an area likely to make Horsham the go

to place. With the other developments on going and planned to the south and west of Horsham, I fear the nice market town will become over run and crowded leading to further developments for super store sites.

Breezehurst Drive, development: These community open sites have been used for over 25 years therefore I believe they are exempt from planning. Bewbush has little open space as required in the New Town Planning Policy. The country planning officer Mr Jefferson said in April 1962 at the Town Map Inquiry that the choice of the site for a recreational open space was made because it formed a very prominent feature in the landscape. It was conspicuous for the Horsham Crawley Road (A264). The development of the site for residential proposes would have a very ill effect on the area. It was therefore allocated to a public open space. The area given over to open space would be too low without it. The town standard I understand is 4.12 acres per 1000 people. The removal of the two proposed sites in Bewbush, which have been used by the public for 25 years, would be a very ill effect for the population and Crawley landscape which we through would remain green and pleasant. A buffer zone between the Horsham Kingswood Vale development and Bewbush needs to be kept, for life and for green lung between the two. *Bewbush*

- I strongly disagree that Bewbush should have any development more housing will equal an uproar and crime will rise once again the field is a place where kids can play and enjoy themselves why take it away from them and convert them to roaming the streets and getting up to bad behaviour! *Bewbush*
- I think the playing fields should be preserved, especially Bewbush West Playing fields that run along the Horsham Road. It must be remembered that 3,500 houses are already being built a few hundred yards from this site which will incur heavier traffic together with pollution. (I live very close to the Horsham Road and have had to live with this disruption for months and that will continue further but I accept that. These green spaces are needed to help counteract the effects of pollution from the traffic, besides the need for children to have green spaces to play. What about the infrastructure of further houses bearing in mind the 3,500 houses that are being built just down the road. Currently we have problems with hosepipe bans if we get a dry spell of more than 2 weeks. What is going to happen when these houses are built together with the addition of the proposed dwellings? Is a new reservoir going to be built? May be the Government should consider another New Town with the infrastructures put in place rather than a further drain on Crawley. I thought the Government was concerned about child obesity taking their playing fields away is not going to help! *Bewbush*
- Maybe the answer is we do not have and capacity for more housing especially social housing. Bewbush has large open space, no development like Langley Green where you have small pockets of land

and the council at every opportunity seem to be building flats e.g. space near Langley Green pub now flats. *Langley Green*

- No more building in Bewbush. It is full. Too many people and not enough facilities. *No neighbourhood stated*

- Planning for the future is great. Without planning or investing in the right things there is no future. This obviously comes with a cost, with sacrifices and it could may well lead to a better brighter future. Or it could lead to an over populated town with no space to breath. Neck to neck with your neighbours. There is currently a housing development in Bewbush where the old car park used to be, adjacent to the shops. That is land well recycled. Can you not find more places such as this in Crawley rather than using up the green we all love? Does Crawley really have the ability to maintain a larger host community anyway? What is the impact on the environment? The construction works in Kilnwood Vale have forced foxes into my streets. Where will they go to once you remove the little they can roam in Bewbush West? This country is not only populated by humans. We share the land with animals and they have no say in the matter but must adapt to everything we do. It's a shame that the view I wake up to and admire every day, the area I run along weekly, the area I enjoy to escape the town will be replaced by construction and thereafter homes. For what? So you may house people that do not work or pay their taxes as they are "unable" to do so? So that the quiet and relatively peaceful area of West Bewbush may turn into its corrupted sister streets? More people with no room to breathe will not be a great idea but what do I know? I'm just a person who pays her taxes so you can waste it on something other than schools or the health service. Not sure if you guys have heard but Crawley isn't exactly the best place to live. Poor schools, exhausted medical centres because there's not enough staff and recently a higher crime rate... If I wanted to live in a city I would have moved to London. As a young adult I enjoy watching things evolve, I enjoy seeing improvement and I certainly give credit where it is due. There is no credit due here. Unfortunately as I don't own the land I cannot stop you from going ahead but thank you...to some extent for allowing me to share my views. Perhaps I'll vote for another party next time. *Bewbush*

- We have an ever decreasing number of green spaces in the area which also includes the devastating impact on wildlife. Bewbush playing fields is an area of beauty and is used by many people. Also the traffic would be a danger to children playing in the ears and our amenities would be under a huge strain is doctors etc. *Bewbush*

- We have an under supply of allotments, and I believe some of the Bewbush West site should be retained to provide additional allotments. I recently considered applying for an allotment in Bewbush but I was discouraged and disheartened to see the length of the waiting lists, so I have not bothered. Also I believe the woodland at Bewbush Brook should

be wholly preserved due to its natural beauty and as a haven for wildlife. Any developments in Bewbush West and Breezehurst Drive should leave space for recreation, given that both parks and recreation grounds and play space in Bewbush appear to be under-supplied. *Bewbush*

- Why devastate the west fields in Bewbush when there is new whole estate being built just the other side of the hill down the A264? Why destroy a green space that is used and loved by the local residence, where will we have when it is all concreted over and just another part of the ghetto that is Bewbush. *Bewbush*
- Why do Crawley council need to build 200 homes on the Breezehurst drive playing fields when there is a development for 2500 homes less than a mile away towards Horsham is the council determined to create more gridlock and pollution around Bewbush or is it just greed. *Bewbush*

General negative comments

- Protect Bewbush West as there will be housing on the Horsham side of the open space, it will be required as a buffer zone between Bewbush and Kilnwood Vale. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West Playing Fields (part of) - Subject to flooding - the runoff water will end up flooding around Gemini Close etc. if this proceeds. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush West Playing Fields I consider to be unsuitable for development due to the ecological factors of being in proximity of Bewbush Brook, Spruce Hill Brook and an ancient Moat. *Ifield*
- Concerns regarding flood zone at Bewbush West. Also would expect plans for upgrading of recreational areas to be agreed in advance of any building work. *Maidenbower*
- Q4: Why not space the houses out a little - Bewbush is very squashed. *Three Bridges*
- There will soon be no green areas left around Crawley if you keep building in these areas. *Bewbush*
- Too much development this side of town (west). *Ifield*

Goffs Park Depot

Positive Comments

- Southgate is less populated and the Goffs Park depot is an ideal site for some homes. *Ifield*
- Bewbush has nothing to offer apart from green spaces. Three shops, post office, chemist and two schools are bare minimum. If you choose Goffs Park, you will claim only part of green spaces. It will not have as much impact as in Bewbush. *Bewbush*
- Bewbush needs at least the playing field area to be left for the community to enjoy. Housing on the Goffs Park Depot area would not adversely

affect the area as a lot of other development has occurred here in the previous year's. *Pound Hill*

- Goffs Park depot is a brownfield site so has to be considered. *Broadfield*
- Goffs Park is unused so don't see the problem with that. *Bewbush*
- Goffs Park - this site is aptly suitable for housing of the right quality. As long as Goffs Park remains there is ample greenery and leisure areas available to the locals. *Bewbush*
- Goffs park depot could be considered for the gypsy traveller site as it already has existing good road access and would have little impact on the surrounding community, as it is located a distance away from the local houses unlike the Langley Green option. *No neighbourhood stated*
- GoffsPark depot could be considered for traveller site as already has good infrastructure and is away from local residence. *Langley Green*
- Goffs Park Depot could be used for housing development as the site is unused at the moment. Providing the new development is sympathetic to the existing residential area. *Langley Green*
- Goffs Park depot should be for housing possibly used for elderly homes / flats or a warden place, as there is a great need for more places like this, which would free up houses that other person cannot cope with anymore and this would give a greater advantage to family homes. *Broadfield*
- Goffs Park depot could be suitable for housing or perhaps a 'cemetery'? *Langley Green*
- If Goffs Park Depot is unused it would be good to use this land for some new homes. *Pound Hill*
- Q5 The 30 homes would be ideal for that space, taking into account private cars of 30 / 40 would be sufficient for road area. *Pound Hill*
- Goffs Park depot, I believe it is an ideal place to build as it is now disused and is already man made, therefore it may serve no other real use other than development. *No neighbourhood stated*
- The Goffs Park Depot proposal seems valid due to the regeneration aspect. There should be a focus to identify underdeveloped or derelict sites and re-purpose them. *Broadfield*
- The Goffs Depot site should take more than 30 homes. *Gossops Green*
- The Goffs Park depot is making use of land that has already been built on and is not reducing the amount of green space available. *Bewbush*
- The Goffs Park social club car park at the back could be used for more houses. *Ifield*
- The area in Goffs Park has already been used as a development in the past and due to this and the fact that it is already in a residential area; would in my opinion be suitable for a housing development. *No neighbourhood stated*
- I see no reason why the Goffs Park site should not be built on as Goffs Park itself is still there for people to exercise and breathe and the local residents never had that space anyway. *Bewbush*

- Using Goffs Park Depot seems ok as there is already a building so nice land isn't being taken away from the local community and the land will be more useful as a housing estate than an empty building. *Pound Hill*
- Goffs Park - the park could be extended to increase open space, but as there is open space here anyway, the use for housing would be acceptable. *Ifield*
- The land in Goffs Park is very near the school and would be useful for prospective parents of St. Wilfred's. However, I do not feel there is an urgent need to build homes in Crawley. *Langley Green*
- The Old depot in Southgate is prime estate and would fetch good money and be lovely next to Goffs Park. *Pound Hill*
- Using playing fields should never be an option for new housing developments. Only land, such as the council depot in Southgate, where a housing development would be an improvement, should be considered. Housing should never have a negative effect on the existing residents in the area being considered. *Ifield*

Negative Comments

- As a resident of Hillside Close (off Old Horsham Road) and a member of the Buckswood Grange Residents Association, I am concerned at the impact on traffic movements and pedestrian safety, especially with St Wilfrid's school in the vicinity, if 30 new housing units are introduced onto the Council Depot site. The residents are aware that a Road Safety Audit has been conducted for the Old Horsham Road and understand that the recommendations would severely limit the number of properties that can be built at this site. *Southgate*
- Goffs Park Depot should not be used as this will impinge upon the rural ambience of Goffs Park. The Depot should be put to some use, but not housing. *Ifield*
- Goffs Park is an area of natural beauty and a haven for children and families alike. I've been a friend of Goffs Park for many years and support the projects and events that it organises (probably with a limited budget). It must be maintained for future generations, especially as it is so near to the town centre and easy for people to get to. *Ifield*
- The Depot site could be utilised for an urban farm or other community project. *Bewbush*
- Q5: Access onto Horsham Rd is already congested at school times. *Bewbush*
- Q5: We had always been told that the depot would be used for housing after it had been closed, so development here shouldn't cause upset. I write as a neighbour of the park and as a 'friend of Goffs Park'. *Southgate*
- The Goffs Park site is adjacent to the park and shouldn't be considered. *Ifield*
- The Old Horsham Road already has too many residential units requiring access from this dead end road. When the St Wilfred's development was

approved by WSCC Highways it was on the understanding that no more residential development would be permitted that required vehicular access from the Old Horsham Road. *Southgate*

- As a resident of Hillside Close (off Old Horsham Road) and a member of the Buckswood Grange Residents Association, I am concerned at the impact on traffic movements and pedestrian safety, especially with St Wilfrid's school in the vicinity, if 30 new housing units are introduced onto the Council Depot site. The residents are aware that a Road Safety Audit has been conducted for the Old Horsham Road and understand that the recommendations would severely limit the number of properties that can be built at this site. *Southgate*

Maintain green space - general

- I think it is essential in keeping with the original plans of New Towns to have significant green space in each neighbourhood. Inevitably the houses built in different areas will be similar in size to those already there i.e. larger in Goffs park than in Bewbush. But it is essential to give sufficient space for sports, dog walking and walking in every area. *Ifield*
- All the time the Government & medical profession are saying we are getting fatter & obese and at the same time more and more school playing fields & recreation land are being carved up for development. Children should be playing out in the fresh air, not stuck in front of the television or electronic games & computers. Teenagers should be encouraged to do athletics & old people who maybe don't have transport to walk to exercise moderately, perhaps with their dogs. *Langley Green*
- As I cannot inspect these sites it is impossible to give a definitive reply. In general I would want the Council to protect parks, playing fields and woodland for the future. *Furnace Green*
- At present Crawley has some really lovely neighbourhoods with enough green space for children to play and communities to meet - by taking these away and building more houses it will be like living in a city where green space is a premium. *Broadfield*
- By taking our precious green spaces and hemming us in with more houses you simply create worse problems. Vandalism and antisocial behaviour because people have even less opportunity and space. We struggle with resources now more housing needs more support with schools, doctors emergency services etc. etc. the council needs to support the community it has not make the town bigger or more overcrowded. What about healthy living, open spaces, fresh air and wellbeing for us and our families? Is the council obliged to bring more people to Crawley? Is it really necessary to fill every available space with housing? *Bewbush*
- By the sounds of things" there is unlikely to be enough playing fields in the future" if housing takes them over. We need to look after ourselves and

our children's wellbeing now, you can't just presume our children (the next generation) will want to set up home in Crawley; we need to do what's best for them now! That means keep our lovely parks for them to use and enjoy now, and not have them hanging around the streets (that's what will be left) possibly causing future problems. Learning from a young age, for example: Football in the park is better than bored on street corners. We think the councils forward thinking should be more about shaping the here and now of the current residents of Crawley. *Southgate*

- Community open spaces are very important to the wellbeing of local people. *Ifield*
- Free green spaces should be used to develop play areas for children to play, i.e. astro pitches/swings/climbing frames. *Ifield*
- Do not take away park lands or football grounds to build shoddy poorly constructed new builds. As a new build owner they are poorly constructed and have untold problems due to the speed they are thrown together. Leave parklands and football training grounds as they are, where do you expect children, families and youths to play/train/keep fit etc? Don't build and increase Crawley's population any further. Find run-down buildings and convert into flats. Or any empty houses re-vamp and modernise. The spare land is needed for dog walkers, children etc etc. *Bewbush*
- Don't build any more housing within the already over populated areas. The open areas are meant for health and well-being of the general public. *Langley Green*
- I do not believe that building on park land is the way to find space for future development. If you have problems finding suitable land then you should solve these problems and not use land that affects people living nearby that use the parks for recreation. This is not the solution is it? At some point these problems will need to be tackled as you run out of parks to build on, so why not solve these problems now? *Bewbush*
- I do not want any houses built on the greenbelt/ green land in and around the Crawley area! *Bewbush*
- I don't think playing fields should be taken away as these are places young people can exercise, play football etc. We must be careful not to put down too much concrete which takes away natural drainage, thus the possibility of flooding occurs. *Langley Green*
- I don't want to see valuable playing fields lostonce they are built on they are gone forever. *Furnace Green*
- I feel strongly that this area should be kept as playing fields, as was intended when first provided. It is a well-used recreational space. *Bewbush*
- I feel too much land is being taken for development and too little is being preserved for our young people to play. The children are nationally becoming obese. Don't let it be Crawley children! *Ifield*

- I have lived in Crawley for 56 years and enjoyed the green and open spaces. During the last 10 years I have seen the rapid loss of many of these open spaces to development of tightly packed and ill-considered areas. I understand the requirement for more homes in the area.
Bewbush
- I need parks and open spaces to relax and get away from built up and congested areas. These are a must for modern society. *Bewbush*
- I need spaces to run and train for marathon. *Bewbush*
- I play on those fields with balls and my kite. Where would I go to do this with my Nanny and Granddad. *No Neighbourhood stated*
- If you keep building on green spaces, we will have none left for the growing populations of Crawley and surrounding area. *Southgate*
- I'm strongly against using playing field etc. for building as people already have too few recreational areas to visit. It does seem odd to me that the council would consider reducing the amount of "exercising" space when the government has a nationwide initiative to get the population fitter??
Broadfield
- In my view any recreational spaces should remain for the use of the public.
Pound Hill
- Keep playing fields as playing fields. *Langley Green*
- Killing the nature. *Northgate*
- New housing is obviously required but I strongly feel that this should not be at the expense of losing our 'green' spaces which are a very important and valuable land use for towns as well. *Langley Green*
- No housing development on green space as existing resources (water, flooding, schools) are already under treat. I f people need housing they should move to the North of England. *Ifield*
- No more building on fields the town is big enough I don't want to live in a concrete England stop the immigration and we wouldn't have a problem.
Maidenbower
- No more playing fields should be built on. *Bewbush*
- Open spaces should for the benefit of local residence and those of the wider Crawley community. Housing Developers should be using brown sites first, before building on green fields. *No neighbourhood stated*
- Parks need to be kept for future generations for activities. I like walking in parks, games with children and friends. We need these spaces otherwise what and where can children go to play. When bringing my children up parks and open spaces were very important, also in my children's development. What are we leaving future generations? *Pound Hill*
- Playing fields should not be used for housing. *Langley Green*
- Playing fields should not be wiped out to build house. Provision or maintaining Recreation facilities should be a high priority for the development plan. *Three Bridges*

- Q1 Maintain as an open space for recreation and as a green buffer between the present housing and the beauty of Buchan Park. *Ifield*
- Open space should not be used for further development. This not in keeping with the original garden city philosophy. *Ifield*
- Retaining open spaces for future generations is most important; we do not want a complete concrete cover for our town. *Pound Hill*
- Save our parks and open space. We do not want to live in a concrete jungle. There is plenty of space in other parts of Sussex. The open spaces is what makes it enjoyable living in this town. *Bewbush*
- Sites used for recreation and sporting activities need to be kept for those purposes. *No neighbourhood stated*
- Stop looking at playing fields. These areas are used by dog walkers and children; we do not need housing on every green part of our town. *Broadfield*
- Stop using playing fields. *Langley Green*
- Taking what green areas we have left is unacceptable, but using redundant sites previously occupied and built on i.e. closed down factory sites, is acceptable. *Broadfield*
- The council wants to take away public amenities. You should not take away playing and parks. *Pound Hill*
- The field is our place to relax and share with our children and family, it's used for outdoor activities, and my childhood was a big part there I have a lot of memories, it should be kept an open area, we like the nature and view, seeing the local team play football and rugby and keeping fit, it's also very peaceful, picnics, sports, walking, playing in the snow, going for run, relaxing, sunbathing etc. *No neighbourhood stated*
- The football team should practise on their own ground. Not public playing fields. *Three Bridges*
- The open space parks and playing fields should not be further developed. If that means not building within Crawley, so be it - build outside on less used sites that will not remove open space for town dwellers. *Gossops Green*
- There is no doubt, not just in Crawley but the whole country has a need for more housing - we will never meet the demand unless the government change course & why should we lose all our lovely green spaces to accommodate the government mistakes which they inflicting on us, changing our lovely environment into a concrete jungle. What will happen when every piece of land is used? *Ifield*
- We are losing too much open green space. If additional housing is required why can't the developments be built in other parts of the county or the country? *Pound Hill*
- We cannot continue to develop on our green spaces. On the whole Crawley has a lot to offer and we are lucky to give our families this open space. We do not have the infrastructure to constantly support expensive

housing. Let's keep out green spaces for the future children. *Furnace Green*

- We can't keep building on fields and football pitches where will our children play this is pushing more on to the streets bored. *Maidenbower*
- We consider any further housing should be on the outskirts of Crawley even if it means taking up some parkland. Crawley is already too built up and to have any quality of life we must have space, green areas for those without gardens and small attractive places to sit and smell the roses. Don't spoil what was once an attractive and pleasant town. *Ifield*
- We do not need more houses with the new Kilnwood development being built, community greens are very important to protect we cannot just build on every green land!! *Bewbush*
- We have precious little true park land and woods in Crawley, this area should not be used for housing because of its uniqueness. *Maidenbower*
- We need all the open spaces for football and leisure for youth of the town. Building houses is essential but must leave some for leisure I feel. *No neighbourhood stated*
- We need parks and fields to educate our children. *Pound Hill*
- We need to keep our green land. *Langley Green*
- We need to keep as many open space as possible once they have been developed they have been lost forever. Crawley is full to bursting point we need to stop bringing in more people to area. *Langley Green*
- Young children and families need these places to play, they are important to keep. *Langley Green*

No further housing development - general

- We are not in favour of any future housing. We have been let down by Crawley Borough Council by not improving the infrastructure within its boundaries. Why have not Crawley Borough Council liaised with West Sussex County Council to ensure a better infrastructure. Travelling time from Bewbush to town centre 30-60 minutes in peak times. *Pound Hill*
- Crawley already has enough housing. The majority of new builds are bought by out of town people. We had better allocation. Our infrastructure cannot cope! *Ifield*
- Crawley does not need any more housing. The council has failed on infrastructure i.e. traffic jams within borough boundaries. For example Pound Hill to Three Bridges 20-30 mins, Pound Hill to town centre 40-60mins, Bewbush to town centre 40-60 mins. These are at Peak times. Horse buses were quicker 100 years ago. Both planning officers and elected councillors have failed the people of Crawley by not improving roads and other cut backs in council services. *Bewbush*

- Crawley does not need any more neighbourhoods, if anything the council should look at getting a second runway at Gatwick, for more job security for its residence. We already have more than our fair share of immigrants without the need for more homes to house them. *Tilgate*
- Crawley has no employment to cater for any more houses to be built. *Ifield*
- Don't need more houses!! *Ifield*
- I am opposed to the building of new houses anywhere within the town, particularly those being proposed on green areas, such as playing fields or woodland. People need to understand that not everyone can live in the South East of England. There is simply neither the space nor the resources. *Bewbush*
- I can't understand the need to continue the expansion of the town. The CBC boundary is geographically an artificial construct. We should be looking at the whole of West Sussex and beyond with other local authorities and central government. *Southgate*
- I do not think houses should keep being built. I think the town population is large enough. *Langley Green*
- I strongly suggest not expanding Crawley but using some of the villages and small towns around. They do have a lot of space compared with Crawley which already feels overcrowded and overshadowed. *Northgate*
- I think housing should remain as it is! Why do we need more homes???? We have little green spaces left in this town, and the ones we have we are passionate about keeping. I do not understand why you need more housing ... Maybe more restrictions on WHO is allocated brand new housing needs to be looked at rather than taking away our green spaces because teenagers can't use birth control properly!! *Bewbush*
- I don't think we should continue to add new builds in increasingly smaller and/or inappropriate areas in Crawley ad infinitum. Eventually we will completely run out of space so we need to be thinking more innovatively to solving our housing problems and explore use of turning existing excess office space in the town into city style housing instead. One thing I would say is that I would like to say that where we do build, can developments be built so they do not add to Crawley's already 'institutionalised' feel by not building flats/apartment blocks that look like prisons/institutions. *Gossops Green*
- Perhaps better sites could be found down towards Bolney or Horsham. Crawley has taken its share of housing development since I moved here in 1954. I feel it's full to capacity. *Langley Green*
- Stop finding land to build new homes, Crawley is already unpleasant enough without you putting more inconsiderate and non-tax paying people in it. *No neighbourhood stated*
- The town does not have sufficient infrastructure in place to support further development- the nearest hospitals to admit A&E patients are in different

counties, there are no maternity units in Crawley, and the park spaces are the only areas that you can escape the ill-conceived urban mess that this once nice town has become. *No neighbourhood stated*

- There are enough houses already in Crawley. There are not the facilities for people already living in Crawley. *Langley Green*
- There is no need to constantly look for more high density housing in Crawley. It is already overdeveloped and this affects the quality of living here. There is plenty of space for housing elsewhere in the UK. What we need is to enhance the centre of Crawley to bring it up from its down market image. We need to get those empty premises let. *Pound Hill*
- This town doesn't need new housing it needs better housing management. *Tilgate*
- Why doesn't the council now do what some other local councils have now done and refuse to build further in the area. Crawley was a new town and a lot of thought went into the design of it. The town was developed for the employees of the companies to live closer to their work but the planners recognised that all employees have families and need green open spaces in which to enjoy any leisure time they have. This ideal is now being constantly eroded. The town now has too little green space that can be accessed freely for leisure. Given the amount of high rise flats that are now being built the green areas are increasingly necessary for working families to access. Other councils are saying no more is enough why don't you Crawley. *Bewbush*
- Why is expanding the town a good thing? Full. No more houses please. *No neighbourhood stated*

Other comments

- All above areas close to or within residential areas, this providing services (walking) should not entail large expense. Dense city is better and sprawling city, it's easier and less expensive to provide for essential services and also for policing etc. *Gossops Green*
- I have lived in Crawley for 34 years, and seen many new houses built. But hardly any new schools, shops, doctors etc. It's all well and good building new houses for more people to live in Crawley, but there is a lack of essential support e.g. schools, parks, shops to supply the ever growing town. *Furnace Green*
- All three sites are in areas of housing with parks or open spaces next to them. *Three Bridges*
- Any housing development in proposed sites should be in keeping with its surroundings and be of affordable rents to meet the needs of the local people's housing requirements over that of newcomers. *Tilgate*
- Don't know. *Bewbush*

- I do not have sufficient local knowledge of the proposed areas to give a definite yes or no to any of the proposed sites. *Langley Green*
- I don't know the Goffs park area so can't comment! *Bewbush*
- I don't live near these so don't feel I can vote on these. *Pound Hill*
- Flats would be better than houses and possibly place for retirement homes. *Langley Green*
- I think we need more housing for them poor couples/families that have no hope of housing and have to use their income on private rent!!! I was born in Crawley and have lived here all my life, I understand the need for more affordable housing so our children can continue to live in Crawley. At the same time you need to take on board the issue that there will soon be no room left to develop on. Also the very important issue that we have had the same Fire and Ambulance Stations for as long as I have been alive and that is 48 years. Considering how large Crawley has become, it is extremely urgent and important that they are increased in line with the population and the growth area of Crawley, before you increase the population further. *Bewbush*
- I don't think we should be plotting developments so close to historic buildings and public open spaces, particularly when they are so aesthetically appealing that a development on the site would stick out like a sore thumb unless they're so sympathetically built as to not impede the overall look but as already mentioned, there seems to be a lack of attention to this among developers. What that area does need is a nice cafe for public use. *Gossops Green*
- I would like to see more high rise buildings in Crawley. *Northgate*
- If there is a growing demand due to increase in population, then the council should increase the housing needs for all to be able to live in the existing communities as the area has been for all the other ethnic communities who have integrated within the area as normal residents. No special area should be allocated for the gypsy site. Otherwise you may have to allocate the requirement of each community according to the practices. *Broadfield*
- If we have to have a traveller site there is some land by the roundabout by Gatwick Airport and the small business units and a farm. *Tilgate*
- In the allocation of any additional housing development sites it is important to have regard to avoiding those areas which are focused on meeting the needs of airport related activities and any areas of potential future airport expansion. *Gossops Green*
- Is it possible that neighbouring council land could be used to build on? E.g. Horsham land round Ifield. Crawley should keep green areas inside existing *neighbourhoods* for people to use and keeping the general green feel of Crawley. *Langley Green*
- Make sure that land such as that at the back of K2 and adjacent to Desmond Anderson school which has already been acquired by private

- business for housing and has good access is used rather than the ad-hoc infill of smaller sites -which it appears the council is keener to do. *Tilgate*
- More houses should be built so the people of Crawley (born and bred and worked their whole life) should be able to have a council home instead of making single parents go into private rented accommodation that they can't afford. What with agency fees/holding fees and 1st month's rent upfront it's too expensive and unfair! *Bewbush*
 - None. *Bewbush*
 - Stop immigration. *No neighbourhood stated*
 - Stop letting people in to our country and we will not have this problem. *Bewbush*
 - The areas that I have yes to, I believe should be used to build houses in Crawley as there is a huge shortage which is affecting young families. *Broadfield*
 - The construction industry needs helps & building new houses is part of the solution. Also with so many people desperate for housing it is essential this development should go ahead. *Langley Green*
 - The Horsham Road cannot take any more traffic. *No neighbourhood stated*
 - The infrastructure of Crawley cannot cope with any more housing. *Northgate*
 - You cannot get a quarter into a pint jug! What type of housing? Flats - if so, how high? *Langley Green*
 - The West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service have a responsibility under the Fire Services Act to accommodate any future development and the current and future strategies will be designed to manage the risk appropriately. *No neighbourhood stated*
 - There is already an issue of anti-social behaviour due to lack of things to entertain the young. Develop these sites to suit the needs and reduce anti-social behaviour rather than bring more numbers to join the issue! *Broadfield*
 - There is enough housing developed but just not given to people who have lived here their whole lives. *Langley Green*
 - There is too much construction work going on in Crawley as it is. *Langley Green*
 - Bewbush local transport links are very good compared to other parts of town. This is very noticeable when trying to get home on a bus, more buses go to Bewbush than Langley Green. *Langley Green*
 - We are concerned about the loss of green space and whether local amenities i.e. NHS/utilities etc. can cope with additional housing. *Broadfield*
 - We don't need any more houses in Crawley look further afield. *Langley Green*

- We need more space not every nook and cranny filled with ugly cheap housing, kick out the Tory scum and build some proper social housing, expand the town, give people homes they can be proud of so people want to live here. There isn't even the infrastructure in place to handle this constant sardine packing building works; you imbeciles are making this dive of a town even worse. *Gossops Green*
- While I appreciate the need for new houses, it would seem better to have a number of small developments, rather than larger numbers of houses in overcrowded areas. *Langley Green*
- Yes you should build homes but Council Homes not private. *West Green*
- With the option of reducing the number of houses to retain a larger open, communal space. *Gossops Green*

Other land that might be suitable for housing

Brown Field Sites

- All the vacant sites on the old industrial park in Manor Royal and Fleming way instead of all the green belt areas! *Broadfield*
- As there are many empty offices in the town centre these could be used for housing. Manor Royal was intended as the "work place" for Crawley keeping housing, recreation, shopping separate from work. Perhaps all office space should be on the industrial area. Crawley has none of the old industries only support industries so all offices could go there opening up many new sites for housing. *West Green*
- Perhaps to answer space shortage, Crawley could reclaim some of ex industrial estates, i.e. space where Ikea meant to be build, etc. *Bewbush*
- The town centre should not be extended for shops but revamped sympathetically. The increase in online shopping means there won't be the need for traditional shops in the future. The area shops were going to be extended into should be considered for housing. Still many unused (and never occupied) offices around Crawley (i.e. Station Way) could be demolished and used for housing. *Ifield*
- Broadfield, County Oak Retail Park are empty site for Flats or homes. Brownfield sites should be used to build houses not playing fields and parks. Crawley has love parks and open spaces let the people use them! *Broadfield*
- Crawley town centre! We will need a lot less shops in the future and there needs to be a clear and integrated strategy how area's in the town centre can be turned into residential districts. This needs to be tied into the Stanhope/TCN development if shops move to the north of the town and County Mall remains to the North there will be a swathe of empty shops that could be turned in reasonably high density housing. However please note the quality of this development needs to be far higher the

development at the old sports centre site. A sense of community and destination still needs to be maintained. *West Green*

- Demolish Stevenson Way industrial site and relocate to Manor Royal, replace with 100's of homes/flats, utilise an entry/exit onto the "square-about". *Ifield*
- Empty shops in town centre? *Pound Hill*
- Development of the old bowling alley and council offices site should have been all housing; apartments /flats. Crawley does not need another hotel. *Southgate*
- How about using empty shops or empty commercial premises? *Maidenbower*
- How about using some of the land on the Industrial estate? There always seems to be a large number of empty buildings and it seems such a waste of the space. There are other empty offices/warehouses around like opposite paymaster. *Pound Hill*
- How about where the old hospital accommodation was. It's been vacant for a long time now. There is an awful lot of empty commercial property in Crawley. Look at compulsory purchase for conversion to residential. Huge areas on the industrial estate lay empty; it is pointless the council petitioning the government to save Manor Royal for industry when we are sacrificing green space for housing. Radford Farm, Gatwick Road, Edge of Denvale Trade Park all used to be housing which you gave away to industry, so balance it out now by using parts of the industrial estate for housing. *Pound Hill*
- In terms of vacant space, I believe there are empty offices on Russell Way off the Paymaster General's roundabout. This could be used for housing. Can we not repurpose some of the empty offices and homes in Crawley before building on new green spaces? *Tilgate*
- Traveling around Crawley, there are many empty properties that could be redeveloped and brought back into use. *Bewbush*
- Here is a little out of the box idea you have had so many office buildings go up that we all see half empty why not convert some of the ones in town into sort after apartments i.e. as they would come with high ceilings and be really close to town for the London and Gatwick workers *Broadfield*
- If a refuse depot was acceptable, then housing must be preferable. *Langley Green*
- Industrial estate - where there are so many empty properties, some have even been demolished and redeveloped. *Gossops Green*
- Industrial Estate, Thales and Edwards has been laid bare this is a good area to build new houses, this is a massive area, and would be put to good use rather than take all our green areas and playing fields which I feel is enjoyed by many and should be kept for generations to come. If we destroy these green areas, we will never to able to have them back,

creating a generation of concrete jungles, where no space is green for children families etc. to enjoy for all. *Ifield*

- Look to use up sites where unoccupied offices stand constantly empty. Ensure future commercial developments have compulsory provision for housing. Many areas of Manor Royal are derelict unoccupied. Do not take much needed recreational space away before exhausting brownfield sites. *Pound Hill*
- Land that might be suitable for housing. South of Stephenson Way, adjacent to the footpath from Haslett Avenue to Tilgate - Tilgate Drive cycle track. Near block of flats in Dedisham Close, access from Greenacres. *Three Bridges*
- Land that is now used as a car park in West Green Drive opposite Asda. Could the council buy land where Fairfield House was? *Ifield*
- Knock down old buildings, rebuild on those sites. Re-vamp old buildings that have been boarded up. *Bewbush*
- It seems that where isolated areas of the town or areas of interest or of an historic nature or open areas are proposed for development. Where infill in already build up areas are ignored. I would also look for more brown field options office blocks warehouse industrial areas. *Ifield*
- It's not about new homes-stop building office blocks that are going to remain empty like those in the town centre. Fill the houses that are empty due to standard of accommodation. And build for families. 2 bed flats are plenty. 3/4 bed affordable homes are not!!! *Gossops Green*
- Use eye-sore of Stevenson Way for development. *Langley Green*
- Lots of houses in Crawley especially Broadfield need replacing, they are looking old out of date run down and dirty. I'm sure with new technologies and improved knowledge of living and lifestyle you could rebuild these areas and houses. Get rid of the rotten out of date houses and replace them, that's the answer; you will improve lifestyle living cleanliness and be able to build more homes. Improve what you do have. *Broadfield*
- Manor Royal now that the Government have allowed residential development in this area. *Langley Green*
- More use of Brownfield sites should be used rather than green spaces. *Ifield*
- More use of Brownfield sites should be used rather than green spaces. *Ifield*
- Need to use already developed sites that are unoccupied office blocks, wasteland or demolished buildings. Stop building offices. Use the nurse's flats, opposite Crawley library, sites at square about, opposite Crawley train station for housing. Make the most of already developed areas and don't use land that families use for leisure e.g. Breezehurst playing fields. *Broadfield*
- Old Desmond Anderson primary school site because it is an unused site. *Pound Hill*

- Opposite Paymaster Generals Office. The developers were greedy hence all the objections. A smaller development would be ok. The old police station and library site seems a waste of land that could be flats. Lots of empty units at the old Tilgate Pallets site up Pease Pottage Hill, this would make ideal housing land. *Furnace Green*
- Brown field sites should be developed such as the now derelict nurses accommodation close to Crawley Hospital. It's criminal that this building has stood empty for so long. *Bewbush*
- All unoccupied office space within the town and Industrial areas. Some office space has remained unused, for many years, since being built and quite easily be converted in to flats/bedsits. *Tilgate*
- Also do not build on green field site, when there are plenty of Brown field sites to build on. *Bewbush*
- Start using your reserves to buy land in adjoining areas that are suitable for housing. There are areas towards Gatwick that we earmarked for commerce, change the use, we have enough empty office blocks that could be utilised and modernised plus land already empty in Manor Royal itself. *Langley Green*
- The empty site facing Sutherland House - formerly occupied by Seeboard which could take a development similar in character to that built on the old leisure centre site. Empty office blocks in and around the town centre such as Overline House which has always had significant unused space. Parking is obviously a major concern but town centre properties have other appeal and are unlikely to attract multi car owning families, additionally most cities and towns are in the same situation in regard to parking. *Furnace Green*
- The land at Thomas Bennett School which has not been developed for years, West Sussex County Council is waiting for the price of land to increase. Crawley Council should put pressure in then to build. The old comet site it appears parking is more important than homes. There are a number of office premises that have remained empty for a vast amount of years, laws need to be changed to turn these into flats, and this will then decrease the amount of green / open spaces that require building upon. The Old Fairfield house site and old Southern Counties garage site in West Green, what is happening here! *Tilgate*
- The old Beechams site for a new development for many houses for years to come. Private land that farmers want to sell or anyone else that has land to sell. The London road low field Heath opposite Gatwick Manor land there they could build housing on. The old first choice building, knock it down and build houses. The old Edwards community building in Ifield, flats housed on there. *Maidenbower*
- The old EDF site near the Square about (Russell Way) which is derelict and a complete eyesore. *Tilgate*
- The town car park next to the registry office? *Gossops Green*

- There are a number of previously commercially used sites in the Manor Royal area that are no longer used for commercial purposes & some for a considerable amount of time. In the present (and continuing) economic climate, it would appear sensible to change the use of these sites from business to residential / traveller site. *Langley Green*
- There are buildings in Crawley that are currently abandoned that have not been used for a long time and seem to have no intention of being used. Rather than looking at Green Spaces maybe it's worthwhile looking at spaces already built on but unused. Or stop building. Crawley cannot continue to expand indefinitely. *No neighbourhood stated*
- Unfortunately I have no serious contenders to suggest other than dis-used industrial sites. There are already too many people in Crawley for the existing services etc. I don't see the council rushing to build the new hospital we so desperately need! *No neighbourhood stated*
- Use all the empty offices and demolished sites around the town to build homes - make sure you plan enough parking. *No neighbourhood stated*
- Use brown sites - a better option. Do not build on small patches that are tucked up behind established land / property. *Tilgate*
- Use some of the empty office blocks that are polluting the town centre. *Ifield*
- Use the empty spaces on Manor Royal. *Ifield*

Increase Crawley Boundary

- As for extra housing as Crawley is a New Town unless space is found on the boundary on the outskirts it has to be accepted that Crawley either has or will reach a limit. Though there is the option of building on 'brown' sites such as Manor Royal if there is 'unused' space. Here a solution opposite to the one I suggested for Bewbush would be to bring businesses' / buildings close together to create a large unused space for housing. *Pound Hill*
- Areas around the out skirts should be utilised as we don't want to lose the open feeling to the middle of the town. There are already a lot of blocks of flats that have been built which is starting to make the town feel cluttered. *Southgate*
- As Crawley has little land available for housing, which will become worse in the future, then perhaps land should be acquired from adjacent Council's who have more available land than us. *Also, they do not have an airport, which may seek to expand, creating an even greater shortage. Could the government allocate more land the Crawley by changing the boundaries. Ifield*
- Buy some land from adjacent Council. They have more land than us - we need our playing fields. *Ifield*
- Have the council considered including at least some of their requirements into the NE sector development? *Pound Hill*

- In the long term the Council must look at changes to boundaries or merging with other LA's. *Furnace Green*
- I feel very strongly the boundary of Crawley needs to be re-drawn. The best thing about Crawley is its Green spaces. There are large building sites being constructed which will use Crawley facilities, and which are essentially part of Crawley and should be included in Crawley but are officially Horsham despite being some distance from Horsham. If there is no room for the extra houses in Crawley's borders then Crawley cannot expand except to the detriment of all who live there and may live there in the future. *Southgate*
- Can we just have the boundary commission enlarge Crawley's boundaries. Why have a very large power house of commerce when we are effectively wrapped up in a tight jacket we need to expand but not within our present boundaries. *Northgate*
- If no more land can be found then it means that Crawley is full. The only land that would be suitable to expand Crawley boundary is the Balcombe Road area. This area is not used for anything (only dog walking). This could be a site for a cemetery or travellers, noise wouldn't be a problem for a cemetery. *Ifield*
- As a general observation, there appear to be many unoccupied office blocks. I know that in East Grinstead, an office block has been converted to residential flats successfully, and we should place consideration for the re-use of office blocks (and car parks such as at Dorsten Square) above the development of green spaces. *Bewbush*
- Work with neighbouring local authorities to build shared homes on adjoining land. A town still needs green space or we will become like New York where there is only 1 park and no gardens - and a town of blocks of flats. *No neighbourhood stated*

Other Sites

- Burleys Wood could be used for housing *Langley Green*
- Land to the south of Gatwick bordered by Bonnetts lane in the west and County Oak in the east - Langley Green to the south. *Maidenbower*
- Allotments between Southgate Ave, Brewer Ave & Malthouse Road. *Maidenbower*
- Other land that could be used for housing- garage blocks all over Crawley. They tend not to be used by tenants in flats that they neighbour and were built for, they just seem to be a crime hotspot with so many garage break ins or attempts. These blocks are in residential areas and so it seems logical to build on these plots of land. They do bring in a good income for the council but it seems silly to keep all of them if the council is struggling for land. *Pound Hill*
- Broadfield Kennels site could be used, any houses build even if only a few is a few more people off the housing list. *Broadfield*

- CFC should move to a new out of town location to more extensive grounds with adequate parking for their future development and league promotion prospects - as a private business this should be at their own cost. The land could then be used for low-density housing. The move out of the area by CFC would relieve the local population from the regular influx of visiting fans and traffic that currently is a blight on the residential areas and road verges surrounding the stadium. *Southgate*
- Desmond Anderson old school sight (two) fenced off and unused. *Three Bridges*
- Areas from county oak towards Lowfield Heath are not used. *Langley Green*
- Ensuring that empty homes are brought back into occupancy. Making use of brownfield sites including empty or under-occupied retail and office space in the town centre. *Southgate*
- Hedgerow House, Rusper Road, Ifield, has 4 acres which they may consider selling. *Ifield*
- I have stated elsewhere Ewhurst Playing Fields you should consider land and the end of the Mardens and council depot on south side. From middle hedge line to A23, yes, I know it belongs to the school but is not used except for a couple of times a year has benefits of access. There is a small plot of land in Mowbray Drive, by garages and flats south of Ifield brook. I know it is small but you need every space and any developer would cut their arm off to build flats here. *No neighbourhood stated*
- Ifield Park. *Ifield*
- One or more of the playing fields behind Cherry Lane, Langley Green. *Langley Green*
- Releasing land currently protected for any 2nd runway at Gatwick would provide space for many more homes. Specifically the area north of Cherry Lane and County Oak. *Ifield*
- Rusper Road playing fields, Ifield. I believe there is no pavilion or changing facilities. This area does not overlook any existing residents. *Tilgate*
- Suitable for housing, old Edwards social club site, old Duracell social club site, old radiffson social club site. *Ifield*
- The area that is where Buchan Kennells used to be? *Broadfield*
- From looking at your Additional Sites Allocation Consultation Map, which doesn't appear to be up to date as it doesn't show the vast development near three bridges square-about, Gaps can be seen in the Ifield and Langley areas that aren't marked as playing fields. There is a strip of land between Broadfield brook and the A23, Furnace green could be expanded up to the railway line and the commercial offices next to three bridges square-about (which seem derelict when viewed from the railway) could receive a change of use to a quite sizeable residential development. *Broadfield*

- Or there is the option of using the area proposed as a travellers site along the A264 as a residential development considering your own gypsy, traveller and travelling show people accommodation needs assessment document states that there is 'no current need'. *Broadfield*
- The farm on the worth way the other side of the M23. It is large enough for a development the size of Maidenbower. *No neighbourhood stated*
- The land between Astral towers and Lowfield Heath roundabout. The land to the right of the footbridge into Goffs Park from West Green to Gossops Green. I agree with building homes where developments already exist but Crawley's green spaces must be preserved and protected. *Langley Green*
- The old Broadfield Kennels site would be a preferable site for housing rather than a Travellers site which would not generate any income unlike traditional housing where people would actually be contributing to the local economy, I fail to see why the council should provide a specific site for travellers who choose not to either buy or rent a place to live. Lessons should be learned from the Essex Travellers sites that were a blot on the landscape. *Bewbush*
- Northgate playing fields. *Gossops Green*
- There is a Large amount of land in front of Waterlea playground, I am not sure if Waterlea use the land or perhaps the scout hut there but there is a large area there. *Three Bridges*
- Park next to Tesco's petrol station Pound Hill. *Gossops Green*
- Thomas Bennett playing fields. Garage sites. *Southgate*
- Use the land to the east of the M23 near Maidenbower Audi Garage. *Maidenbower*
- There are places on the edge of town which could be developed. We shouldn't be building on inner town green areas. *Tilgate*
- We need our green spaces, how about looking at brown field site. The old Glaxo site off Crawley Avenue. *Broadfield*
- We need to protect our green spaces this town is getting too big too many hotels etc. We need the little spaces within communities they provide wildlife areas etc. consider building houses on sites like the old GSK etc. before commercial there's not room now for both. *Northgate*
- West Green Park, Ewhurst Road seems to be very run down and unused. *Furnace Green*
- What about land at Thomas Bennett and what about Ifield, Lady Margaret have been demolished? *Tilgate*
- What about the land where the nurse's home used to be in West Green - nothing has been done with the land since the building was knocked down and also the site where Southern Counties garage used to be in West Green opposite Asda??? *Ifield*
- What is happening to the site in Ifield which used to house Ifield Community College? That is a perfect housing site and has been left derelict for many years now. *Ifield*

- Why is the old Ifield Community College site still undeveloped after 8 years? This site could potentially house hundreds of homes. *Ifield*

Appendix B1 - Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Comments made regarding the proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites at Langley Walk and Broadfield Kennels.

Langley Green site – people who said YES

Langley Green – better location

- Any Gypsy/Traveller site would need to be near schools etc.
- The Langley Walk site would have better access to local amenities than the other site.
- Langley Green would be better as within community so better restriction in place.
- They need somewhere to live and I can't think of any other sites.
- If I were a traveller i would prefer the Langley Green site. Noise from the A264 and speed of traffic,
- I feel that although Langley Green may suffer some airport noise it would be a lot safer for the travellers to use than a site which exits onto a busy "A" road.
- The Langley Walk site is more included in the community with much better access to facilities.

Seems reasonable

- A total of 20 families doesn't sound unreasonable, wouldn't overburden the area's facilities, and goes some way towards satisfying the Council's duties in this regard.
- There is a legal obligation to provide such sites, so identifying locations that have minimal impact on the rest of the neighbourhood makes good sense.
- I am not aware of any potential alternative sites but Crawley desperately needs to fulfil its responsibility to provide legal and dignified sites. Not only is this an ethical issue, but it would also give greater force to eviction of illegal sites and help to end the devastation and cost of cleaning up the detritus from such encampments.
- Will be ok as long as not impacting too much on being able to access Buchan Park or cherry lane fields
- It seems surprising that Gypsy families' children might want to go back to caravans but very reasonable of the council to make the offer

Views from gypsy and travellers

- I feel that a permanent gypsy site should be built in Crawley area because communities clash and beliefs get in view of people. (i.e. open family cooking complaint because of noise and people feel its wrong but its our way)
 - The land at Broadfield Kennels would be ok, but the access on to the A264 needs to be sorted, we are in need of a Gypsy/ Traveller site, however, what must be assured is that you cannot put both parties on the same site!! I have absolutely no problem with where the sites will be it is not going to be easy to get these sites included as the racist element in town will be out in force, personally I also expect more racism for those Gypsies / Travellers all ready living within the settled community from the ill informed. As already happens.
 - As Secretary of the Sussex Traveller Action Group I welcome the arguments put forward for the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites. They are well put and convincing on the importance of identifying sites in order to get the Local Plan accepted. We have a few comments as below.
 1. We accept that the assessment identifies 9 sites, but are not entirely clear if those are sites with multiple pitches or single pitches. Council owned sites presume have multiple pitches but with privately owned sites, it is not as clear. Gypsy and Traveller families tend to be intergenerational and need to extend the accommodation on their site to accommodate family members. These extensions are often refused.
 2. The Plan states there is not enough accommodation to cater for projected future needs, but here is not enough accommodation to cater for current needs as the recent unauthorised incursions testify.
 3. The explanation for the shortage should be more specific about the ...(blocking access to) common land such as Ditchling Common, Henfield Common, Devils Dyke and other previously accessible common land, whether in the Crawley district or in nearby locations.
 4. The financial benefits of providing sites are stated but could be emphasised with the approximate annual cost for evicting unauthorised encampments as against the cost of providing sites.
 - STAG urges private planning applications from Gypsies and Travellers be dealt with much more quickly and effectively, and notes that two applications are awaiting decisions. We trust these will be resolved quickly as many applicants wait years and are repeatedly asked to provide additional, sometimes irrelevant, information. Many are then only granted temporary permission. It should be made clear that increasing acceptance of private Gypsy and Traveller planning applications would relieve pressure on public sites and also reduce costs to the council.
 - If the Sussex Traveller Action Group can assist in any way, please contact me
- Juliet McCaffery, Secretary. E mail: juliet@sussextag.org.uk

Alternative sites

- The site considered and rejected for housing in Stephenson Way (5) might work better for a traveller site.
- Unused land near Manor Royal and around Gatwick Airport, giving privacy to the traveller community.
- I think a better site would be off the A23 near the Lowfield Heath roundabout the best way I can describe where is if looking from google earth it would be the field in between and Gatwick and the long hall parking as this would have easier access for the caravans to enter be far enough away from residence but still within the Crawley boundary to accommodate the requirement for a site, it also has a bus stop very close by
- Gas Holder Site, North East Sector.
- Reclaimed industrial sites, i.e. around Three Bridges Station, etc.
- Next to Delta Force paint ball site
- Horsham or Haywards Heath
- The area to the south of K2 where it was noted that a new hospital could go. It seems unlikely that we will get a new hospital
- The area by business units by roundabout near Gatwick by farm. If we have to have one.

Find an alternative site – away from local community

- I agree they need somewhere but maybe an option where it wouldn't affect the local community already established there.
- In France they have allocated sites for travellers and these are always located away from residential areas but within easy access of shops etc and these sites are always very clean.
- Consulting with the travellers on sites they would be happy with, and somewhere that could be expanded. Perhaps putting the sites near existing neighbourhoods would cause conflict.
- Gypsy sites are not generally popular with residents (hence all the grass banks and yellow gates) so any site should be as far away as possible so as to avoid conflict.

Other site not good – concerns about the wildlife and environment

- To be truthful I believe if you allow the site to go at the old Broadfield kennels it will detract families from going to Buchan park , I think it will cause havoc with the local wildlife as there are always wild deer living up in that area
- Buchan park is too close to this area, and there is a risk that one of Crawley's finest, and beautiful parks will be jeopardised.
- The surrounding common areas, such as St. Leonard's Forest and the Golf Course will be affected too. I am totally against this proposal, as I have been in the past.
- Adamantly against this site where kennels were. This is much too close to the amazing Buchan park where the dogs are walked, children from schools

visit in large groups with teachers. The park rangers have done an exemplary work and take great pride in all they do. They will overlap into this public space and it will be spoilt.....This is a free park for families and treasured by us all. The wild life and lakes are incredible, they will ruin the lakes with their rubbish and it will be spoilt.Please please leave this park for us it is used so much. They are too close to it and will encroach on it and the safety of all of us will be spoilt!

- Using the Broadfield site may encourage overspill into the park.
- Broadfield Kennels is a beautiful site that is part of Buchan Park. The site of a gypsy and travellers are would be damaging to the area and could case significant distress to anyone walking in the area, especially alone if they accidentally wander onto the site.
- Having previously lived in Brighton and witnessed the damage that travellers have made to various parks and open land in the area. I do not want to have a traveller site near to Buchan Country Park....
- A site should not be located next to a nature park which many people use and enjoy
- You will deter people from walking in Buchan Park,
- The land at Broadfield kennels is an area of natural beauty and used by many dog walkers, this area will not be enhanced by a permanent travellers site.

Other site not good - negative impact on local community

- Along with safety, house prices would fall (Dale Farm has shown this).When they have been on illegal sites, safety in the area has been compromised; the rubbish they leave is disgraceful.
- These sites have to be located away from the centre of town as the noise and rubbish these sites produce would reflect badly on the town. Crime increased 100% when they arrived near our home.
- Gypsy and traveller sites should be away from housing estates.
- It's hard enough when they pitch up on fields they are not allowed on and then intimidate our local children on there way to school.
- I do not!! want travellers within the area of broadfield.
- I also think it will have a detrimental effect on the new housing being built around the corner. No-one will want to buy a house next to a gypsy site. It will probably have a negative effect on the value of houses in Broadfield.
- As a resident who lives in Broadfield and enjoys walking in Buchan park and the surrounding areas, I feel having a traveller site here would compromise the area.
- Broadfield itself already has enough social problems; these will not be helped by the proposed traveller's site The proposal is for only ten units but as we all saw from what happened at Dales Farm, this is almost impossible to police.
- Because Broadfield Kennels has a wealth of woodland & scouts amenity [illegible], this would most probably be decimated if the site was located here.

- The Broadfield site is not easily accessible & the pedestrian access from Broadfield is unlit & little more than a muddy path. The proposed site is also in an AONB.
- I am a member at Cottesmore and we have already suffered several vandalism acts on fairways and greens on the Broadfield boundary. My fears are that the incident rate will increase with the siting of a traveller park. I also believe that since many new housing estates are placed on flight paths and suffer noise issues then the travellers should not be protected from having to suffer similar nuisance issue.
- Not only will a travellers fixed site at Broadfield Kennels create untold misery for neighbouring areas, and the community but also congestion on the by-pass that runs alongside the proposed site. As travellers have been know to keep to their own rules and not abide by local community (country people's) rules, then I am sure that there will be more homes (caravans) than allowed.
- Broadfield already has enough problems, the last thing needed there is to invite any more.
- Broadfield has enough poverty and introducing travellers will only harm the area more which is a very bad thing on a area which is trying to better itself
- Kennels site is far too isolated from the community. Access on foot is very poor.

Use the site for something else

- That site would be much better used as a family eateries/ public house like what tilgate park has which would bring in business to the area, plus this could have a plus side like Bewbush got rid of the Dorsten and it improved the area get rid of the imperial and turn this into flats and hopefully that would help improve that shopping parade.

Not sure about the permanent element

- Gypsy's are not meant to be permanent. They travel so why a permanent site?
- Traveller sites are by their nature "short stay" for Travellers so they wouldn't want to settle there, I'm assuming this is more a rest stop?

Need to myth bust around this issue

- Given the difficulty when two sites were proposed several years ago, plans must be put in place to inform local residents that such sites are in place throughout the country and cause local people no disturbance.

Other

- I struggle with this concept and understand the argument that is often put regarding this community that they need to retain the ability to roam, however this does feel like having your cake and eating it.
- If this site is picked I will sell up and leave the town of Crawley, never to return.
- Wherever they are put these people should be made to pay rent and Council tax.
- It should be abundantly CLEAR to the gypsy and travellers that THEY are responsible for keeping the sites clean and tidy, and under no circumstances should the cost be borne by the Crawley tax payers
- It's too small in Broadfield.

Langley Green site – people who said NO to the site

No need to make a special case for this group of people

- Gypsies housing needs should be dealt with the same as any other persons. I.e. through housing lists and qualifying to be on them.
- There are many private caravan sites available for those that wish to use caravans I do not see why any section of the community needs special privileges at ratepayers expense.
- They should be made to wait on a housing list like the rest of us and forced to pay their way.
- These are travelling people and do not need fixed sites.
- When Gypsies [your phrase, not mine] contribute ..., then they are eligible, like everyone else to apply for council housing. Why are we providing spaces that could be used as homes, for all?
- I do not agree with providing traveller sites as it is an unacceptable form of positive discrimination the provision and upkeep burden of which falls negatively to those who will never use its facilities.
- Personally I don't think Crawley should have to provide a site for travellers. We are currently struggling to provide space for the people already living in Crawley. If they want to move permanently to Crawley then they can await housing like everyone else.
- Travellers should be just that.. travellers. If they wish to have permanent land entitlement they should integrate into society and get on waiting lists like the rest of the taxpayers have to do. What on earth way will this benefit long term residents of Crawley and there families.
- Travellers should either get a fixed house to live in or become members of the caravan club and use commercial sites such as one next to flight tavern, Gatwick airport and pay to use the site instead of having a site provided by the local council.
- If the G's & T's are in houses why give them sites, and why give them sites in the first place, as their title means that they are travellers.
- Whilst I believe newcomers to the town have rights / needs this should not be at the expense of resident, residents who have rights and needs as well.

- If travellers wish to settle then, like residents they must rent, purchase or seek social housing just like everyone else.
- Gypsies and Travellers are by definition on the move. Why do they want houses to live in when they happen to be in the area? When there are people on waiting list for years.
- This is a national and country wide problem. Crawley has very limited space for housing and must not be required to provide a site. ... Any space we have must be use for Crawley residents not individuals who choose alternative life styles. WSCC should work with Crawley BC to find site (if really needed) I shall be contacting Henry Smith on this subject.
- Do not understand why the need to spend money for the travellers children to have a site when my children who have lived in Crawley all their lives cannot get a council house. Perhaps money should be spent on housing life long Crawley residents and not travellers.
- We should not use council funds to build sites for traveller families children when local families cannot get housing also if they are living in houses they are not travellers.
- Remaining in one place for a period of time allows people from this group to access education and health services, which is often not the case if they are travelling around the country." Then they should buy a house like the rest of us.
- If they are happily settled then why would land need to be set aside. The land would be better used for housing for the many families that need houses now.
- I disagree with the whole concept of providing for people who choose not to pay for traditional homes
- Gypsy / travellers are just that and I have always understood this was their lifestyle choice. If they have a fixed site they will not be 'travellers' anymore, and should therefore be liable for council tax and to adhere to any rules and regulations set out by Crawley Borough Council. I therefore have no suggestions for alternative sites.
- Travellers by definition are people who do not want to stay in one place. Therefore if they do decide to stay in one place they should have to rent/buy a property just like everyone else. The council should not be responsible (using tax payers money) for producing these sites.
- Crawley is an urban area and as such should not be required to house travellers who purport to be countryside dwellers.
- Is they are 'travellers' then they should travel, if they're not travelling then they are not travellers.....
- But why are they called travellers? If they want to settle why don't they buy houses like everyone else if they don't want to TRAVEL??
- Gypsies and travellers should have to buy there own land for development. Anyone that wants to buy there own land has to pay for it, so why shouldn't they.
- With gypsy and Travellers the biggest challenge is to integrate them and create opportunities for them to genuinely participate in the city. Its about urbanizing people not urbanizing land....

- Why do families of Gypsies & Travellers already in Crawley Housing qualify for a site when the offspring of other resident families do not get a chance of housing or mobile sites?
- Why do we need to provide a fixed site for 'travellers'. Either they are travellers or they are not. Why should we provide the best of both worlds for a way of life they chosen. We object most strongly to a fixed traveller's site anywhere in the uk.
- Why should travellers who choose to live in this manner be permitted to have easy access to the city amenities....?
- Why should travellers who choose to live in this manner be permitted to have easy access to the city amenities.....?
- If travellers want to settle in one place they should be housed straight away and not put on a temporary site.
- In your FAQ relating to the proposed Gypsy & Traveller sites you mention a figure of 77. From previous dealings with the Local Council I am lead to believe that there are several thousand waiting on the Council waiting list many have been on the "list"(i use the term loosely) many years. I know of many who were born and bred in Crawley but still have no idea or any likelihood of ever being housed..... Yet the Local Authority (surprise..surprise) are going out of their way to accommodate these 77 individuals at a cost to the local tax payers What is the POINT of local elections?. And what's the POINT of local officials voted into "office" who ignore local opinion and just "cow tow"to the "big wigs"they REALLY SERVE.
- We don't have 'sites' for other ethnic minorities in the town - it is not right. Travellers housing needs should be dealt within the same way as everyone else's - through council housing list.
- If they are in housing let them stay in housing This land could be used for permanent housing. All children want to leave home and travel, but we do not supply a site for them to do so.
- Why not leave the gypsy people that we have in the houses that they have at the moment and the children will move into the community like all other children.
- They should live in houses like everyone else has too. Why should public funds be used for ""special"" provision.

Site not suitable – proximity of Gatwick

- I believe that the site in Langley Green is not suitable as it is close to the airport and could pose a security risk.
- Thirdly the possibility of a second runway at Gatwick would make this site very unsuitable.
- It would be an environmental hazard, and with the proposition of a new runway coming for Gatwick, this will be in very close proximity to any new development in this area.
- It would be an environmental hazard, and with the proposition of a new runway coming for Gatwick, this will be in very close proximity to any new development in this area.

- Too near airport.
- If the Gatwick Airport 2nd runway goes ahead this site will be blighted by noise pollution. Health issues due to kerosene discharge from Aircraft.
- Gatwick Airport - if a second runway is given the go ahead, there will be a dramatic increase in noise pollution and public health issues due to additional kerosene discharge from increased aircraft movements.
- With the possible expansion of Gatwick airport I think the area has enough to deal with.
- With air port expansion in the future this would only be a temporary solution. With air port expansion this would just be an additional burden on the road.
- The location of Broadfield Kennels is a much better option for traveller's suite as it would not impact on any neighbouring community and it would be in Langey Green
- 10 fixed pitches will soon become 100! Plus could be a security risk for the airport

Site not suitable – Noise

- Narrow road.
- Access from the surrounding roads very difficult as they are narrow and parking causes extra problems.
- If they are travellers then they will not make it a permanent home. If families settle then it will not be big enough to accommodate them.
- It is stated that the Langley Green site will be exposed to airport noise.
- Langley Walk is not suitable for the following reasons: noise pollution from airport.
- This area at Langley Walk is a potential site which may be significantly adversely affected by noise levels from Gatwick Airports operations. Gatwick Airport therefore does not consider the site to be an appropriate location for a housing allocation.
- Not to mention the noise and pollution from the airport. If a second runway goes ahead they would be right on the edge of it.
- Sites such as Langley Walk which may be subject to noise issues associated with Gatwick Airport should be avoided.
- Land north of Langley Walk not suitable because of aircraft noise, I live in Langley Walk and we suffer.
- The area is close to the flight path from Gatwick airport and therefore can be noisy at all hours of the day.
- This locality already suffers to a certain extent from noise and air pollution from the adjacent runway at Gatwick Airport. There are proposals, current at the moment, to extend the airport and to provide a further runway in the near future. Given the specific controls on noise pollution, deemed acceptable for caravan dwellers in particular, why is it even being considered appropriate to develop this site for this purpose?
- The possible expansion of the airport is another factor, higher noise levels etc moving closer to the site.
- Airport noise very excessive and can only get worse with possible additional runway at Gatwick.

- I believe the noise from the airport would be an issue for people in a caravan.
- If Gatwick expands area will be blighted by noise which would be particularly bad for people in caravans.
- Also noise levels as mentioned are an issue.
- The northern side of town is already affected by noise from the airport. The proposed site is very close to the airport and if the second runway is built will be even closer. Airport noise is already intrusive living in a house with double glazing and insulation. I would suggest that it would be much more intrusive through the thin walls of a caravan.
- Too near the children's playing field and play ground.
- Both sites are too close to existing houses....
- Since new housing build in infield as well as we'll as temple the traffic as increased tenfold that now you can not leave your windows open at night due. Car noise pollution access to site is restricted and issues already around. Road safety on lane walk
- Noise pollution, already noise levels have increased since the new housing next to temple
- Noise pollution already there has been and unease of traffic noise due to housing next to temple, can not leave windows open at night as traffic noise continuous well into after midnight
- In view of the likely development of Gatwick Airport, the site would suffer from severe noise pollution and the existing tree/natural coverage would be disturbed or removed which would also affect the noise pollution for the existing settled community too.
- This area already suffers from noise pollution from Gatwick Airport....
- I think it interesting that for the Langley Walk site you consider that it may be unsuitable due to noise levels from Gatwick, does that not apply to homes?
- Noise levels/ too close to noise from aeroplanes taking off and landing at Gatwick.
- Too near to airport noise
- The noise from the airport would not be acceptable to caravan dwellers

Site not suitable – poor drainage/ flooding

- The area is prone to flooding.
- This land is NOT suitable, it floods.
- High risk of flooding and there is nice woodlands.
- The area floods and became very boggy
- The area is also known to be affected by flooding.
- The area is also known to be affected by flooding, which potentially has its own risks to consider.
- The adjacent land is too close to the water course so additional development will add to the risk of flooding. A recent development has already exacerbated the risk.
- Possible extra flooding risk.
- The site off Langley Walk is not suitable for fixed pitches for several reasons; this area of land has poor drainage so is very wet in the winter.

- Langley Walk is a flood area, wild deer roam...
- Land is liable to flooding
- Problems at Langley Walk with flooding - this year has been particularly bad.
- Drainage of site very poor making it very wet and boggy and regularly floods.
- Land North of Langley Walk, floods every year and overflows on to road. Strongly against works to be done on this land, since more houses have been built on land in Walnut Lane road floods more to the point footpath and road can not be used.
- The land at Langley Walk is known to flood and is surrounded by oak trees which would possibly have the root systems disturbed if the site was developed.
- Flooding
- Concerns re flooding
- I strongly believe Langley walk is unsuitable; it has a lot of flooding on the site. I live next to it and I feel the stress and the fact that it is right in the middle of us who keep horses etc.
- Gypsies and travellers would be accommodated on land liable to flooding.
- Flooding - there is a high risk of constant flooding in the area. Any new properties or travellers site will increase the runoff for the area and increase the risk of flooding.
- The land often gets boggy when it rains.
- There is a high risk of flooding. Water runoff will be an issue, clean water drains and sewerage would need to be increased.
- Possible flooding.
- It also floods in winter.
- The field floods regularly.
- The land floods terribly there and has done every year for the past 40 years that I recall.

Site not suitable – traffic congestion/ access

- Langley walk is too narrow for added traffic and caravans. Would poles lane be suitable. It has good public transport links into town. The dual carriage could handle the extra traffic, and type of traffic.
- Road is too narrow to deal with extra traffic and large vehicles.
- Access from Langley Walk and surrounding areas - the road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic. Langley Walk is very narrow without pavement on one side. It is totally unsuitable for any heavy traffic to undertake any construction work.
- The road infrastructure is not capable of taking more traffic. Access to the site whilst under construction is unsuitable for heavy vehicles.
- Concerns regarding access to the site, Langley Walk is a cul-de-sac. There have already been electrical power problems in Langley Green due to underground cable burning out, this will only exacerbate the problem.
- Road access for large vehicles in Langley Green Walk, Mulberry Road, Walnut Lane very difficult because of parking in narrow roads, especially at weekend and evenings.

- The access down Langley Walk or through the current housing is poor and so extra traffic is likely to cause issues.
- Access is limited & roads too narrow due to residential proximity.
- Broadfield kennels has greater access for vehicles but Langley Walk is already congested with current resident's vehicles.
- Access is limited
- I would like to object to the proposal to site a permanent Gypsy and Traveller Site here for the following reasons: Langley Walk is a very narrow road, lined with large mature trees and all the approach roads serving this area are basically down to a single track, the majority of the time, due to the high volume of residents cars parked on the roads, throughout the area. There are already major problems experienced at peak travelling times and when service vehicles, repair vans, delivery lorries, etc. need to access the area. To then have to experience the noise, disruption and pollution from the major construction works, as well as the high volume of constructors HG vehicles and plant, necessary to develop the site, over many months, will make life quite intolerable for all the residents in the local area.
- Since finding out about the proposed site in Langley Green on Monday I have spoken to many local residents, many of whom had not even been informed, and we are all in agreement that we are opposed very strongly to the site off Langley Walk. The site itself is situated on a narrow road, very close to neighbouring houses. The road struggles as it is with traffic, especially larger vehicles and an increase in both of these is unacceptable. We have a number of small children that play on the green and obviously the chances of an accident happening could greatly increase.
- Also not right on top of residential area causing problems with the in and out of their vehicles. As they all mostly have 4x4's Lorries and vans. The gradient of the ground is the least of your problems to sort out for them."
- Access to the side would be difficult.
- Road access is a nightmare in the Langley Walk area, having a traveller site there would cause major issues. The issues would not only be isolated in Langley Walk but also the surrounding small roads and lanes
- Langley Walk with the nearby access road are already not safe for vehicle there are permanent obstruction on the road (too many cars parked irresponsible on the verge which the council doesn't care about the constant complaint) Rushetts road has been taken as a short cut by too many driver in the morning is impossible to come out of the driveway just waiting for a fatal accident to happen you have already authorised a bed & breakfast house on the corner without due reason to parking congestion it causes
- Increase in traffic on minor narrow roads.
- Langley walk is a small road that wouldn't cope with the additional traffic.
- The road access is very limited and would not be able to cope, making the area unsafe for children and pedestrians.
- Extra housing and traveller site both accessed via Langley Walk would be too much, one or the other could be ok but would need improvement to Langley Walk (wider), Stafford Road (speed humps or similar) Rushetts Road (widening &/or one side parking)
- The road is too small to carry their lorries and caravans. Will they pay council tax and income tax like the good residents of Langley Green?

- Access to the areas within Langley Green is via very narrow roads.
- The access to this area through Langley Green is very limited.
- Access to Langley Walk is already very congested
- Langley Green access road is too small, and is a very quiet residential area.
- The area around Langley Walk is totally unsuitable for any traveller site or indeed any extra housing. The road infrastructure could not accommodate any more vehicles in particular travellers caravans, trailers etc. It is already congested with vehicles. This site would be suitable for the additional cemetery as it is quite quiet with lots of birds and wildlife, lovely old trees which must be preserved. I think this would be a lovely site for a cemetery.
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- That side of Langley area has already being overdeveloped with the addition of new flats opposite Squirrel Close and those on Rushetts Road near the parade. Besides, the roads in that area are quite narrow with heavy amounts of on the road parking. There is too much congestion and not enough parking as it is without adding the potential of 20 extra vehicles - probably vans.
- Langley Walk is very narrow, and damage has been done to parked cars by large truck & vans! We have horse going up & down at various time of the day to stables located at the end of our road. The public footpath via Langley Walk to Willoughby Fields is used continually by dog walkers, crossing back to footpath in Langley Walk has resulted in near accidents, due to already high traffic volume.
- IF the gypsy and traveller community are requiring a site then Broadfield Kennels would be a better choice as there is better access.
- I strongly disagree with land North of Langley Walk being considered as it is a narrow road too small to be used by large vans & trucks, it is a lane used by horses & dog walkers.
- Road infrastructure is not good.
- This space is totally unsuitable due to the size and access. Langley Walk has parking on one side making it very difficult for two cars to pass. Traveller families need space for their horses, vans and lorries they will need grazing and stabling space which I feel this space cannot provide.
- Extra traffic it will cause Crawley on the whole is not an acceptable place for a traveller site.
- To near Gatwick airport and built up area too congested as it is already not good road access anyway over used road
- There is limited road access to the proposed site in Langley Green with quite narrow roads and considerable road parking which makes access to the site very difficult with large caravans and vehicles.
- Road is very narrow in Langley Walk and so building would be very difficult.
- Also the road access is very narrow and would be very disruptive for the residents and at the moment with only a few cars going down the road it has a great deal of pot holes.
- Langley Lane which is narrow and often only one lane available due to parked cars, would suffer with large 4x4s and double axle caravans plus the pick-ups and lorries that these folk use.

- The area off of Langley Walk is not suitable due to access. The roads around Langley Green are already difficult to navigate due to the number of parked cars. Any increase in the level of traffic would make this harder still.
- Langley Walk access for cars is awful and this would make it worse. If you try and drive a caravan down Walnut Lane, Langley Walk, juniper road or even Stafford Road you will see how tight the roads are. There will be issues with cars being parked and caravans trying to get passed.
- Site unsuitable. Poor access also
- Access problems.
- Cul de Sac not good road for additional traffic.
- Firstly vehicle access must be considered as the road is too narrow to accommodate large vans, caravans, lorries etc (more traffic would make the road more dangerous as it is a quiet road due to being a cul-de-sac at one end and Stafford Road at the other with restricted turning into Langley Walk).
- Langley walk has a very small and busy lane now with limited parking; increased traffic would be of great concern to the safety of cars and children
- Transport another issues. The area is a quiet road and not suitable for caravans
- Issues around access
- Vehicle access currently down Langley Walk is extremely difficult with existing resident's parking and a maze of narrow, winding local roads that lead to this area would not take any additional vehicle / traffic movements and certainly not the size of vehicles regularly associated with travellers' living accommodation and employment (vans/lorries/caravans).
- Access to the Langley Green site will be very congested and inadequate.
- Traffic is another issue and the last time we had Travellers parked, okay unofficially, in Langley Walk we personally had our garden shrubbery used as a toilet and the vegetable garden considered free food.
- There is too much disruption, the road as it is not sufficient for access.
- Langley Walk does not have good access. Fire engines have trouble getting along the road to fires and trapped animals.
- Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night.
- Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night.
- The Consultation Questionnaire is unfairly biased towards the Langley Walk site because it doesn't point out that there are access problems to the site and that it is approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels area as the maps used are to two different scales.
- The Consultation Questionnaire is unfairly biased towards the Langley Walk site because it doesn't point out that there are access problems to the site and that it is approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels area as the maps used are to two different scales.
- Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night.
- Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night.

- The Consultation Questionnaire is unfairly biased towards the Langley Walk site because it doesn't point out that there are access problems to the site and that it is approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels area as the maps used are to two different scales.
- The access to this site is very restricted and recently this area has extra housing built which has added to this problem. The addition of any more traffic will make this extremely dangerous for existing households.
- Langley Walk already has access problems with the road turning into single lane traffic. Any further developments would only add to this current issue.
- Where as the Langley Green option has poor road access the infra structure is too small.
- The Langley green site has poor access.
- Bad access.
- Bad access and only through housing estates.
- The Langley Walk site would be accessed via narrow residential roads which would put an even greater strain on the current road infrastructure.
- Bad access. Middle of housing estate. Do any of the people involved in planning actually live in Langley Green. I can guess the answer to that one.
- Additionally, road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic as currently parking is on one side of each road.
- Additionally, road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic as currently parking is on one side of each road.
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- The local community is across the small road
- The road is too small to turn in
- Langley Walk, and surrounding roads. The road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic. Currently parking is on one side of each road and vehicles make their way in and out to proceed down the road. The passing in the street ensure that the road is single lane.
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Langley Walk, and surrounding roads. The road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic. Currently parking is on one side of each road and vehicles make their way in and out to proceed down the road. The passing in the street ensure that the road is single lane.
- Access to this site is restricted due to width of the Langley walk, also local resident parking takes up some of the road width, if a traveller arrives at the site is there room to turn vehicle and caravan around if the site is full?
- Increase traffic and access to the site is a concern.
- The surround road is very narrow.
- Langley Walk already has parking issues. More housing, etc would add to this congestion.
- Potentially, this could cause an increase in traffic on narrow roads which already suffer at busy times. Also, there is the risk of an increase in noise in a quiet residential area.....
- Access via Langley Walk is limited with the road being narrow.
- Langley Walk is a narrow road and should not be developed further.

- Langley walk is essentially a one lane road because of all the parked cars and caravans would be too large to go down it.
- Junction of mulberry road and Langley walk already busy as used as a cut through.
- Road is difficult as it is, and when we had travellers in Cherry lane they completely spoiled our fields
- Access in Langley Walk is limited, including emergency vehicles.
- This area north of Langley Walk would not be good for Gypsy & Travellers, they need better access and more space
-foresee a definite problem with access and travel. Langley Walk at present has a lovely countryside a peel (the reason many of us residents set up home here) to it. Horse riders, dog walkers, joggers, ramblers and cyclists use our walk daily. With this proposal and the ridiculous housing proposal (why no room to add our thoughts and concerns on your previous page?) our road will become unsightly and unbearable with noise, disturbance & safety concerns regarding the amount of traffic.
- Langley Walk is a quiet area with small, tree lines roads. It is used by horse riders and adding to the traffic and removing trees will dramatically increase the noise levels from increased traffic and from the airport, which is currently blocked by the trees.
- Difficulty accessing site.
- Camp could encroach on farmland/ river - rubbish could cause pollution and devastating effect on wildlife/countryside
- Problem parking and accessing the site.

Site not suitable – pressure on existing facilities/ infrastructure

- There will be a high impact on the local infrastructure due to the increased need and demand for electricity, gas, water, sewage, communications and waste management required to provide for this site.
- The local school is already under pressure and so may not be able to cope with the extra children.
- Capacity at local school. Children from the local area are already being sent to schools across the town. Utilities will have to be provided at Langley Walk.
- If the area were to be used for more families there would not be adequate spaces within the local schools for the traveller children as local children who already live in the area are being refused spaces.
- Infrastructure
- Children would be taking places in local schools and maybe even taking places which other pupils living permanently in the area might be denied as a first choice school.
- In both locations it would also have a big impact on the infrastructure of the area.
- Too close to already well built up area. Existing amenities and infrastructure already under pressure.
- My name is Mr. Kenvin and I strongly object to the planning and development of a gypsy site in Crawley. My family are amongst the original

settlers and have been here for four generations and we have all seen Crawley progress and develop over the years, of which we did not agree with all the changes. The development of this so called gypsy site will be a strain on our resources

- The infrastructure of the area can not support
- The infrastructure can not support.
- Infrastructure would be too costly in Langley walk.
- Infrastructure - an intolerable burden will be placed on the existing community.
- The town is already under heavy pressure from housing developments and added demands on its schools, health and other services, which are already, outreached their capacity against demand.
- CBCs finances have seen some far reaching cuts in last few years. How this extra cost will be met where existing services to the residents are marginalised.
- Children will be allocated spaces in local schools and often do not turn up. They have to stay on roll, taking up spaces so other children on waiting lists can't get in.

Site not suitable – wildlife and environmental concerns

- This is a wonderful place to live. The fields opposite are full of wildlife, foxes, deer, rabbits and many people walk their dogs there....
- This is a quiet, semi-rural area on the edge of Crawley, one of the few remaining 'green' parts of Crawley; it is also undeveloped land outside the building area. We can ill afford to lose our last remaining natural resources, with regard to trees, plant, animal and insect life and other natural habitats, from this town.
- The majority of the local residents have lived here for very many years and chose to move into this area because of its peaceful green nature. It is not acceptable to completely change the ambience of this area for such a small gain.
- This plot of land will back onto an area of land that is known to be a place of natural interest and is an established home to a family of Dear, Foxes and Woodpeckers which I feel would be greatly disturbed by the introduction of more residence.
- Destruction/damage of historic woodland and area of outstanding natural beauty.
- Historic trees
- Concerns re the historic trees
- We need to keep some 'green' areas for: Wildlife habitats, flood protection, areas for recreation for children & families, dog walkers etc. etc. Crawley has already had considerable 'green' areas consumed by new builds and is gradually becoming a concrete jungle.
- The wildlife such as deer, foxes, rabbits, owls, bats would be detrimentally affected. The vegetation is vital for wildlife such as bees and butterflies.
- Also in order to keep the ambience of the area there is a need to keep it the way it is. There has also been a big news issue just recently how British

wildlife is becoming extinct and so this area should be preserved for this reason.

- Langley Green should not be built on due to conservation of the wildlife and green area that has been raised in the press only just recently by Prince Charles.
- The area is very much green land so the proposal is not environmentally friendly.
- Secondly the area is one of natural beauty with a wealth of wildlife including deer, owls, bats, horses, shetland ponies, woodpeckers, nuthatches, gold and green finches.
- This area has nice fields and is not suitable for a gypsy camp. Keep the green areas and develop brownfield sites.
- Besides the lack of services to the site (sewage etc.) the threat to wildlife will be hugely affected as will the cost of replacing valuable and protected oak trees.
- There is also a lot of wildlife, flora and fauna. The abundance of trees shields residents from aircraft noise.
- This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use. This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site.
- This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use.
- This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use.
- This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use.
- Will spoil surrounding countryside and wildlife. caravans will be passing through housing estates at all hours.
- Environment - the area is ancient historic woodland and the surrounding area is also designated as one of outstanding natural beauty.
- The area is ancient woodland and designated as one of outstanding natural beauty and a nature conservation area.
- This is an area of great use. It is safe for the residents to walk around and admire the nature.
- We have deer foxes rabbits all sorts of birds.
- Local wildlife habitat would be destroyed in an area that is known to have a great variety of animal and birds within it also there habitat has already been reduced by some local social housing when walnut road was extended.
- The wildlife habitat would be destroyed and this is right next to the fields which were recently protected as part of the Queens jubilee!
- Both sites I feel, are far too close to residential properties and places of natural habitat
- Both areas have good wildlife and it is not clear there even is a need for a gypsy park.
- It would be a shame to lose all the investment and the natural beauty of the park and area if this proposed idea goes ahead.
- Will spoil the wild life.
- These are areas of countryside that should not have people living there. Buchan already has a problem with young men from this community driving

unlicensed motor vehicles through it, while Langley Green already has its own issues without adding more to the mix.

- This is also a very unattractive tree lined lane and the land is full of wildlife.
- Reasons: flooding, loss of wildlife, threat to mature oaks, poor infrastructure, overload on local amenities.

Site not suitable – negative impact on local community

- Any further building and incorporation of identified fixed Gypsy and Traveller site on only green belt still locally available for neighbourhood recreational and countryside exposure between housing and airport will negatively impact on prices of existing housing in the area and quality of life.
- Langley walk has houses right next to the fence of the planned area. There garden would back onto the gypsy site. The road way is narrow and it is a quiet residential area.
- Living in close proximity to this proposed site, I strongly feel a fixed Gypsy and Traveller site here would negatively impact upon my existing quality of life. During any spare time, my family and I enjoy walks in and around this area which is the only green belt in close proximity to where I live where I can enjoy a little peace and quiet. Parking and infrastructure are already stretched to the maximum in this area
- Too close to existing housing and community that consists of a large number of elderly residents who already find noise and loud youngsters playing in small areas around housing sites stressful.
- Far too close to existing well built up area and housing. Will impact negatively on existing infrastructure and housing prices in nearby vicinity. Security implications are also highlighted.
- Unless the Council is willing to buy houses from residents at market value and relocate people who do not want a site near them none of these should be considered.
- I live in Langley Walk, have worked very hard all my life to buy my house and I am not prepared to have all of that taken away from me. If we have a traveller site across our road we will never feel safe You are going to be putting hardworking, honest people under undue pressure and already the thought of this happening is making me feel stressed and unwell. I bet not one of you that have been involved in this proposal live anywhere near this area and would not in a million years want a traveller site built at the end of your road! If you go ahead with this proposal you are compromising our safety, our health and our financial status. Think how you would feel if you we're to be put in this position.be it in Langley Green or Broadfield. It's not fair; we would all be living in constant fear.
- It has happened here before when travellers were parked nearby for a short time. Our house and car insurance will go up and our houses will decrease in value - this may not be a concern for the council but when you have worked hard all your life to buy your own home it is beyond the pale to have the value slashed by a development such as this. Rest assured that the residents of this area will not let this happen without a fight.

- Langley Walk has equestrian links; people will be less likely to use the stables near there. Residential area very nearby as well. Langley Green is already overcrowded with lots of new homes being built there recently.
- I strongly disagree with any sites for travellers and house prices will fall we are the only people who won't benefit what will they bring to our society?....
- Great just what Crawley needs a travellers site NOT. crime is low in Crawley, with the introduction of these sites I am pretty sure it will rise, you only have to look at the problems at Dale Farm several months back.
- Langley Green has new flats by the parade also new houses at the end of Langley Walk I think putting more people in Langley walk will overpopulate it.
- Close to housing and children's play centre.
- When Travellers have parked up in certain areas they have left lots of rubbish, messed up the area and in some cases have caused damage, which the people of Crawley have had to pay for. So unfortunately they have given themselves a bad name.
- The impact on the value of our homes will most certainly be impacted and who is going to compensate us for that? The community has been working very hard to improve itself and we do not need to add additional influences that could cause more issues.
- Whatever site is chosen it should be secure and kept tidy and clean - as residents we would not want to worry about any unsavoury behaviour.
- We recently moved to Langley Walk in July last year and one of the main reasons for doing so was because of the green land close by. This is not only a lovely place to take a walk with the dog it is also home for an abundance of wild life including deer. I've spent my life savings buying this house with the intention of never moving again in my lifetime. Whether we agree with it or not moving a traveller's site to this location will without doubt affect the price of the property in the area and furthermore will force residents to sell. I have held off airing my view on this matter in order to give me time to get opinions from other residents of Langley walk and surrounding areas and it would appear no one I have spoken to wants this proposal to go ahead.
- Totally unsuitable for Gypsy and Traveller site as this would be right behind our garden as we have been stressed by their presence before we are 76 and 78 years old and have enough problems without them. Also that lane is used by very young children on ponies Further to this all our properties we have fought to buy would become valueless overnight.
- Too close to other housing areas
- Far too close to local residents it is a very small and tight area
- Close to Retirement homes.
- It is also my opinion that the current community spirit would be compromised and the possibility that the current residence properties may be devalued. I feel that this particular proposal to house travellers in this small pocket of land and the costs involved in developing this site would be a misuse of our money.
- Area too near homes ...

- As a resident of Langley Green/Ifield I am getting fed up with everything being put onto our doorstep we are already a very diverse neighbourhood and have our share of facilities i.e. new Mosque, Psychiatric hospital, new Temple The house prices in my area have already fallen and looking online since the travellers site proposal has fallen another 5% are we to be compensated for this? Also if the new expansion for Gatwick goes ahead won't the money spent building this/ putting in amenities, widening roads be for nothing? This area proposed is in the middle of a residential area that will have a huge impact.
- It would ruin one of the only quiet neighbourhoods in Crawley, also just generally having a gypsy site here could cause a lot of problems for local residents. It will be an eye sore and ruin one of the last bits of greenery in the area.
- The standard of the new housing on for example Apple Tree farm site is very poor and has devalued the area considerably. A Gypsy site in Langley Walk would be undesirable for all local residents.
- The great possibility of the disruption and trouble that these sites cause to the local community should not be underestimated, reference the Dale Farm site in Essex.
- Langley Green has in recent years been over developed with new housing within the area with no thought for the infrastructure and roads to sustain it.
- I really feel for these poor residents. Not only that building this near other people's homes will decrease the value of houses. This is a FACT as I know people who have had their house values and have been told with just the consideration of the area they will never get what their house is worth.
- There will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- The reason why I do not wish to have the land north of Langley Walk was as a permanent fixed site for travellers. There will be a community issue
- There will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- Langley Green itself has already had four major builds within the last few years. If you pack residents in too tightly you create problems, social tensions, vandalism and crime rates rise.
- Allowing a permanent site in Langley Green would invite serious problems for the surrounding area & devalue properties on the area, affecting the local shops, schools etc!
- This area of Langley Green is a particularly affluent and quite pretty part of Langley Green. It is common knowledge that gypsy sites have a detrimental effect on people's perceptions of an area, property prices will be reduced and amenities (that are already stretched) will be further impacted.
- Why the hell would you want to do this? Surely there must be better sites. How about Stephenson's Way for a traveller site? Nobody lives next door to that site.
- ...I take my toddler down to the playing fields and play area down on Langley Walk. I can imagine that play park becoming an undesirable place to take your children.

- This suggestion is absolutely wrong, what about those people living directly opposite the site?
- Thinking of placing this site in Langley walk is absurd. This is right in the middle of a community; the land is often used for dog walkers and is right next to cherry lane adventure play ground where children are playing. This would be a disaster for the community.
- Putting the site on the edge of a well built up neighbourhood and community is unrealistic. It's also unfair on people who have worked hard, paid their taxes and council tax, and are buying their property in this area. This will no doubt lower the value of their home when they come to sell.
- In recent years Crawley's reputation has gone down hill and is now rated in the 50 worst towns to live in the country. If a traveller's site is approved then that would be the nail in the coffin. The recent article in the Crawley News states that " the travelling community don't particularly like living close to residential areas as its hassle for them". I have witnessed travellers driving around Langley Green and witnessed their attempts to steal a caravan from a neighbour's driveway. Housing travellers in Langley Green WILL cause problems and conflict and WILL have a very big impact on the housing market not only in Langley Green but also in the surrounding areas.
- Plot too close to houses. Totally unsuitable area
- I understand that a site needs to be found but Langley Green is not the location as it is too close to a residential area. A site outside of Crawley would be the answer.
- This site is not very far from Cherry Lane Playing Fields when in the past there has been serious assaults etc. To build a site for 10 pitches (which I don't doubt will gradually get bigger in the future) should not even to be considered.....
- The location is extremely close to a dense residential area and will have an adverse impact on property resale. What impact does the plans for additional runways at Gatwick have on this site. There would be concern over noise, mess and anti social behaviour - How will the council control this and monitor it to stop the site being expanded by the travellers
- Site too close to existing properties.
- Conflicts of interest with existing residence.
- We have in the past lived near a Gypsy camp site and found that the crime wave went up and the property value went right down.
- I live right on the end of Langley Walk where the site has been suggested which is far too close to my back garden access would be a major problem here and would spoil the residential area, traffic, noise, rubbish would increase,
- This area is not suitable in my opinion because it is directly beside an existing community.
- whether or not individuals feel that this comment is morally correct or not, history shows it to be absolutely true. It would be unfair, dishonest and completely immoral to impose problems on current resident who have made their home in the area.
- Too close to residential properties,
- Gypsy site already tried in Langley Green a few years ago near to recycling centre, the adventure playground was burnt down, horses released from

farm stables and various other anti social acts. We already have to put up with a noisy airport on our doorstep and a strong possibility of a second runway being built close by. It would not stay 10 fixed pitches as over time more will be squeezed in illegally .remember the dale farm experience.

- Unfortunately, I have had to deal with traveller's illegally setting up site near to my home on Broadfield playing fields in the past, and would not support the council in any plans for a permanent traveller's site in Crawley due to the mess, noise & anti-social behaviour that comes with the travellers.
- Property value will also decrease as no one will want to live here.
- North of Langley Walk, despite the incorrect comments on the assessment, is directly attached to the existing settled community - there is no gap as stated.
- Please be aware that this is a significant imposition for the local residents (particularly in Langley Green) and quality of life for all should be a paramount consideration for our elected officials and their officers, this is not just a pin-sticking exercise in a local map, looking for gaps to fill ! Please reconsider carefully.
- There is also lots of housing around here therefore not fair on residents as the housing prices would drop hugely.
- There is one in Brighton close to where I work and it is forever being repaired because the gypsies are constantly vandalising the facilities that are provided. I also know many people that go to fairly great lengths to avoid the surrounding area because of their anti-social behaviour.
- Langley walk is in the middle of a residential area. This would certainly produce a lot of friction between communities and problems of the future need to be avoided.
- Langley Walk is unsuitable because the site would be built in an established neighbourhood where the comings & goings of travellers people would be as difficult for the residents, noise etc its as it would be for the traveller people. The traveller children would suffer because of this restriction of their life style and freedom.
- Depreciation of property value close to traveller's site...
- Langley Green is over crowded, with much street litter and parking problems, making the area run own without exacerbating the problem.
- Very unlikely that a gypsy site would contain only 10 dwellings. This will de-value the properties in the area greatly.
- Langley Walk is for residents not travellers.....
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties.
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties.
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties.
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties.
- There is also the fact that a traveller's site will cause our property prices to decline... we do not need a travellers site in Crawley.
- Also the local residences are much closer and therefore the impact of the site would be greater.

- Many local residences have had planning turned down due to the council wanting to keep the aesthetic look of the area and the street scene. This would obviously have a large impact.
- Local residents have had planning applications refused by the council as they wish to preserve the aesthetic look of the street scene surely a site of this nature is going against their own policy!
- The proposed Langley Green site is too close to permanent residential accommodation where as Broadfield kennels is not.
- Which will elevate any problems associated with these sites. Whilst a site has already been provided for travellers at Cherry Lane in the past and this was abandoned due to numerous problems caused by the travellers in a residential area
- Contrary to the council's own site assessment, I believe, that this proposal is NOT sufficiently separate from a main residential area, unlike the Broadfield Kennels' site.
- This will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- This will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- This will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- This will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- Langley walk is right next to existing housing ...not even a twenty metre gap of open space. In addition it is a lovely area of Langley Green and residents are against the site.
- Too close to residents travellers would prefer more space.
- I strongly oppose the Gypsy and Traveller site being in this location. This is because it will dramatically reduce house prices in the area, as I have a young family I am not in a position to move financially. We have made many improvements to our house and before this became apparent we had no desire to move.....
- I strongly disagree to this site being used. By having it so close to my home, the price of my home would drop significantly. As we have a young family we are not in the position financially to move. We have recently improved our home significantly and were hoping to be living here for the foreseeable future..... i feel my family would have no alternative but to consider moving from the area, although this would be at a considerable loss due to the reduced house price.
- I do not think this will be a suitable site as too close to Residential Area.
- Too near residential housing
- Too near existing housing/ land should be used by people to walk dogs and enjoy the countryside.
- This is a quiet neighbourhood but the people around here are up in arms at your proposal.
- We had the travellers at the rugby club for a long time they were not pleasant couldn't walk the dogs and children couldn't play they left a terrible mess

- Edge of a neighbourhood which could mean a hostile environment for travellers.
- This site is adjacent to established residential housing; the occupants are all too familiar with way of life of the Travellers. To have to endure a Travellers site so close permanently would cause tension and distress.
- Too much mess.
- Too built up around the area. Too residential.
- No because I have experienced gypsy/travellers property near my home and they left a disgusting mess

Don't use our leisure/ recreational space

- Langley walk is used by a lot of people to access cherry lane playing fields and the playing fields at the back of Burlands, a lot of young girls walk down Langley walk to reach their horses that are kept nearby and sometimes they ride or walk them down the lane.
- It is also used for walkers from the disabled community.
- Both of the suggested sites are green fields, we are encouraging our youth to take more exercise and use our green spaces, I don't think many parents would endorse their child playing next to one of these sites?
- The sit in LG is very small used by the public as a recreation area. As it is in Langley green we have no large green spaces for people to carry out recreation activities the other alternative is cherry lane but that has some anti social issues associated with it
- I myself and have difficulty in walking and use this space to undertake my daily exercise,
- The land is also used by tenants as stabling and consideration should be given to them or there. Use rather than a new community moving in and getting preferential treatment.
- Langley green space is compact issues with access to the site. It is also used by public for access
- I personally take my walks through that area; it is already used by tenant as stables
- Open space for us to carry out our recreation activities such as walks
- ... You claim to want open space for the community yet consider Gypsy and Traveller sites to be made on what we have left!!
- With regard to Langley Walk it is very near Cherry Lane where children play football etc parking could be a huge problem, plus dumping of rubbish, there are also horses kept nearby. There is so little greenery around this area it would be unfair to take away what little there is.
- This site is too close to homes. House prices will fall considerably meaning we will be in negative equity making it virtually impossible to ever be able to move.
- If the housing goes ahead I do not believe the houses will sell so readily. They might sell more cheaply but their insurance costs will be higher.
- Langley Land is used to give exercise and pleasure to many.

Alternatives

- How about off the spur road leading to the crematorium - noise would be less and there are trees and near access to open road, as they are travellers I think a site where SmithKline Beecham was would be more suitable as it is more accessible from the main road also Langley Green being one of the oldest estates many people have lived here for years and are very nervous.
- There is a better site by the Mercedes garage on the industrial estate
- We understand that other sites in the town, some in the North East sector have been proposed, in the past, for this purpose, which were eminently more suitable and were selected with the participation of the Gypsy and Traveller community. These sites should be considered again
- We suggest that you look at the large open field next to Virgin's building by Lowfield Heath roundabout as this would be ideal being well away from residential property.
- What about the Forge Wood area?
- Gypsy and Traveller sites have a detrimental impact wherever they are.
- Stephenson way
- There must be other places between Horsham and Crawley where a site could be found that wouldn't cause as much of a problem.
- Site should be provided by Horsham dc as it has a far larger land area to choose from.
- There is land just opposite the M23 Moto service station at Pease Pottage (sometimes used as a car-boot sale area) which could be developed as a Traveller site. There would be little foreseeable access difficulties and disruption to existing residential areas.
- Could alternative sites be provided on the areas in Stephenson Way and on the Industrial Estate?
- My suggestion is to house them in an area that has still to be developed with Crawley's expansion i.e. between Crawley & Horsham and not integrate into an established community which would be asking for problems.
- What about sites on the industrial estate, good road links, no local residents to disturb.
- There are large parts of Manor Royal Business Park unoccupied - is there any space that could be used there for a small site?
- Why not use the old industrial areas e.g. the old Glaxo site or elsewhere away from the ... majority.
- ... look for a suitable site on the industrial sites.
- Would it be better to try and have a site nearer the motorway?
- None of the above. How about other open land in other parts of the town?
- How about Pound Hill area that's was mentioned a few years ago?
- Industrial estate where there is no one to upset!
- Gasholder site, and land on Balcombe Road??
- If a site has to be in Crawley then why not Pound Hill on the green area by the Tavern on the green?
- There are some sites in Manor Royal which are vacant, have all access roads and services which would be much more suitable.

- Manor Royal
- As for alternative sites, I believe that some of the chronically underused areas on the Manor Royal estate are assessed as they would have sufficient size, access to all of the town's amenities and transportation. A change of use would be needed but for the foreseeable future, it is likely that a significant area in that vicinity will be undeveloped.
- Why not situate traveller's site in the new Forge Wood development? People who move into the new neighbourhood would know from the outset that a traveller's site was there, which is better than imposing it on people who never expected it. Also the new roads could be designed in such a way to make access easier for the traveller's often large and heavy vehicles.
- Tricky, nobody wants travellers near them. Suggest more suitable alternatives in Crawley are (<http://www.crawley.gov.uk/pw/web/PUB194160>) map areas ref #9 #3 #4 #5 #6
- If a site must be built how about the industrial estate? There are plenty of empty sites there.
- Why not consider one of the brown sites in or around manor royal, away from residential areas.
- Alternate sites Manor Royal / Stephenson Way.
- A much better option would be to use one of the many sites on the Manor Royal Industrial Estate which have been unused for years. There is good road access and although in an industrial area, noise levels are low. Positioning the site away from housing areas would make for more harmonious relations with the existing residents of Crawley
- An alternative suggestion for the traveller site is Poles Lane or site ref. 5 Stephenson Way or even site ref 14 - Gas holder site"
- The site labelled '5' at Stephenson Way Industrial site, as a housing site, should be considered just as much as these above sites. Gas holder site could also be considered.
- There is more fields nearer to Horsham just before the roundabout have plenty of room for them. Billingham has more land than us. Also Henfield has plenty of land for them? Broadbridge Heath has a field. (There is a good park for them near the Football Stadium in Broadfields!)
- How come there is no proposal for Worth or Pound Hill for these sites? Have they even been considered? I do not think you should be picking these two parts of town it is very discriminating.
- Turners Hill
- Sites 9 and 14 that have previously been dismissed for housing could be considered as possible gypsy/traveller site.
- Maidenbower has a lot more room to accommodate the travelling community as it is more spacious.
- Sites 9 and 14 could be considered for the traveller site as they have been rejected for housing.
- Try putting this site elsewhere, Langley Green seems to be the dumping ground for anything out of the ordinary, surely these sites would be better placed nearer to the main highways.
- Is Horsham ,Copthorne or Crawley Down being considered for traveller sites.

- Place gypsy and traveller sites away from residential areas - there has never been an instance where these sites have a favourable impact. Make some land available in Manor Royal.
- One of the many unused sites on the Manor Royal Industrial Estate would be far more suitable.
- Industrial estate.....
- The old gas holder site ref 14 would be the best place to put the gypsy site.
- Poles should be considered as it away from many people who are likely to reject Buchan and Cherry Lane
- Neither the travelling community nor local residents would wish the site to be in the middle of a residential area so the obvious site would be at Manor Royal or Stephenson Way where the site could be bordered by commercial premises. This may however create constraints on possible housing developments on such sites because a commercial builder may not find development profitable.
- Would not the use of a Brownfield site with existing infrastructure be more suitable?
- How about a pitch nearer to the new housing development between Bewbush and Horsham or maybe up near the old gas works near Tinsley Green or even in Faygate on the land opposite the Holmbush Pub?
- Would not the use of a Brownfield site with existing infrastructure be more suitable?
- Industrial estate. Off A23 Lowfield Heath. Land from old British Legion Club. Same side as Gatwick Manor between car wash and roundabout going towards Gatwick
- Too much is being provided. Give them a smaller space as law allows located at or near the airport.
- Why not use land at Poles Lane for gypsies
- Use Manor Royal site as Travelling Community are free to move about
- Use Manor Royal Site as Travelling Community are free to move about
- Why can't they go near airport?
- Put them near the airport
- Outreach 3 way - vacant land
- Please explain why the gypsy and travellers cannot be housed at Pole Lane site.
- Outside Crawley altogether.
- There are several large vacant sites on the Manor Royal estate that have been unoccupied for a number of years.
- Areas around Gatwick - there are plenty of open fields.

Find an alternative site – away from local community

- No travellers / gypsies should be provided with any land for fixed pitches and if they must it should be as far out of the main town as possible!
- No to traveller and gypsy sites there must be plenty of green space away from residential areas

- Find a large field somewhere away from residential areas if you are determined to accommodate them....
- Whilst there is an appreciation of the legal requirement to provide a site, due to the historical issues with travellers in Crawley it is unfair to consider utilising space immediately adjacent to established residential areas or green areas used and enjoyed by the local community.
- If these sites are needed and I do not see that they are as you say they are already living in houses then they should be away from residential areas.
- Too close to residential area. Should be at Pease Pottage well away from the town.
- Could these sites not be included in a less populated area? Traveller communities and indigenous populations don't mix well and no site near housing areas will be conducive for either communities
- Both areas are too near residential areas. It would be better to provide a fixed site away from the general public and or areas enjoyed by the general public like Buchan Park.
- Broad field already has a high population of deprived families with a reputation to go with it. Buchanan park is a positive area for broad field and is regularly used by families I and my family have been resident in Broadfield for ten years we live near Rathlin road playing field where travellers have set up illegal sites, they have broken into our garage and stolen on three occasions, so whilst I agree they need a permanent site it needs to be away from a residential area, as they have shown little respect for hard working people who want to keep their properties in good condition and to have nice things.
- No where in Crawley should have a permanent site for gypsy traveller sites unless it is well out of the way of housing and business areas? Like in field out of the way of anything that could be surrounding it
- Somewhere not near residential areas. From my experience they cause nothing but aggravation.
- My fear is we will end up with more than the stated 10 pitches and should certainly NOT be anywhere near a residential area.
- ... consider the old areas of the town. Industrial estates and further out of town towards the airport
- Gypsy sites are better erected away from residential areas.
- Preferably you will choose a site away from a residential area.
- Outside of Crawley.
- Gypsies are often accused of anti-social behaviour. To protect them for this any site should be remote from all standard housing. They all have transport so they have access to the services required. Airport noise should not be a consideration for temporary site.
- House them away from residential areas.....
- Traveller sites should not be located within residential areas. Living as a traveller is a choice and whilst their choice is respected, travellers must accept their living spaces on the outskirts of built up cities
- Isn't there also not a consideration to be made for putting traveller's pitches in out of the way areas but adjacent to large residential areas...
- Surely there must be a better site that is more suited away from close communities. I'm afraid these people will not be welcomed here.

- Gypsy & Traveller site should be on the outskirts of Crawley.
- There are a number of issues concerning how these sites operate including the noise and pollution caused by generators. I do not think it is suitable to have a site near existing housing or a country park.
- Gypsy & Travellers sites should not be in close proximity to existing housing.

The proposed site in Broadfield is a better site

- Broadfield kennels is much nearer to the main road, where Langley Walk would be too congested.....
- Broadfield would be most suitable for their needs close to good size main roads, shops schools.
- Broadfield - no knowledge of the local area but there are utilities already available at the kennels. There may still be a problem with the provision of school places.
- You can get a caravan wherever they want to; Buchan park hill proposes no difficulty in this,
- I grew up in Langley walk, my parents live there, it's a narrow road, Broadfield Kennels would be much better space for the gypsy and traveller site.
- Broadfield Kennels is a more suitable space for the traveller site. Langley Walk is a very narrow road.
- The Broadfield site is the most suitable site - I think this site will be less disruptive and unsettling for existing residents.
- The location is currently in use for livestock whereas Broadfield kennels has been access and wouldn't impact on the surrounding area as much
- Past experience indicates there is too often friction between travellers and the immediate community. The kennels site would meet their needs; give access to the town but avoid, or at least minimise any friction.
- Broadfield is a much larger site and would be able to house more people
- Broadfield kennels would be far more suitable as it is on the edge of town
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- Broadfield Kennels is a large space that would be ideal for the Gypsy & Traveller site.
- Broadfield Kennels would be a much better choice. It has much better access.
- The Broadfield Kennels location seems for more suitable. Travellers often move in large vehicles (vans, trucks etc). These would not be easily accommodated in the Langley Walk site, whereas, Broadfield Kennels are located next to a much more suitable road for large vehicles. Broadfield Kennels locations is also better equipped to deal with additional traffic, which would otherwise swamp the single lane road on Langley walk,

- The Broadfield Kennels site would be better as Langley green is already a built up area with many cars and limit access to move up and down roads. A travellers site would add to this. Also from what I understand travellers would not want to live so close to a residential area so Broadfield kennels would a better site.
- Broadfield kennels is a better site as there would be a lot of noise and pollution from the airport. Also as far as I am unaware travellers do not want to live in residential areas. Somewhere out of town would be more suitable.
- Broadfield kennels seems a much better plot as it's more out of the way and will not affect local communities. The land in Langley Walk is often used by locals.
- As you have pointed out above Langley walk is on the edge of the neighbourhood, therefore Broadfield kennels would be a much more appropriate and fair place to put the plot.
- The land in broad field kennels will not disrupt any community or neighbourhood and we can all get on with living.
- Broadfield have a bigger site, more conducive and on the edge of town.
- The Broadfield site is the lesser of the two evils, however this is not ideal.
- Broadfield Kennels is ideal; however access may be a problem. The site now looks desolate and empty with nothing there. I think it is a good idea to make it a space for travellers.
- Broadfield Kennels is a much better site and not right on top of resident's homes access could be accommodated better than Langley Walk
- Broadfield is a larger area and access is easier. Near shops and town.
- Broadfield would be better than Langley Green for a traveller site due to road access.
- Where as the Broadfield suggested site is on the edge of the town. The Langley Walk site is also half the size of the site in Broadfield. Would the Langley Walk site not be on greenbelt land??
- Broadfield Kennels would have little impact on local area.
- They deserve quality of life too. The Buchan site would be perfect.
- Although I believe that neither site is ideal, the Broadfield option would make greater sense once the entrance issues are sorted out as it will have a suitable distance between communities, allowing the travelling community to retain their own identity with suitable access to local amenities.
- I feel the Broadfield site, which is further away from residences would be better.
- Broadfield Kennels has good access and is further away from existing residents.
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site.
- This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site.
- This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site.
- Better infrastructure at Broadfield Kennels
- Broadfield kennels is a bigger site.
- Broadfield kennels if more removed from residents than the Langley Walk site, which is likely to suit gypsy/travellers as well as local residents.

- Out of the two sites under consideration Broadfield kennels is better suited as it has better access. The steep ramp could easily be The other infrastructure is already in place. And there would be minimal impact on the local residents.
- Of the two sites under consideration the Broadfield site has better facilities. The road network is already in place, it is located slightly away from the local residents and it is high up which would mean no flooding.
- Of the two sites, Broadfield Kennels would be best suited to this development as it is a spacious site, with access from main roads and is also in close proximity of schools and shops etc.
- Broadfield Kennels is more conducive, as it is not directly beside existing residential areas.
- Broadfield Kennels is more conducive, as it is not directly beside an existing residential area.
- Broadfield Kennels is more conducive, as it is not directly beside an existing residential area.
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town.
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- Langley walk l'd half the size of Broadfield kennels. Broadfield would be the better option.
- The area identified at Langley Walk is only half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same number of pitches.
- The site at Langley Walk is within an existing community, that at Broadfield Kennels is not, we believe that travellers themselves prefer to be further away from residential properties.
- The Langley Green site is half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site for the same 10 pitches.
- Broadfield Kennels are already derelict.
- The only consideration should be Braodfield Kennels
- If necessary Broadfield Kennels has no neighbours.
- Broadfield Kennels is better as not as close to existing residents. No site at all is preferable.
- Access to the Kennels is better and they are further away from housing.
- Think Broadfield Kennels Would Be Far More Suitable.
- If it is a case of the Town HAVING to provide a site by new government law, then the best area of Crawley I believe, to be at the old Broadfield Kennels

site. This site is the farthest area away from the majority of residents, where they cannot disturb or interfere with anyone.

- The Broadfield site would be less trouble to manage.
- Langley Green site is most (.....) as it is in a residential area etc. Broadfield kennels would be better. Plenty of road and wont affect many people. Main road on their doorstep.

Comments about the proposed site at Broadfield kennels

- 606 people submitted the same response to this aspect of the consultation – please see below

Crawley is not a suitable town to accommodate permanent Gypsy and Travellers site given its central location; fast access to motorway, A23 & A264; and close proximity to Gatwick Airport. This would mean that more Gypsy & Travellers would be attracted to the town than the allocated provision, which would result in illegal placements and increased littering and anti social behavior and traffic. The proposals are for 10 fixed pitches (not caravans) this would go up as families expand.

The Town is already under heavy pressure from housing developments and added demands on its schools, health and other services, which are already, outreached their capacity against demand. CBC's finances have seen some far reaching cuts in last few years. How this extra cost will be met where existing services to the residents are marginalised? Both proposed sites are on green fields; Broadfield Kennels would have adverse effect on wildlife, Bio-diversity, waterways and wider implications on access to and from the site. It is my view that this possibly more contentious issue will distract from the need to make a robust response to the whole of the Planning Strategy itself. CBC forward planning department (FPD) also needs to encourage residents to view documents and make their responses, complaints and views known directly to CBC, their MPs and their CBC Councillors and engage fully in consultations. FPD must ensure that all information needed to do this is made available to the residents through the websites, notice boards and from Councillors and the Office.

- The Broadfield Kennels site idea is appalling. Why would you let these people ruin this land and a public park? The house values in the area would drop considerably, are you going to compensate the home owners?.....
- I strongly disagree with the site planned for travellers at Broadfield kennels. Not only is the site marked on the map not the site previously used by the kennels, but the field area beside it. There is only a rough path leading to the local shops, which is not suitable. I live local to this site and we have on

going problems with illegal motor bikes using the paths and site proposed and feel it will only escalate. This is unfair on the permanent residents.

- There are no safe roads/paths/street lightening at Buchanan kennels. Apart from that Broadfield already has a bad name and I'm sure it would only get worse.
- Broadfield Kennels should not be considered because Broadfield already has a bad reputation and ongoing problems. Also, the schools need to be considered as it could have a detrimental effect on them.
- I am worried if they are to have site Broadfield with mess and rubbish being left. Also Buchman park is loved by every one in the area would they respect and keep these area clean as I walk dogs there
- Lots and lots of people use Broadfield kennels and Buchan park as part of their daily walk its not only a beautiful country park but offers a place for dog walkers to meet and people to walk freely and safely. Having a traveller site will dramatically change the area and the way people feel about Buchan and Broadfield there is no need to ruin such a lovely and important part to the local community.
- It is unlikely only 10 pitches will be on site. The Broadfield kennels does not have suitable access for caravans and it is too close to Buchan Park and the wildlife
- Broadfield has a bad reputation as it is adding a traveller site will just make it worse
- I find the Broadfield Kennels site to be particularly unsuitable due to the potential damage the site would cause the golf club. There are currently enough problems with children from Broadfield roaming around the golf course and on occasion causing serious and long lasting damage. A site of travellers in close proximity will surely only increase our current problems.
- Broafield Kennels - This is not a suitable site as it is to near to Tollgate Hill.
- I think this is not a good idea due the wildlife in the area Buchan Park.
- Broadfield already has a poor reputation (unfounded in my opinion) however to continue with the plan for Broadfield Kennels will only cause this opinion to become lower still.
- I would not feel comfortable going to Buchan park as I do on a daily basis if the kennels site is approved. I also live local and this site concerns me. I would like to know if you will publish if these sites are going to be monitored.
- These areas are already used as recreational ground and dog walking land by Crawley residents. Placing a traveller site on either location will permanently take these areas away from us, yes we have Buchan and Tilgate park but sometimes they are not suitable, I regularly walk my dog on the kennel land due to people walking aggressive dogs off the lead in Buchan park and not being able to control someone else's dog is an issue. I don't have that issue on the kennel land as everyone I come into contact with are great dog owners....
- No way at broadfield kennels!!
- Buchan Park is a place of natural beauty + peace It is an area for nature + conservation.
- Buchan Kennels is not the right place as there is fast road A264 and will make it congested.

- I oppose the proposed plans for the change of Bradfield Kennels. I have quoted Crawley District council, WSCC and Buchan Park website details to highlight the environmental effects/ concerns such a proposal would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and nature and wildlife. Add to this the social economic impact on the local community
- I oppose the proposed plans for the change of Broadfield Kennels. I have quoted Crawley District council, WSCC and Buchan Park website details to highlight the environmental effects/ concerns such a proposal would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and nature and wildlife. Add to this the social economic impact on the local community
- There are enough problems in Broadfield without the addition of a fixed traveller site. We do not understand why travellers would want a fixed site if they are by nature travellers. Wherever they choose as a temporary base they will be given whatever care they require.
- There has already been an attempted to set up a permanent area for travellers but they broke their agreement and caused damage and trouble to the surrounding area. I would move out of Crawley if a permanent site was given to travellers, especially if it was Buchan Park which is very close to my home.
- Broadfield has been working hard to improve its reputation and a traveller's site will undo all the work so far.
- Broadfield kennels should not be used for a gypsy site as the area it surrounds is of natural beauty and a sanctuary for wildlife and fauna . Our precious green spaces are being destroyed ...
- Wherever you put these sites they will disrupt the neighbourhood. Broadfield already has problems with Gypsies & Travellers. They would ruin Buchan Park.

No provision should be made

- No alternative sites to be in the Crawley area
- Out of principle, I cannot agree to provide any land for such use and any money being spent on providing for gypsy and traveller sites. I know there are problems with the existing non-arrangements but site provision will not reduce the problems, they will just change the type of problems and raise costs.
- No site should be allocated from tax payer's money
- If they are already living in houses keep them where they are.
- I don't agree with providing permanent traveller sites unless they are going to make a contribution to the town
- I don't think travellers should be given sites at all
- I don't care what anyone says we do not need any more gypsy sites in Crawley, the surrounding areas already provide enough for the gypsy community. surely if they are travellers should they not be travelling or do they just want to travel out of Gatwick.
- No way, residents would be gutted.

- Because of the havoc and devastation the travellers cause and because of their total lack of respect for the environment and community, we do not want a site in Crawley under any circumstances.....
- Don't want any travellers staying in Crawley
- No gypsy/Traveller site in Crawley.....we are inviting trouble into the town.
- I do not believe that Crawley should designate a permanent site
- Not in Crawley at all!
- Don't make BF and Langley Green any more undesirable than they already are.
- Don't think we should give them land anyway and blight the lives of local people. I am particularly worried about Buchan Park.
- No sites should be offered. They need to be brought into normal housing so they can pay council tax etc. ... The council should not be promoting a travelling lifestyle.Put them in council housing so they can eventually live like the rest of us. Do not encourage their way of life.
- Without a doubt No.
- I would hate to see Gypsy sites in the Crawley area, if this happens Crawley will never be the same again and it will be regretted in the future.....
- I don't agree with any permanent sites being allowed
- None, why are we paying to accommodate them in our town?!
- We shouldn't be providing any fixed gypsy sites in Crawley, this would be tantamount to just giving away council land as a bribery to prevent them camping where they shouldn't
- I do not agree with any land being given to them.
- There shouldn't be a site at all full stop all.....
- A permanent site is not a good idea and personally don't think it will benefit Crawley at all.
- One in a different town, your not going to help the reputation of our town ...
- None
- There should be no permanent fixed gypsy and traveller site located on either of these two areas. Land should not be used in this way and such a development in any area will have an adversely detrimental affect on the local areas and town as a whole.
- No sites should be considered for permanent Gypsy/Traveller sites. Who came up with this outrageous idea? Crawley people have supported the Council over the last 11 years in vigorously maintaining it an encampment free zone.
- Your gypsy, traveller and travelling show people accommodation needs assessment document states that there is no current perceived need, and the graph within that document shows a negative trend of gypsy and travellers setting up illegal camps, therefore there should be no current allocation of land that could be used for bricks and mortar homes.
- There is no need for a Gypsy site in Crawley. They can purchase or rent like anybody else.
- There is just no need for these developments.
- There should not be a permanent gypsy or traveller site.....
- I do not see why there should be any reason to encourage gypsy travellers in and around the Crawley area.

- Having lived in Edenbridge, Kent for many years, I have seen the problems caused by a permanent Gypsy site and therefore feel strongly against this idea for Crawley.
- However, I am of the opinion that we should not provide any permanent facilities for travellers, as they are TRAVELLERS, clue in the title(!)
- We should not have permanent Gypsy & traveller sites
- Do not agree that gypsies and travellers be allocated sites to set up.
- "An absolutely definite no" to even consider a traveller site in Langley Walk. The access is my main concern. This is a small lane with parked cars at all times on one side of the road and lorry and caravan access will almost be impossible.
- I would not like a site in Crawley full stop. I do not wish to have my Council tax spent on Gypsies or travellers.
- I would not be in favour of having a permanent gypsy or traveller site in Crawley.
- I don't agree that any sites should be used for a permanent gypsy and traveller site
- I don't see why there should be a permanent site for gypsies...

Other questions arising

- Will it be paid for by the council or are the travellers going to buy the field? Will fixed permanent sites be paying the same council taxes etc as the rest of the community and who is going to foot the bill for making the area habitable! So many problems have arisen from traveller sites being placed so close to private residential homes, we understand that places have to be found for gypsy and travellers but as a community we feel that there are better suited areas to consider.
- I find it difficult to understand why the future generation of travellers living in Crawley must have a permanent site when many children who were born in Crawley and whose parents have lived here all their lives, have no chance of getting council accommodation in Crawley. My eldest child is 25 years old and as she has worked hard in her chosen career, she is unable to get on the council house waiting list as she is earning. Why should Gypsy/Travellers get priority??
- As an aside, if they have settled in Crawley for more than one generation are they still considered travellers?
- Why is it that the Broadfield site can be developed for gypsies but not for development of homes?
- Hygiene - Will there be a toilet block and will they use it?
- Why has this moved from the Pound Hill area that was mentioned a few years ago to the above sites? Why are CBC always looking at LG and BF? Is it because you feel the people in them areas don't mind? Well we do, it's our homes and lives that will be affected. You have loads of other land that you can put this site at, e.g. In town centre, park area near Tesco's three bridges ..

- I would also like to pose the question 'Have the local Gypsy and Traveller Community been consulted as to the size, location, suitability and accessibility of this site, for their future needs?
- Question is why is there a requirement for a permanent site. My understanding was that there did not want permanent site.
- Broadfield Kennels is a site of last resort. What would happen to the existing kennels. How would Buchan Park be affected - which is not even meant to be in Crawley's borders and is well used by people in Crawley and Horsham.
- Why do we need two sites?
- Why do we need two gypsy and traveller camps? They cost a great deal of money. I am very concerned about Buchan Park...
- Will they pay tax or council tax to provide for the site?

Disagree with the proposed site

- I object very strongly to the notion of building a traveller site at Langley Walk.
- The Langley Green site has very limited access and is half the size of the Broadfield site but both are unsuitable.
- They should not have sites in either Broadfield or Langley Green as these neighbourhoods already have a low image, reflected in house prices, and it would only make them worse.
- Everyone has a right to live their life in their own way, but I can not think of a suitable site within the borough.
- Don't know of any suitable sites in Crawley.

Use land to develop housing for all

- Land should be used to build houses for the residents of Crawley, those who cannot afford private rent or mortgages.
- Crawley doesn't have enough housing for people with links to the town let alone for travellers that are not from the area....
- No land should be made available for Gypsies in Crawley.
- This will be a very bad move to have the sites anywhere in Crawley as we have enough housing problems in the town we should be concentrating on providing living space for young Crawley residents before we talk about providing for outsiders
- As a young Crawley resident I would feel threatened seeing the travellers around the area, I am also concerned about housing for myself over the next few years, we should not provide for them but think of us young (from birth) Crawley residents.
- Don't agree that gypsies/travellers should get priority land for their families when my children won't stand any chance of obtaining council housing even though they are unlikely to be in a position to be able to afford private rents or buying. My mum and I are Crawley born and bred but my children's needs are not being met.

- You state there is little space for more housing then build council housing in these spaces...

Ok with the site if Gypsies and Travellers pay for it

- ...The only way they should be allowed a permanent site is if they pay council rates up front in advance and with regards to utilities they should be issued with a top up key.
- This site should only go ahead if they are going to pay towards the site (council tax), rubbish collecting etc.
- Gypsy (genuine) should be given every opportunity to have a stopping off point during their travels providing they pay for the amenities provided.
- Having permanent sites for gypsy and traveller is a contradiction in terms. However, overall I have no objections to sites being established around Crawley so long as the gypsy and traveller community pay council tax.

Integration

- It's a difficult one we do need to provide suitable sites and if we do so it might help to break the nomadic existence and bring some of the travellers to realise they are part of our society and should conform to those standards..
- If an integration of the gypsy and traveller communities is one of the aims for 2029 more needs to be done about the local's attitudes and awareness of these communities before utilising such nice open spaces. Also more needs to be done to address the Gypsy and Travellers cultural attitudes towards waste etc before permanent pitches are made on such nice areas of land and in such close proximity to local communities.
- Travellers do not wish to live too close to settled community
- Travellers do not integrate with the community.....
- Both these sites will cause too much animosity in an already tense area. And there would be no way of integrating the traveller people effectively
- I cannot understand the need for a site for children of Travellers of the parents are settled in the community. The children, like the parents, should be integrated into the community for stability. Many people have the urge to travel but do not have sites provided for them around the country. It is called taking a holiday. If these people can afford expensive cars and caravans then they can afford permanent housing, for the sake of the children.
- Travellers can be difficult neighbours.

Other

- Well they wouldn't be travellers if they had permanent fixed sites
- The peripheral business/industrial area would afford good vehicle access and suitable transport links into the town centre to utilise local amenities. By definition Travellers would not stay long term so it is unlikely they would be

disadvantaged regarding local community ties. Should they chose to stay in Crawley permanently they might consider settling in a house.

- Security issues
- Not enough space for accommodation.
- Please take a look at the position of the permanent traveller site just off the A12; between Kessingland Village and Lowestoft, Suffolk. It is separate from any other residential areas. Enabling privacy and security to both travellers and residents. I think the residents of Crawley should always be the first and main concern of the council.
- Transport links not good in LG better transport to south of town. Easily noticeable with the amount of buses going into Bewbush and Broadfield Especially from airport
- Personally I feel that the assessment previously carried out is inconsistent when comparing attributes/drawbacks of these 2 sites within the report. This should be reviewed for consistency!
- Neither site is suitable. A criteria that appears not to have been taken in to account is the possibility of illegal extensions to these sites. This has happened at a number of sites during the past, most notably at Dale Farm in Basildon. This possibility should be designed out at the planning stage; fences and banks can easily be removed overnight behind both proposed sites to facilitate illegal occupation. The removal of such trailers sited illegally can be exceedingly expensive to local authorities with legal & policing costs rising to millions of pounds. The only way to prevent this would be to enclose the site with other buildings.
- Re-visit sites previously looked at by the cross party scrutiny panel in 2004/5.
- Travellers should keep on travelling

Langley Green Site – those people who DIDN'T KNOW whether it was a good site or not

Other questions arising

- I know very little about the Gypsy and Traveller community and would prefer to have some idea of what their requirements would be before making a decision on either of these sites.
- To what extent are they a travelling community that want stopping off points for a few days at a time? Or are they looking for a fixed site where they stay for long periods - or permanently?

Comments about the proposed Broadfield site

- Broadfield kennels area should not have gypsies or travellers living permanently there. The pedestrian links into Broadfield are through the area of Broad Wood rise a quite area with residents that take pride in there homes and their community and is the only direct access to Buchan park Cottersmoore school and golf course. This a peacefull area of natural beauty full with wild life. We do not want this in this area, the safety of our

homes and property the welfare of our children and also the value of our properties are at stake

- Please do not consider travellers in Buchanan kennels, they will be too near a heavily populated neighbourhood
- Land at Broadfield Kennels has previously been rejected for development on the grounds that the only access is via the fast lane of the A264, a busy, unlit dual carriageway. The development of the large Kilnwood Vale estate nearby will result in an increase in traffic along this stretch of road. The only pedestrian access is via an unlit, unpaved underpass and a steep, high bank with badly maintained steps. There is no disabled access and nowhere to provide a bus stop. The land is also a designated AONB and is home to a large variety of wildlife. Crawley's Green Spaces Strategy quotes that the council is committed to "recognise the wealth of wildlife in Crawley and try to ensure that these areas are protected and enhanced.
- The steep drop off to the south of the land also makes it an unsuitable choice for a residential plot.
- Concerned Buchan park could be polluted for fishing and conservation area wild life not to mention the number of families on nature walks and dog walking this is a lovely area would be a shame if the area was not looked after.
- Broadfield Kennels site. I do not think that it is suitable for the following reasons
 - It is isolated from the rest of Crawley by a major road.
 - Access is difficult for both pedestrians and wheeled transport.
 - The small site could preclude the provision of permanent supervision of the site.
 - High cost of making the site suitable for occupation.
 - Buchan is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI)
 - Buchan is a Site of Special Scientific Interest. (SSSI)
 - Buchan Country Park has won the Green Flag Award which recognises the best green spaces in the UK.
 - Buchan park is a key part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
 - The park is on the urban fringe so is already under pressure from the growing town's population.
 - Buchan park is recognised as a site of National & scientific importance . It has been entrusted under the care & stewardship of our current Crawley councillors, to preserve this local treasure for future generations. With growing development pressures all over the south east, this site will be of growing importance for future generations. For the current councillors of Crawley to even propose endangering such a site, is an exemplary example of extremely poor, reckless planning at the expense of future generations
 - I do not think that land next to open space such as golf course or forest is suitable for either traveller site or other housing development.
 - Worried about the connection between them and the park and may be the miss use of the park.
 - The site near Broadfield should not be used as a new site for Gypsy & travellers because the wild life that live there will be affected and the travellers will take over our lovely Buchan park and destroy more of our

country side as more travellers will use this location not just 10 fixed pitches as their families are very large.

- Broadfield kennels is not an appropriate site as it is too close to broadfield estate and there are not enough amenities for them, the schools are full up to capacity, The NHS are full to breaking point , the sewage etc are under strain as is the water pressure. The site is too close to the A264 road which is a very busy road, the land they would settle on has no lighting also it has a deep slope almost like a cliff edge, there is no public transport, no pedestrian paths (only a sloped dirt track with no access for wheelchairs or prams, The site proposed would be on the lap of Buchan park where the whole community go to enjoy, plus people as far away as Cornwall and Scotland and further afield visit.. Everybody is worried of the parks future as most people will no longer come to the park..... Broadfield Kennel houses lots of wildlife and wild plants and flowers and also has a protected community of Nightjar birds which are protected by the RSPB. Buchan park and this side of town will soon be bombarded by a new housing estate Kilnmead Vale which will create more activity around this side of town eg. , traffic schooling etc, the gypsy site proposed is also too close to the Cottismore golf club and Cottismore school plus one or two small businesses in the area and also the Scout huts at Pease pottage. Also will mention that more houses are going to be built on the site of the old leisure centre land in Bewbush which is also very close to Buchan park. I am told that permission was turned down in the past for building houses on Broadfield kennel land as it was a ""Beauty spot!!!) Surely about 40 caravans are going to blight the area's beauty anyway,? more so? I think it would be a wonderful idea to give or sell this land to buchan park as it is practically ""Buchan park"" so that this community of Crawley and Sussex and far afield can go on into future generations being able to enjoy a little bit of escapism in a little bit of wild and natural countryside. Also protecting the wildlife that is gradually dying out. .
- Broadfield site could make the travellers feel more isolated from the rest of the community. Is this something they prefer?
- Being on the edge of Buchan Park/Forest - possibility of rubbish being dumped taking in to account gypsy's occupations(s) local residents could also be uneasy
- The permanent travellers' site will have an irreversible, negative impact to Buchan park and should not be built for the following reasons: The land boarding the park proposed as the traveller's site, is an important buffer zone to the nature within the park. Crawley has several areas of derelict land sites (other alternatives), so why use risk an important SNCI/SSSI site.
- Broadfield should not be considered for the following reasons:-
- Broadfield is already an area plagued by crime with minimal police presence. Creating a traveller site will only increase this problem. Statistically areas containing traveller sites have high crime rates.
- Buchan Park is one of very few nice areas of Broadfield. Travellers will not respect this and will abuse it.
- Council tax will increase to maintain their park, which I will end up paying along with other tax payers in the area.
- Many other areas of Crawley have land available for travellers (Ifield, Copthorne, pound hill) why are these areas not being considered? It strikes

me that you are trying to put this problem on already deprived areas because the residents of nicer areas of Crawley will be more likely to complain. Otherwise its a bit of a coincidence that you have chosen Broadfield and Langley Green as choices!

- It's not a suitable site for travellers + gypsies accommodation as the motor way is close by and could be dangerous.... Unfortunately I do not know any alternative sites.
- My company used to have storage at these premises and they are very secluded and away from other people who may right or wrong be intimidated by them (Broadfield Kennels Q10). It looks okay but I don't know the area enough to make a proper comment.
- If what is needed is a stopping off point, then perhaps Broadfield site is more suitable, providing the access can be organised."

Site not suitable – negative impact on community

- Noise, rubbish and potential trouble in a peaceful area.
- Having Gypsy site in the immediate neighbourhood will compromise the houses value and increase house owners home insurance cost.
- One of the ones you don't consider suitable for housing. Gypsies have their own transport, don't need normal access to work etc, and aren't bothered by noise/pollution as they stick their caravans anywhere.so just put them as far away from normal housing and beauty spots as possible.

No provision should be made

- There should not be any allocated site for travellers in Crawley!

The proposed site in Broadfield is a better site

- I previously thought that the Broadfield site would be a good option, especially as it quite far from residential areas
- The 'old kennel' site would be perfect if we are required to give them anything at all

Find an alternative site – away from local community

- Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be anyway near residential areas.

Both sites have their problems

- I think there should be a space but don't know which would be best as both have issues (access and noise)

Use land for housing

- Langley Walk site might be more suitable for housing - has this been considered as a possibility?

Other

The West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service have a responsibility under the Fire Services Act to accommodate any future development and the current and future strategies will be designed to manage the risk appropriately

Appendix B2 - Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Comments made regarding the proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites at Langley Walk and Broadfield Kennels.

Broadfield site – people who said YES

Langley Walk not suitable

- The Langley Green site has poor access, the land floods as do the drains and sewage as they are already running at capacity. Local residents have had planning applications refused by the council as they wish to preserve the aesthetic look of the street scene surely a site of this nature is going against their own policy! The wildlife habitat would be destroyed and this is right next to the fields which were recently protected as part of the Queen's Jubilee!
- Land north of Langley Walk not suitable because of aircraft noise, I live in Langley Walk and we suffer. How about off the spur road leading to the crematorium noise would be less and there are trees and near access to open road, as they are travellers.
- The site off Langley Walk is not suitable for fixed pitches for several reasons; this area of land has poor drainage so is very wet in the winter. The access down Langley Walk or through the current housing is poor and so extra traffic is likely to cause issues. The local school is already under pressure and so may not be able to cope with the extra children. The area is close to the flightpath from Gatwick airport and therefore can be noisy at all hours of the day.
- If a traveller site is situated at the end of Langley Walk It has happened here before when travellers were parked nearby for a short time. Our house and car insurance will go up and our houses will decrease in value - this may not be a concern for the council but when you have worked hard all your life to buy your own home it is beyond the pale to have the value slashed by a development such as this. Rest assured that the residents of this area will not let this happen without a fight.
- Langley Walk is a flood area, wild deer roam, and access is limited & roads too narrow due to residential proximity.
- Broadfield kennels has greater access for vehicles but Langley Walk is already congested with current residents' vehicles.
- Langley Walk has equestrian links; people will be less likely to use the stables near there. Residential area very nearby as well. Langley Green is already overcrowded with lots of new homes being built there recently.
- Langley Green has new flats by the parade also new houses at the end of Langley Walk. I think putting more people in Langley Walk will overpopulate it.
- Also Langley Green being one of the oldest estates many people have lived here for years and are very nervous of this happening.

- Road access for large vehicles in Langley Green Walk, Mulberry Road, Walnut Lane very difficult because of parking in narrow roads, especially at weekend and evenings. Airport noise very excessive and can only get worse with possible additional runway at Gatwick. Drainage of site very poor making it very wet and boggy and regularly floods.
- Road access is a nightmare in the Langley Walk area, having a traveller site there would cause major issues. The issues would not only be isolated in Langley Walk but also the surrounding small roads and lanes
- Langley walk is a small road that wouldn't cope with the additional traffic. The location is currently in use for livestock whereas Broadfield kennels has been access and wouldn't impact on the surrounding area as much
- extra housing and Traveller site both accessed via Langley walk would be too much, one or the other could be ok but would need improvement to Langley walk (wider), Stafford Road (speed humps or similar) Rushetts Road (widening &/or one side parking)
- Too close to other housing areas
- The land at Langley Walk is known to flood and is surrounded by oak trees which would possibly have the root systems disturbed if the site was developed. I believe the noise from the airport would be an issue for people in a caravan. The road access is very limited and would not be able to cope, making the area unsafe for children and pedestrians. If the area were to be used for more families there would not be adequate spaces within the local schools for the traveller children as local children who already live in the area are being refused spaces. This plot of lands will back onto an area of land that is known to be a place of natural interest and is an established home to a family of Deer, Foxes and Woodpeckers which I feel would be greatly disturbed by the introduction of more residence. It is also my opinion that the current community spirit would be compromised and the possibility that the current residence properties may be devalued. I feel that this particular proposal to house travellers in this small pocket of land and the costs involved in developing this site would be a miss use of our money.
- Totally unsuitable for Gypsy and Traveller site as this would be right behind our garden as we have been stressed by their presence before we are 76 and 78 years old and have enough problems without them. Also that lane is used by very young children on ponies and Gypsies always have aggressive dogs and if they chase the ponies young children or any rider could be thrown and seriously injured or worse. We would feel threaten by their presence as will all our neighbours. Further to this all our properties we have fought to buy would become valueless overnight.
- Increase in traffic on minor narrow roads, close to Retirement homes, destruction/damage of historic woodland and area of outstanding natural beauty. Possible extra flooding risk. If Gatwick expands area will be blighted by noise which would be particularly bad for people in caravans.
- Far too close to local residents it is a very small and tight area
- Langley walk is used by a lot of people to access cherry lane playing fields and the playing fields at the back of Burlands, a lot of young girls walk down Langley walk to reach their horses that are kept nearby and sometimes they ride or walk them down the lane.

- The area around Langley Walk is totally unsuitable for any traveller site or indeed any extra housing. The road infrastructure could not accommodate any more vehicles in particular travellers caravans, trailers etc. It is already congested with vehicles. This site would be suitable for the additional cemetery as it is quite quiet with lots of birds and wildlife, lovely old trees which must be preserved. I think this would be a lovely site for a cemetery.
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- The reason why I do not wish to have the land north of Langley Walk was as a permanent fixed site for travellers
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- I do not wish to have a traveller's site on the North end of Langley Walk because:
 - The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
 - I strongly believe Langley walk is unsuitable; it has a lot of flooding on the site. I live next to it and I feel the stress and the fact that it is right in the middle of we who keep horses etc.
 - Allowing a permanent site in Langley Green would invite serious problems for the surrounding area & devalue properties on the area, affecting the local shop, schools etc!
 - Langley Walk is very narrow; damage has been done to parked cars by large truck & vans! We have horse going up & down at various time of the day to stables located at the end of our road. The public footpath via Langley Walk to Willoughby Fields is used continually by dog walkers, crossing back to footpath in Langley Walk have resulted in near accidents, due to already high traffic volume.
 - I strongly disagree with land North of Langley Walk being considered as it is a narrow road too small to be used by large vans & trucks, it is a lane used by horses & dog walkers. It is also used for walkers from the disabled community. The wildlife such as deer, foxes, rabbits, owls, bats would be detrimentally affected. The vegetation is vital for wildlife such as bees and butterflies.
 - Gypsies and travellers would be accommodated on land liable to flooding. Road infrastructure is not good. Plot too close to houses. Totally unsuitable area
 - This space is totally unsuitable due to the size and access. Langley Walk has parking on one side making it very difficult for two cars to pass. Traveller families need space for their horses, vans and lorries they will need grazing and stabling space which I feel this space cannot provide.
 - Thinking of placing this site in Langley walk is absurd. This is right in the middle of a community; the land is often used for dog walkers and is right next to cherry lane adventure play ground where children are playing. This would be a disaster for the community.
 - Putting the site on the edge of a well built up neighbourhood and community is unrealistic. It's also unfair on people who have worked hard, paid their taxes and council tax, and are buying their property in this area. This will no doubt lower the value of their home when they come to sell.

- The dogs will not be distracted, the tenants of Langley Green will. How anyone even thought up this idea is beyond me!
- Road is very narrow in Langley Walk and so building would be very difficult. Also in order to keep the ambience of the area there is a need to keep it the way it is. There has also been a big news issue just recently how British wildlife is becoming extinct and so this area should be preserved for this reason.
- Langley Green should not be built on due to conservation of the wildlife and green area that has been raised in the press only just recently by Prince Charles. Also the road access is very narrow and would be very disruptive for the residents and at the moment with only a few cars going down the road it has a great deal of pot holes.
- Broadfield Kennels would have little impact on local area but Langley Lane which is narrow and often only one lane available due to parked cars, would suffer with large 4x4s and double axle caravans plus the pick-ups and lorries that these folk use.
- The area off of Langley Walk is not suitable due to access. The roads around Langley Green are already difficult to navigate due to the number of parked cars. Any increase in the level of traffic would make this harder still.
- The northern side of town is already affected by noise from the airport. The proposed site is very close to the airport and if the second runway is built will be even closer. Airport noise is already intrusive living in a house with double glazing and insulation. I would suggest that it would be much more intrusive through the thin walls of a caravan.
- As a resident of Langley Walk this site is almost opposite my house. Firstly vehicle access must be considered as the road is too narrow to accommodate large vans, caravans, lorries etc (more traffic would make the road more dangerous as it is a quiet road due to being a cul-de-sac at one end and Stafford Road at the other with restricted turning into Langley Walk). Secondly the area is one of natural beauty with a wealth of wildlife including deer, owls, bats, horses, Shetland ponies, woodpeckers, nuthatches, gold and green finches. Thirdly the possibility of a second runway at Gatwick would make this site very unsuitable.
- I live right on the end of Langley Walk where the site has been suggested which is far too close to my back garden access would be a major problem here and would spoil the residential area, traffic, noise, rubbish would increase.
- Langley Walk access for cars is awful and this would make it worse. If you try and drive a caravan down Walnut lane, Langley Walk, juniper road or even Stafford road you will see how tight the roads are. There will be issues with cars being parked and caravans trying to get passed. Would it be better to try and have a site nearer the motorway?
- This area north of Langley Walk would not be good for Gypsy & Travellers; they need better access and more space
- Langley Walk is a quiet area with small, tree lined roads. It is used by horse riders and adding to the traffic and removing trees will dramatically increase the noise levels from increased traffic and from the airport, which is currently blocked by the trees.

- Access in Langley Walk is limited, including emergency vehicles. If the housing goes ahead I do not believe the houses will sell so readily.. They might sell more cheaply but their insurance costs will be higher.
- Langley walk is too narrow for added traffic and caravans. With air port expansion in the future this would only be a temporary solution. With air port expansion this would just be an additional burden on the road. Would poles lane be suitable? It has good public transport links into town. The dual carriage could handle the extra traffic, and type of traffic.
- Langley Walk and surrounding roads. The road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic. Currently parking is on one side of each road and vehicles make their way in and out to proceed down the road. The passing in the street ensure that the road is single lane. The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- Langley Walk and surrounding roads. The road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic. Currently parking is on one side of each road and vehicles make their way in and out to proceed down the road. The passing in the street ensure that the road is single lane. The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties. Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night. This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use. This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site. The Consultation Questionnaire is unfairly biased towards the Langley Walk site because it doesn't point out that there are access problems to the site and that it is approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels area as the maps used are to two different scales.
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties. Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night. This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use. This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site. The Consultation Questionnaire is unfairly biased towards the Langley Walk site because it doesn't point out that there are access problems to the site and that it is approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels area as the maps used are to two different scales.
- Langley Green space is compact issues with access to the site. It is also used by public for access.
- I personally take my walks through that area, it is already used by tenant as stables. Since new housing build in infield as well as we'll as temple the traffic as increased tenfold hat now you can not leave your windows open at night due. Car noise pollution access to site is restricted and issues already around. Road safety on lane walk
- Langley walk has a very small and busy lane now with limited parking , increased traffic would be of grate concern to the safety of cars and children
- The sit in LG is very small used by the public as a recreation area. As it is in Langley green we have no large green spaces for people to carry out

recreation activities the other alternative is cherry lane but that has some anti social issues associated with it

- I myself and have difficulty in walking and use this space to undertake my daily exercise,
- "North of Langley Walk, despite the incorrect comments on the assessment, is directly attached to the existing settled community - there is no gap as stated. The adjacent land is too close to the water course so additional development will add to the risk of flooding. A recent development has already exacerbated the risk. In view of the likely development of Gatwick Airport, the site would suffer from severe noise pollution and the existing tree/natural coverage would be disturbed or removed which would also affect the noise pollution for the existing settled community too. Vehicle access currently down Langley Walk is extremely difficult with existing resident's parking and a maze of narrow, winding local roads that lead to this area would not take any additional vehicle / traffic movements and certainly not the size of vehicles regularly associated with travellers' living accommodation and employment (vans/lorries/caravans).
- With reference to the planned housing estate in Langley Walk I am opposed to this development for the same reasons as above. Flooding has happened at this end of the road, the road is narrow, wildlife is abundant and increase in traffic would make the road more dangerous."
- Broadfield kennels is much nearer to the main road, where Langley Walk would be too congested. Young girls would be at risk when riding/walking their horses/ponies. Not to mention the noise and pollution from the airport. If a second runway goes ahead they would be right on the edge of it.
- Langley walk is in the middle of a residential area. This would certainly produce a lot of friction between communities and problems of the future need to be avoided. Why not consider one of the brown sites in or around manor royal, away from residential areas. Access to the Langley Green site will be very congested and inadequate.
- Langley Walk is unsuitable because the site would be built in an established neighbourhood where the comings & goings of travellers people would be as difficult for the residents, noise etc its as it would be for the traveller people. The traveller children would suffer because of this restriction of their life style and freedom.
- Langley Walk is for residence not travellers. I believe that it will bring crime to the area and as a Burlands residence I would not feel safe if travellers were living just across the way from me. There is too much disruption, the road as it is not sufficient for access and I feel the Broadfield site, which is further away from residences would be better.
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties. Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night. This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional housing/caravan use. This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site.
- Langley Walk should not be considered as it is too close to existing properties. Access roads are narrow and residential, with blind corners and many junctions, where cars parked day and night. This area is part of the Crawley 'Greenway' and as such should not be used for any additional

housing/caravan use. This site is also approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site. The Consultation Questionnaire is unfairly biased towards the Langley Walk site because it doesn't point out that there are access problems to the site and that it is approx half the size of the Broadfield Kennels area as the maps used are to two different scales.

- Access to this site is restricted due to width of the Langley walk, also local resident parking takes up some of the road width, if a traveller arrives at the site is there room to turn vehicle and caravan around if the site is full?
- Langley walk is half the size of Broadfield kennels. Broadfield would be the better option. Increase traffic and access to the site is a concern. Too close to residents travellers would prefer more space. Infrastructure would be too costly in Langley walk. High risk of flooding and there is nice woodlands.
- Langley Land is used to give exercise and pleasure to many. It also floods in winter.
- An absolutely definite no to even consider a traveller site in Langley Walk. The access is my main concern. This is a small lane with parked cars at all times on one side of the road and lorry and caravan access will almost be impossible. and the land floods terrible there and has done every year for the past 40 years that i recall. This is also a very unattractive free lined lane and the land is full of wildlife.
- Langley Walk is not suitable for the following reasons: noise pollution from airport, narrow road, edge of a neighbourhood which could mean a hostile environment for travellers and possible flooding.
- The noise level from Gatwick is a problem in land north of Langley Walk. This would be more of a problem for travellers in caravans. Broadfield Kennels would be better - less noise. The land north of Langley Walk has a lot of wildlife that should not be disturbed, this is also a wetland.
- I believe that the site in Langley Green is not suitable as it is close to the airport and could pose a security risk. The area is very much green land so the proposal is not environmentally friendly.
- Langley Walk already has access problems with the road turning into single lane traffic. Any further developments would only add to this current issue. Langley Walk is already prone to flooding and water run off which would make it unsuitable for developments.
- Where as the Langley Green option has poor road access the infra structure is too small. The land is known to flood and the drainage system currently needs regular works as it is currently working over capacity. Also the local residences are much closer and therefore the impact of the site would be greater. local wildlife habitat would be destroyed in an area that is known to have a great variety of animal and birds within it also there habitat has already been reduced by some local social housing when walnut road was extended. Many local residence have had planning turned down due to the council wanting to keep the aesthetic look of the area and the street scene. This would obviously have a large impact.
- The noise from the airport would not be acceptable to caravan dwellers - the field floods regularly and access from the surrounding roads very difficult as they are narrow and parking causes extra problems.
- Please be aware that this is a significant imposition for the local residents (particularly in Langley Green) and quality of life for all should be a

paramount consideration for our elected officials and their officers, this is not just a pin-sticking exercise in a local map, looking for gaps to fill ! Please reconsider carefully."

Site unsuitable – negative impact on community

- Whatever site is chosen it should be secure and kept tidy and clean - as residents we would not want to worry about any unsavoury behaviour.
- Why do we need to do this unless they are monitored closely,
- Conflicts of interest with existing residence.
- Site too close to existing properties.
- Access problems.
- Too near the children's playing field and play ground.
- Too close to residential properties, Cul de Sac not good road for additional traffic.
- The land is also used by tenants as stabling and consideration should be given to them or there. Use rather than a new community moving in and getting preferential treatment.
- Transport another issues. The area is a quiet road and not suitable for caravans
- Noise pollution, already noise levels have increased since the new housing next to temple
- Issues around access
- Noise pollution already there has been and unease of traffic noise due to housing next to temple, can not leave windows open at night as traffic noise continuous well into after midnight
- Open space for us to carry out our recreation activities such as walks "
- The infrastructure of the area can not support
- The area identified for the site in Langley Walk is approximately half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same 10 x fixed pitches
- This will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- This will be a community issue
- Concerns regarding access to the site
- Concerns regarding rubbish accumulation
- The local community is across the small road
- The road is too small to turn in
- The infrastructure can not support
- Traffic is another issue and the last time we had Travellers parked, okay unofficially, in Langley Walk we personally had our garden shrubbery used as a toilet and the vegetable garden considered free food.
- Which will elevate any problems associated with these sites. Whilst a site has already been provided for travellers at Cherry Lane in the past and this was abandoned due to numerous problems caused by the travellers in a residential area "

- Additionally, road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic as currently parking is on one side of each road. The area is also known to be affected by flooding.
- Road is too narrow to deal with extra traffic and large vehicles. The land often gets boggy when it rains. If travellers want to settle in one place they should be housed straight away and not put on a temporary site. With the possible expansion of Gatwick airport I think the area has enough to deal with.
- Difficulty accessing site/ Camp could encroach on farmland/ river - rubbish could cause pollution and devastating effect on wildlife/countryside
- Too near residential housing/noise levels/ too close to noise from aeroplanes taking off and landing at Gatwick.
- Travellers can be difficult neighbours.

Broadfield is the better site

- Broadfield would be most suitable for their needs close to good size main roads, shops schools
- You can get a caravan wherever they want to, Buchan park hill proposes no difficulty in this,
- I grew up in Langley walk, my parents live there, it's a narrow road, Broadfield Kennels would be much better space for the gypsy and traveller site.
- Broadfield Kennels is a more suitable space for the traveller site. Langley Walk is a very narrow road.
- The Broadfield site is the most suitable site - I think this site will be less disruptive and unsettling for existing residents. Whilst I believe newcomers to the town have rights / needs this should not be at the expense of resident, residents who have rights and needs as well.
- Past experience indicates there is too often friction between travellers and the immediate community. The kennels site would meet their needs, give access to the town but avoid, or at least minimise any friction. If travellers wish to settle then, like their residents they must rent, purchase or seek social housing just like everyone else.
- Broadfield is a much larger site and would be able to house more people
- Broadfield kennels would be far more suitable as it is on the edge of town.
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- Broadfield Kennels is a large space that would be ideal for the Gypsy & Traveller site.
- Broadfield Kennels would be a much better choice. It has much better access.
- IF the gypsy and traveller community are requiring a site then Broadfield Kennels would be a better choice as there is better access.

- The Broadfield Kennels location seems for more suitable. Travellers often move in large vehicles (vans, trucks etc). These would not be easily accommodated in the Langley Walk site, whereas, Broadfield Kennels are located next to a much more suitable road for large vehicles. Broadfield Kennels locations is also better equipped to deal with additional traffic, which would otherwise swamp the single lane road on Langley walk,
- The Broadfield kennels site would be better as Langley green is already a built up area with many cars and limit access to move up and down roads. A travellers site would add to this. Also from what I understand travellers would not want to live so close to a residential area so Broadfield kennels would a better site.
- Broadfield kennels is a better site as there would be a lot of noise and pollution from the airport. Also as far as i am unaware travellers do not want to live in residential areas. Somewhere out of town would be more suitable.
- Broadfield kennels seems a much better plot as its more out of the way and will not affect local communities. The land in Langley walk is often used by locals.
- As you have pointed out above Langley walk is on the edge of the neighbourhood, therefore Broadfield kennels would be a much more appropriate and fair place to put the plot.
- The land in broad field kennels will not disrupt any community or neighbourhood and we can all get on with living.
- To near Gatwick airport and built up area too congested as it is already not good road access anyway over used road
- Broadfield is a larger area and access is easier. Near Shops and town.
- The land at Broadfield Kennels would be ok, but the access on to the A264 needs to be sorted, we are in need of a Gypsy/ Traveller site, however, what must be assured is that you cannot put both parties on the same site!! I have absolutely no problem with where the sites will be, it is not going to be easy to get these sites included as the racist element in town will be out in force, personally I also expect more racism for those Gypsies / Travellers all ready living within the settled community from the ill informed. As already happens.
- Broadfield have a bigger site, more conducive and on the edge of town.
- Broadfield Kennels is ideal; however access may be a problem. The site now looks desolate and empty with nothing there. I think it is a good idea to make it a space for travellers.
- Broadfield Kennels is a much better site and not right on top of resident's homes access could be accommodated better than Langley Walk
- Broadfield would be better than Langley Green for a traveller site due to road access.
- Although I believe that neither site is ideal, the Broadfield option would make greater sense once the entrance issues are sorted out as it will have a suitable distance between communities, allowing the travelling community to retain their own identity with suitable access to local amenities.
- I previously thought that the Broadfield site would be a good option, especially as it quite far from residential areas
- Broadfield Kennels has good access and is further away from existing residents.

- Langley Walk does not have good access. Fire engines have trouble getting along the road to fires and trapped animals. There is also a lot of wildlife, flora and fauna. The abundance of trees shield residents from aircraft noise.
- Contrary to the council's own site assessment, I believe, that this proposal is NOT sufficiently separate from a main residential area, unlike the Broadfield Kennels' site. The Langley Walk site would be accessed via narrow residential roads which would put an even greater strain on the current road infrastructure. Of the two sites, Broadfield Kennels is more conducive, as it is not directly beside existing residential areas.
- Broadfield Kennels is more conducive, as it is not directly beside an existing residential area. Additionally, road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic as currently parking is on one side of each road. The area is also known to be affected by flooding, which potentially has its own risks to consider.
- The proposed Langley Green site is too close to permanent residential accommodation where as Broadfield kennels is not.
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town. The only consideration should be Broadfield Kennels
- Broadfield Kennels are already derelict.
- If necessary Broadfield kennels has no neighbours.
- Broadfield Kennels is better as not as close to existing residents. No site at all is preferable.
- This is a quiet neighbourhood but the people around here are up in arms at your proposal. The Broadfield site would be less trouble to manage.
- The location of Broadfield kennels is a much better option for traveller's site as it would not impact on any neighbouring community and it would be in Langley Green
- 10 fixed pitches will soon become 100! plus could be a security risk for the airport
- If it is a case of the Town HAVING to provide a site by new government law, then the best area of Crawley I believe, to be at the old Broadfield Kennels site. This site is the farthest area away from the majority of residents, where they cannot disturb or interfere with anyone.
- I do not think this Will Be A Suitable Site As To Close To Residential Area . Think broadfield Kennels Would Be Far More Suitable.
- Access to the Kennels is better and they are further away from housing.
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- The Broadfield site is more conducive as it is not directly beside an existing community but on the edge of the town
- Broadfield Kennels is more conducive, as it is not directly beside an existing residential area. Why should travellers who choose to live in this manner be permitted to have easy access to the city amenities, when they pay so little towards its keep?

- Broadfield Kennels would be best suited to this development as it is a spacious site, with access from main roads and is also in close proximity of schools and shops etc.
- The 'old kennel' site would be perfect if we are required to give them anything at all personally they should have to pay all taxes first however from a local point of view this is the least interfering with the residents of Crawley. I would not have them anywhere near my home and most people will agree you will face huge resistance where ever it's decided to put them...
- They deserve quality of life too. The Buchan site would be perfect.
- Better infrastructure at Broadfield Kennels
- Langley Green site is most (.....) as it is in a residential area etc. Broadfield kennels would be better. Plenty of road and wont affect many people. Main road on their doorstep
- Of the two sites under consideration the Broadfield site has better facilities. The road network is already in place, it is located slightly away from the local residents and it is high up which would mean no flooding.
- Broadfield kennels is a bigger site.
- Broadfield kennels is more removed from residents than the Langley Walk site, which is likely to suit gypsy/travellers as well as local residents.
- Out of the two sites under consideration Broadfield kennels is better suited as it has better access. The steep ramp could easily be The other infrastructure is already in place. And there would be minimal impact on the local residence.
- Transport links not good in LG better transport to south of town. Easily noticeable with the amount of buses going into to Bewbush and Broadfield especially from airport

Find an alternative site – away from local community

- These sites have to be located away from the centre of town as the noise and rubbish these sites produce would reflect badly on the town.
- Gypsy sites are not generally popular with residents (hence all the grass banks and yellow gates) so any site should be as far away as possible so as to avoid conflict.
- Also not right on top of residential area causing problems with the in and out of their vehicles. As they all mostly have 4x4's lorries and vans. The gradient of the ground is the least of your problems to sort out for them.
- There is a legal obligation to provide such sites, so identifying locations that have minimal impact on the rest of the neighbourhood makes good sense.
- Consulting with the travellers on sites they would be happy with, and somewhere that could be expanded. Perhaps putting the sites near existing neighbourhoods would cause conflict.
- Gypsy sites are better erected away from residential areas.
- Too built up around the area. Too residential.
- Gypsy & Traveller site should be on the outskirts of Crawley.
- Gypsy & Travellers sites should not be in close proximity to existing housing.

- Traveller sites should not be located within residential areas. Living as a traveller is a choice and whilst their choice is respected, travellers must accept their living spaces on the outskirts of built up cities or pay the normal grading of Council Tax as those residents in the residential areas.
- Positioning the site away from housing areas would make for more harmonious relations with the existing residents of Crawley

Alternative sites

- There is a better site by the Mercedes garage on the industrial estate.
- Unused land near Manor Royal and around Gatwick Airport, giving privacy to the traveller community.
- I think a site where Smithkline Beecham was would be more suitable as it is more accessible from the main road.
- Reclaimed industrial sites, i.e. around Three Bridges Station, etc.
- We suggest that you look at the large open field next to Virgin's building by Lowfield Heath roundabout as this would be ideal being well away from residential property.
- Could alternative sites be provided on the areas in Stephenson Way and on the Industrial Estate?
- There are some sites in Manor Royal which are vacant, have all access roads and services which would be much more suitable.
- Gasholder site, and land on Balcombe Road??
- What about sites on the industrial estate, good road links, no local residents to disturb.
- The area to the south of K2 where it was muted that a new hospital could go. It seems unlikely that we will get a new hospital
- Manor Royal
- A There is more fields nearer to Horsham just before the roundabout have plenty of room for them. Billinghamurst has more land than us. Also Henfield has plenty of land for them? Broadbridge Heath has a field. (There is a good park for them near the Football Stadium in Broadfields!)
- much better option would be to use one of the many sites on the Manor Royal Industrial Estate which have been unused for years. There is good road access and although in an industrial area, noise levels are low.
- An alternative suggestion for the traveller site is Poles Lane or site ref. 5 Stephenson Way or even site ref 14 - Gas holder site.
- As for alternative sites, I believe that some of the chronically underused areas on the Manor Royal estate are assessed as they would have sufficient size, access to all of the town's amenities and transportation. A change of use would be needed but for the foreseeable future, it is likely that a significant area in that vicinity will be undeveloped.
- Sites 9 and 14 that have previously been dismissed for housing could be considered as possible gypsy/traveller site.
- Sites 9 and 14 could be considered for the traveller site as they have been rejected for housing.
- Use Manor Royal site as Travelling Community are free to move about
- Use Manor Royal Site as Travelling Community are free to move about

- Outreach 3 way - vacant land
- Areas around Gatwick - there are plenty of open fields.
- The old gas holder site ref 14 would be the best place to put the gypsy site.
- One of the many unused sites on the Manor Royal Industrial Estate would be far more suitable.

No need to make a special case for this group of people

- I struggle with this concept and understand the argument that is often put regarding this community that they need to retain the ability to roam, however this does feel like having your cake and eating it.
- Gypsy and traveller sites should be away from housing estates.

Views from Gypsies and Travellers

- I feel that a permanent gypsy site should be built in Crawley area because communities clash and beliefs get in view of people. (I.e. open family cooking complaint because of noise and people feel its wrong but its our way)
- Travellers do not wish to live too close to settled community
- Why should we pay for travellers to have a fixed place to live when they pay no money into the government/council?
- As Secretary of the Sussex Traveller Action Group I welcome the arguments put forward for the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites. They are well put and convincing on the importance of identifying sites in order to get the Local Plan accepted.
- We accept that the assessment identifies 9 sites, but are not entirely clear if those are sites with multiple pitches or single pitches. Council owned sites presume have multiple pitches but with privately owned sites, it is not as clear. Gypsy and Traveller families tend to be intergenerational and need to extend the accommodation on their site to accommodate family members. These extensions are often refused.
- The Plan states there is not enough accommodation to cater for projected future needs, but here is not enough accommodation to cater for current needs as the recent unauthorised incursions testify.
- STAG urges private planning applications from Gypsies and Travellers be dealt with much more quickly and effectively, and notes that two applications are awaiting decisions. I trust these will be resolved quickly as many applicants wait years and are repeatedly asked to provide additional, sometimes irrelevant, information. Many are then only granted temporary permission. It should be made clear that increasing acceptance of private Gypsy and Traveller planning applications would relieve pressure on public sites and also reduce costs to the council.

Proposal seems reasonable

- A total of 20 families doesn't sound unreasonable, wouldn't overburden the area's facilities, and goes some way towards satisfying the Council's duties in this regard
- It's a difficult one we do need to provide suitable sites and if we do so it might help to break the nomadic existence and bring some of the travellers to realise they are part of our society and should conform to those standards.
- Gypsy (genuine) should be given every opportunity to have a stopping off point during their travels providing they pay for the amenities provided.
- I am not aware of any potential alternative sites but Crawley desperately needs to fulfil its responsibility to provide legal and dignified sites. Not only is this an ethical issue, but it would also give greater force to eviction of illegal sites and help to end the devastation and cost of cleaning up the detritus from such encampments.
- It seems surprising that Gypsy families' children might want to go back to caravans but very reasonable of the council to make the offer

Questions that still need to be answered

- Hygiene - Will there be a toilet block and will they use it?
- I cannot judge Gypsies or Travellers as they have done no harm to me. Will they be paying taxes though? Or will we be paying for their up keep?
- Question is why there is a requirement for a permanent site. My understanding was that there did not want permanent site...
- Why do families of Gypsies & Travellers already in Crawley Housing qualify for a site when the offspring of other resident families do not get a chance of housing or mobile sites?
- Why not leave the gypsy people that we have in the houses that they have at the moment and the children will move into the community like all other children?

No to any site

- However, I am of the opinion that we should not provide any permanent facilities for travellers, as they are TRAVELLERS, clue in the title(!)
- If they are travellers then they will not make it a permanent home. If families settle then it will not be big enough to accommodate them.

Other

- Personally I feel that the assessment previously carried out is inconsistent when comparing attributes/drawbacks of these 2 sites within the report. This should be reviewed for consistency!
- They need somewhere to live and I can't think of any other sites.
- Any Gypsy/Traveller site would need to be near schools etc.

- The financial benefits of providing sites are stated but could be emphasised with the approximate annual cost for evicting unauthorised encampments as against the cost of providing sites.
- The explanation for the shortage should be more specific about the bunding (blocking access to) common land such as Ditchling Common, Henfield Common, Devils Dyke and other previously accessible common land, whether in the Crawley district or in nearby locations.
- Given the difficulty when two sites were proposed several years ago, plans must be put in place to inform local residents that such sites are in place throughout the country and cause local people no disturbance.
- It should be abundantly CLEAR to the gypsy and travellers that THEY are responsible for keeping the sites clean and tidy, and under no circumstances should the cost be borne by the Crawley tax payers
- Problem parking and accessing the site / too near existing housing/ land should be used by people to walk dogs and enjoy the countryside / too near to airport noise
- My company used to have storage at these premises and they are very secluded and away from other people who may right or wrong be intimidated by them (Broadfield Kennels Q10). It looks okay but I don't know the area enough to make a proper comment.

Broadfield site – people who said NO to the site

This group should not be treated any differently

- Gypsies housing needs should be dealt with the same as any other persons. i.e through housing lists and qualifying to be on them.
- I do not see why any section of the community needs special privileges at ratepayers expense.
- Why are these people given anything...They should be made to wait on a housing list like the rest of us and forced to pay their way.
- There should be no space set aside anywhere within the town boundaries for Gypsy and Traveller sites. These are travelling people and do not need fixed sites. Unless the Council is willing to buy houses from residents at market value and relocate people who do not want a site near them none of these should be considered.
-Why are we providing spaces that could be used as homes, for all?
- If they are already living in houses keep them where they are.
- I do not agree with providing traveller sites as it is an unacceptable form of positive discrimination the provision and upkeep burden of which falls negatively to those who will never use its facilities.
- Personally I don't think Crawley should have to provide a site for travellers. We are currently struggling to provide space for the people already living in Crawley. If they want to move permanently to Crawley they can await housing like everyone else.
- I find it difficult to understand why the future generation of travellers living in Crawley must have a permanent site when many children who were

born in Crawley and whose parents have lived here all their lives, have no chance of getting council accommodation in Crawley. My eldest child is 25 years old and as she has worked hard in her chosen career, she is unable to get on the council house waiting list as she is earning. Why should Gypsy/Travellers get priority??

- If they are happily settled then why would land need to be set aside. The land would be better used for housing for the many families that need houses now.
- By definition Travellers would not stay long term so it is unlikely they would be disadvantaged regarding local community ties. Should they chose to stay in Crawley permanently they might consider settling in a house.
- Travellers should be just that travellers. If they wish to have permanent land entitlement they should integrate into society and get on waiting lists
- ...
- If the G's & T's are in houses why give them sites, and why give them sites in the first place, as their title means that they are travellers.
- ... Why is it that the Broadfield site can be developed for gypsies but not for development of homes?
- I don't feel that people who choose to travel and class themselves as Gypsies and Travellers should be given houses which they will leave when they choose to travel when there are people in the area waiting for houses as a permanent point to live. This applies be sites as well.
- Gypsies and Travellers are by definition on the move. Why do they want houses to live in when they happen to be in the area? When there are people on waiting list for years.
- Broafield Kennels - This is not a suitable site as it is to near to Tollgate Hill.
- No sites should be offered. They need to be brought into normal housingThe council should not be promoting a travelling lifestyle. This town has already spent enough money over the recent years trying to keep them from parking on Crawley land. I totally reject any money spent on cleaning up their dirt and mess. Put them in council housing so they can eventually live like the rest of us. Do not encourage their way of life.
- Do not understand why the need to spend money for the travellers children to have a site when my children who have lived in Crawley all their lives cannot get a council house. Perhaps money should be spent on housing life long Crawley residents and not travellers.
- We should not use council funds to build sites for traveller families children when local families cannot get housing also if they are living in houses they are not travellers
- Remaining in one place for a period of time allows people from this group to access education and health services, which is often not the case if they are travelling around the country. Then they should buy a house like the rest of us.
- Travellers by definition are people who do not want to stay in one place. Therefore if they do decide to stay in one place they should have to rent/buy a property and pay council tax and other utilities just like everyone else. The council should not be responsible
- Land should be used to build houses for the residents of Crawley, those who cannot afford private rent or mortgages

- Crawley doesn't have enough housing for people with links to the town let alone for travellers that are not from the area
- Travellers/gypsies should live in houses like everyone else ...
- Gypsies and travellers should have to buy their own land for development. Anyone that wants to buy their own land has to pay for it, so why shouldn't they.
- You state there is little space for more housing then build council housing in these spaces...
- Don't agree that gypsy/travellers should get priority land for their families when my children won't stand any chance of obtaining council housing even though they are unlikely to be in a position to be able to afford private rents or buying. My mum and myself are Crawley born and bred but my children's needs are not being met.
- Your GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE ACCOMMODATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT document states that there is no current perceived need, and the graph within that document shows a negative trend of gypsy and travellers setting up illegal camps, therefore there should be no current allocation of land that could be used for bricks and mortar homes.
- There is no need for a Gypsy site in Crawley. They can purchase or rent like anybody else....
- I cannot understand the need for a site for children of Travellers of the parents are settled in the community. The children, like the parents, should be integrated into the community for stability. Many people have the urge to travel but do not have sites provided for them around the country. It is called taking a holiday. If these people can afford expensive cars and caravans then they can afford permanent housing, for the sake of the children.
- If they are in housing let them stay in housing and contribute to the Crawley economy,. This land could be used for permanent housing. All children want to leave home and travel, but we do not supply a site for them to do so.
- "Choices:
 - Get a mortgage
 - Rent a council house
 - Rent a private house.
 - Keep travelling"

Other provision is already available

- There are many private caravan sites available for those that wish to use caravans.
- Travellers should either get a fixed house to live in or become members of the caravan club and use commercial site such as one next to flight tavern, Gatwick airport and pay to use the site instead of having a site provided by the local council.

- **Site not suitable – negative impact on local community**
- As a resident who lives in Broadfield and enjoys walking in Buchan park and the surrounding areas, I feel having a traveller site here would compromise the area, along with safety, house prices would fall (Dale Farm has shown this).
- When they have been on illegal sites, safety in the area has been compromised, the rubbish they leave is disgraceful.
- Broadfield kennels area should not have gypsies or travellers living permanently there. The pedestrian links into Broadfield are through the area of Broad Wood rise a quite area with residents that take pride in their homes and their community and is the only direct access to Buchan park cottersmoore school and golf course.
- We do not want this in this area, the safety of our homes and property the welfare of our children and also the value of our properties are at stake
- The house values in the area would drop considerably, are you going to compensate the home owners?
- I strongly disagree with the site planned for travellers at Broadfield Kennels. Not only is the site marked on the map not the site previously used by the kennels, but the field area beside it. There is only a rough path leading to the local shops, which is not suitable. I live local to this site and we have on going problems with illegal motor bikes using the paths and site proposed and feels it will only escalate. This is unfair on the permanent residents.
- Please do not consider travellers in Buchanan kennels, they will be too near a heavily populated neighbourhood.
- Noise, rubbish and potential trouble in a peaceful area.
- Also as a local resident near this proposed site I am concern as to how this may affect the value of my property. We already have problems with rally bikes riding on the bridal path and it has been identified by the police who we have to keep calling out, that some of this is due to local gypsies who are living locally. I also feel that placing this site so near to Buchan Park could cause problems within this area.
- ... This will de value any property nearby of hardworking citizens.
- Apart from that Broadfield already has a bad name and I'm sure it would only get worse.
- Broadfield Kennels should not be considered because Broadfield already has a bad reputation and ongoing problems.
- When Travellers have parked up in certain areas they have left lots of rubbish, messed up the area and in some cases have caused damage, which the people of Crawley have had to pay for. So unfortunately they have given themselves a bad name.
- I am worried if they are to have site Broadfield with mess and rubbish being left. Also Buchan park is loved by every one in the area would they respect and keep these area clean as I walk dogs there
- Lots and lots of people use Broadfield kennels and Buchan park as part of their daily walk its not only a beautiful country park but offers a place for dog walkers to meet and people to walk freely and safely. Having a traveller site will dramatically change the area and the way people feel

about Buchan and Broadfield there is no need to ruin such a lovely and important part to the local community.

- Don't make BF and Langley Green any more undesirable than they already are. Why should we house travellers who only cause trouble when they arrive in town?
- Broadfield has a bad reputation as it is adding a traveller site will just make it worse
- Any neighbouring houses will lose value and this is totally unfair for the people who have worked hard and respectfully all their lives. A large number of residents in Crawley also live in fear of threats and violence from the travellers and will not be able to feel at ease in their own homes. In view of these comments I cannot suggest any alternative site.
- Security issues
- I am a member at Cottesmore and we have already suffered several vandalism acts on fairways and greens on the Broadfield boundary. My fears are that the incident rate will increase with the siting of a traveller park. I also believe that since many new housing estates are placed on flight paths and suffer noise issues then the travellers should not be protected from having to suffer similar nuisance issue.....
- Gypsy and Traveller sites have a detrimental impact wherever they are.
- Strongly object to this proposed site adjacent to Cottesmore Golf course as previously have experienced both theft of property and malicious damage to the course when travellers have been located in the vicinity.
- Having Gypsy site in the immediate neighbourhood will compromise the houses value and increase house owners home insurance cost.
- The surrounding common areas, such as St. Leonard's Forest and the Golf Course will be affected too. I am totally against this proposal, as I have been in the past.
- I find the Broadfield Kennels site to be particularly unsuitable due to the potential damage the site would cause the golf club. There are currently enough problems with children from Broadfield roaming around the golf course and on occasion causing serious and long lasting damage. A site of travellers in close proximity will surely only increase our current problems.
- Again DO NOT encourage this group to break up the co-existence of the other communities in the area...
- Broadfield already has enough problems, the last thing needed there is to invite any more
- Unfortunately, I have had to deal with travellers illegally setting up site near to my home on Broadfield playing fields in the past, and would not support the council in any plans for a permanent traveller's site in Crawley due to the mess, noise & anti-social behaviour that comes with the travellers.
- Broadfield already has a poor reputation (unfounded in my opinion) however to continue with the plan for Broadfield Kennels will only cause this opinion to become lower still.
- Property value will also decrease as no one will want to live here.
- I would not feel comfortable going to Buchan park as I do on a daily basis if the kennels site is approved. I also live local and this site concerns me. I

would like to know if you will publish if these sites are going to be monitored...

- Broadfield has enough poverty and introducing travellers will only harm the area more which is a very bad thing in an area which is trying to better itself
- No way at Broadfield kennels!!Broadfield is already considered the worst neighbourhood in Crawley! Don't drag it down more!!
- A permanent site is not a good idea and personally don't think it will benefit Crawley at all. There is one in Brighton close to where I work and it is forever being repaired because the gypsies are constantly vandalising the facilities that are provided. I also know many people that go to fairly great lengths to avoid the surrounding area because of their anti-social behaviour.
- They should not have sites in either Broadfield or Langley Green as these neighbourhoods already have a low image, reflected in house prices, and it would only make them worse.
- Very unlikely that a gypsy site would contain only 10 dwellings. This will de-value the properties in the area greatly.
- Depreciation of property value close to traveller's site.
- Broadfield Kennels is a beautiful site that is part of Bucham Park. The site of a gypsy and travellers are would be damaging to the area and could cause significant distress to anyone walking in the area, especially alone if they accidentally wander onto the site.
- The gypsy site proposed is also too close to the Cottismore golf club and Cottismore school plus one or two small businesses in the area and also the Scout huts at Pease pottage. Also will mention that more houses are going to be built on the site of the old leisure centre land in Bewbush which is also very close to Buchan Park. I am told that permission was turned down in the past for building houses on Broadfield kennel land as it was a ""Beauty spot!!!) Surely about 40 caravans are going to blight the area's beauty anyway
- I strongly oppose the Gypsy and Traveller site being in this location. This is because it will dramatically reduce house prices in the area, as I have a young family I am not in a position to move financially. We have made many improvements to our house and before this became apparent we had no desire to move. However should this be forthcoming we would have a serious re-think for our own safety as 2 years ago we got burgled. Even though we have made many improvements of the security of our house, by having the Gypsy and Traveller site introduced in this location we feel our security would be compromised. We would have no alternative but to consider moving out of Crawley and selling the house at a reduced price.
- I strongly disagree to this site being used. By having it so close to my home, the price of my home would drop significantly. As we have a young family we are not in the position financially to move. We have recently improved our home significantly and were hoping to be living here for the foreseeable future. 2 years ago we got burgled and although significant security improvements have been made to our home, if this site was to be introduced we feel our safety and security would be compromised living

here. With the possibility of this site being introduced i feel my family would have no alternative but to consider moving from the area, although this would be at a considerable loss due to the reduced house price.

- Having previously lived in Brighton and witnessed the damage that travellers have made to various parks and open land in the area. I do not want to have a traveller site near to Buchan country park....
- There are enough problems in Broadfield without the addition of a fixed traveller site. We do not understand why travellers would want a fixed site if they are by nature travellers. Wherever they choose as a temporary base they will be given whatever care they require.
- You will deter people from walking in Buchan Park, I will not feel safe to walk there if there is a traveller site next door. I also think it will have a detrimental effect on the new housing being built around the corner. Non-one will want to buy a house next to a gypsy site. It will probably have a negative effect on the value of houses in Broadfield.
- Only trouble can occur if sites are put in these areas like most of the other areas they occupy legally or illegally
- I am opposed to this land to be set aside for the travellers. There is enough troubles being caused by the youngsters along the Broadfield forest which is hard for the police force and the council to handle it effectively and you would like to put some more problems?....
- Broadfield has been working hard to improve its reputation and a travellers site will undo all the work so far.
- Broadfield should not be considered for the following reasons:-
- Broadfield is already an area plagued by crime with minimal police presence. Creating a traveller site will only increase this problem. Statistically areas containing traveller sites have high crime rates.
- Buchan Park is one of very few nice areas of Broadfield.
- Council tax will increase to maintain their park, which I will end up paying along with other tax payers in the area.
- The land at broadfield kennels is an area of natural beauty and used by many dog walkers, this area will not be enhanced by a permanent traveller's site. Broadfield itself already has enough social problems, these will not be helped by the proposed travellers site and The proposal is for only ten units but as we all saw from what happened at Dales Farm, this is almost impossible to police.
- These are areas of countryside that should not have people living there. Buchan already has a problem with young men from this community driving unlicensed motor vehicles through it, while Langley Green already has its own issues without adding more to the mix.
- Why do we need two gypsy and traveller camps? They cost a great deal of money. I am very concerned about Buchan Park. I walk on the Crawley Health walk and do not want to be intimidated. We are all older residents.
- We had the travellers at the rugby club for a long time they were not pleasant couldn't walk the dogs and children couldn't play they left a terrible mess don't want them in Crawley

Site not suitable – wildlife and environment

- This a peaceful area of natural beauty full with wild life.
- The Broadfield Kennels site idea is appalling.
- To be truthful I believe if you allow the site to go at the old Broadfield kennels it will detract families from going to Buchan park and people getting intimidated on going on normal family walks , I think it will cause havoc with the local wildlife as there are always wild deer living up in that area
- Whilst there is an appreciation of the legal requirement to provide a site, due to the historical issues with travellers in Crawley it is unfair to consider utilising space immediately adjacent to established residential areas or green areas used and enjoyed by the local community.
- The land is also a designated AONB and is home to a large variety of wildlife. Crawley's Green Spaces Strategy quotes that the council is committed to recognise the wealth of wildlife in Crawley and try to ensure that these areas are protected and enhanced.
- Concerned Buchan park could be polluted for fishing and conservation area wild life not to mention the number of families on nature walks and dog walking this is a lovely area would be a shame if the area was not looked after.
- The proposed site is also in an AONB.
- It is too close to Buchan Park and the wildlife
- Buchan park is too close to this area, and there is a risk that one of Crawley's finest, and beautiful parks will be jeopardised.
- I think this is not a good idea due the wildlife in the area Buchan park.
- Worried about the connection between them and the park and may be the miss use of the park.
- Besides the lack of services to the site (sewage etc.) the threat to wildlife will be hugely affected as will the cost of replacing valuable and protected oak trees.
- Buchan park is a beautiful area and many people will refrain from using this area for safety fears.
- Parks/woods are not safe for children as they are these days. You claim to want open space for the community yet consider Gypsy and Traveller sites to be made on what we have left!!
- Buchan Park is a place of natural beauty + peace which would be ruined by the noise + mess It is an area for nature + conservation.
- The site near Broadfield should not be used as a new site for Gypsy & travellers because the wild life that live there will be affected and the travellers will take over our lovely Buchan park....
- These areas are already used as recreational ground and dog walking land by Crawley residence. Placing a traveller site on either location will permanently take these areas away from us, yes we have Buchan and Tilgate park but sometimes they are not suitable, I regularly walk my dog on the kennel land due to people walking aggressive dogs off the lead in Buchan park and not being able to control someone else's dog is an issue. I don't have that issue on the kennel land as everyone I come into contact with are great dog owners.....

- Adamantly against this site where kennels were. This is much too close to the amazing Buchan park where the dogs are walked, children from schools visit in large groups with teachers. The park rangers have done an exemplary work and take great pride in all they do..... This is a free park for families and treasured by us all. The wild life and lakes are incredible,They are too close to it and will encroach on it and the safety of all of us will be spoilt!
- The site proposed would be on the lap of Buchan park where the whole community go to enjoy, plus people as far away as Cornwall and Scotland and further afield visit.. Everybody is worried of the parks future as most people will no longer come to the park (I for one won't visit) Broadfield Kennel houses lots of wildlife and wild plants and flowers and also has a protected community of Nightjar birds which are protected by the RSPB. I think it would be a wonderful idea to give or sell this land to Buchan park as it is practically ""Buchan park"" so that this community of Crawley and Sussex and far afield can go on into future generations being able to enjoy a little bit of escapism in a little bit of wild and natural countryside. also protecting the wildlife that is gradually dying out. .
- I oppose the proposed plans for the change of Bradfield Kennels. I have quoted Crawley District council, WSCC and Buchan Park website details to highlight the environmental effects/ concerns such a proposal would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and nature and wildlife. Add to this the social economic impact on the local community:
http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/enjoy_west_sussex/wildlife_and_landscape/countryside_and_wildlife/places_to_visit/buchan_country_park/about_buchan_country_park.aspx
 4 Land tenure/Grant Aid/Agreements
 About Buchan Country Park
 Lesser spotted woodpecker Buchan Country Park is owned and managed by West Sussex County Council. It is designated a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and is of national importance for its dragonfly populations. In 1985 the lakes and surrounds were designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest• West Sussex County Council purchased the park on 31 July 1969.
 Educational initiatives like Buchan Bushcraft, show the educational aspects of the park, local land and nature reserves â€¦. National BBC news earlier this year, events planned all through the summer for families etc.
http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/prow/pdfs/BuchanPark_Background-Objectives.pdf
 The education service has undertaken school visits, holiday clubs, very able pupil courses, adult education courses and out of school group visits. The park is increasingly popular with cub and beaver groups• Such activities would experience safeguarding issues as the exact nature of people close to school, club and beaver groups could result in the educational aspect of Buchan park being lost to schools and cub and beaver groups.
http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/prow/pdfs/BuchanPark_Background-Objectives.pdf
 West Sussex County Council holds the freehold for the Country Park.

Numbers 1 and 2 Laundry Cottages are also owned by WSCC and are rented by the Senior Ranger and one Countryside Ranger. WSCC also holds the freehold for 2.5 hectares of unimproved grassland at the entrance to the park. This area does not currently form part of the country park. Since 2004 it has been threatened twice with development. In 2004, in a Local Development Framework consultation document, Horsham District Council identified the site as a location for housing. Following local opposition and representations from park staff and County Council specialists the site was withdrawn. In October 2005 the field was the preferred site option to re-locate the Broadbridge Heath Highways Depot. WSCC property department carried out survey work as part of a feasibility study. This proposal is currently shelved. Any development of this green field site will impact on the rural nature of the park entrance. If the site was to form part of the country park, there is considerable potential for use by groups for educational purposes. Improved access would also allow an additional circular route to Target Hill Local Nature Reserve. There are several Easements and Wayleaves applying to the park most notably regarding the installation of a water main over Target Hill. A small plot of land is leased to Cottesmore Golf Course. An area of 5.3 hectares of Target Hill is under a 10 year Defra Countryside Stewardship Scheme for lowland heath restoration (appendix 8.4). This agreement expires in 2012. From 1996 to 2007 two Forestry Commission Woodland Grant Schemes covered the whole park. In October 2000 WSCC entered into a 10-year management agreement with Crawley Borough Council to manage 3.36 hectares of land under a Countryside Stewardship Scheme for lowland heath restoration.

• Bio-diversity - The diversity of habitats and landscapes provide suitable interest for both amenity and educational use. The ecological diversity of some of the habitats is low, due to unfavourable management in the past, particularly felling of most of the woodland during World War 2. All the habitats present have been created by human management of the site over a long period and thus cannot be described as natural. However they have all been on the site for a great length of time and have a natural feel.

• The presence of a site that has such high value for both amenity and nature conservation is rare in the context of the urban fringe of Crawley.

Management Objective 1

Maintain a high standard of habitat management to ensure the site retains its Site of Special Scientific Interest and Site of Nature Conservation Importance designations.

Management Objective 2

Enable people of all abilities to safely visit, enjoy and understand the park and the wider AONB countryside, and involve the local community and volunteers in its development

Management Objective 4

Promote sustainability issues such as re-cycling, green energy, food miles and wildlife friendly gardening and the health benefits of an active lifestyle
 Point 3 producing a programme of graded health walks in partnership with Crawley Borough Council and Gatwick Greenspace Partnership.

Management Objective 5

Liaise with local landowners to encourage landscape and bio-diversity improvements, as specified in WSCC Land Management Guidance Sheet HW2, to complement work at Buchan Country Park. We aim to achieve this by

Managing 3.36 hectares of restored heathland leased from Crawley Borough Council on Target Hill.

Liaising with WSCC Property and Trading Standards Department and grazing tenant to promote appropriate management of grazing land at park entrance.

Working with partners such as the Holmbush estate, Sussex Probation Service and Gatwick Greenspace Partnership to remove invasive *Rhododendron ponticum* from the parks immediate borders.

Developing a partnership with Cottesmore Golf Course to identify and promote habitat management to improve bio-diversity.

Working with Crawley Borough Council and Gatwick Greenspace Partnership to carry out the aims of the management plan for Target Hill Local Nature Reserve.

Management Objective 7

To meet all legal and other obligations

We aim to achieve this by -

Ensuring that the site is safe for the general public through regular risk assessments.

Nightjar details RSPB- red Status

Red list criteria

Globally threatened

Historical population decline in UK during 1800-1995

Severe (at least 50%) decline in UK breeding population over last 25 years, or longer-term period (the entire period used for assessments since the first BoCC review, starting in 1969).

Severe (at least 50%) contraction of UK breeding range over last 25 years, or the longer-term period

The particular habitat requirements of the nightjar (described below) means that its distribution and numbers are limited by the availability of suitable habitat. One component of that habitat - mature lowland heathland - has been decimated in southern England over the last century, and whilst today the remaining fragments of heaths are largely protected from further losses (and initiatives are underway to restore large areas of former heathland) the habitat remains a scarce one.

Largely as a result of the losses of heathland area, the nightjar has declined dramatically over the past century, and by 50% nationally between surveys carried out in 1968-72 and 1988-91. Within the last ten years or so, the species has showed signs of recovering, and this is in part due to increases in habitat provided by clear-felling of conifer plantations.

Basic management requirements for the nightjar:

Site size: At least 10 hectares are normally required to attract nightjar.

Heather management: Cyclical heather management to maintain the long term vigour of the heath, on a rotation between 20 and 40 years and/or controlled burning.

Scrub control: Periodically remove invading tree scrub to prevent succession; the density of retained trees should ideally be kept to less

than 10 per ha; above this the value of the heath for other species can become compromised, depending on local circumstances. Prevent bracken invasion of heath by herbicide treatment (N.B. mowing or rolling is unsuitable as a method of bracken control as it would have to be done during the nesting season of nightjar and other ground nesting birds).

Grazing: Extensive grazing enhances the vegetation structure, restricts invasion and incidentally increases the number of dung insects, some of which are important elements of the nightjars diet.

Bare ground: All the above help to create and maintain bare patches of 3-5 m² within the heather-dominated vegetation and at the base of small trees (1-3 m tall). This provides nightjars with suitable nesting habitat in areas where the heather cover is otherwise too dense for sufficient natural sites to be available.

Conifer plantations: Clearings (over 10 hectares) restocked within 10-15 years are preferred by nightjar. Continuity of suitable nest sites may be extended for two to three years by inter-row ploughing or rotovating.

Diversification of the age structure within the more even-aged plantations will ensure a continuity of suitable open space through the production cycle. Ideally the proportion of newly-created open space should then be maintained throughout the cycle. The inclusion of unplanted bays (20-50 m wide) in the form of wide rides can provide nest sites in undisturbed areas, which also provide heathland corridors through large woodland areas, providing sheltered feeding sites.

Buchan Park management Plan 2006 to 2013

http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/prow/pdfs/BuchanParkMP_LowRes.pdf

ref DEFRA map distance 50 to 100m of the following protected areas
SNCI Citation WSCC Site of nature Conservation Importance
Status: Site of Special Scientific Interest notified under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

- It would be a shame to lose all the investment and the natural beauty of the park and area if this proposed idea goes ahead.
- I oppose the proposed plans for the change of Bradfield Kennels. I have quoted Crawley District council, WSCC and Buchan Park website details to highlight the environmental effects/ concerns such a proposal would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and nature and wildlife. Add to this the social economic impact on the local community
http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/enjoy_west_sussex/wildlife_and_landscape/countryside_and_wildlife/places_to_visit/buchan_country_park/about_buchan_country_park.aspx

2.4 Land tenure/Grant Aid/Agreements

About Buchan Country Park

Lesser spotted woodpecker Buchan Country Park is owned and managed by West Sussex County Council. It is designated a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and is of national importance for its dragonfly populations. In 1985 the lakes and surrounds were designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest• West Sussex County Council purchased the park on 31 July 1969.

Educational initiatives like Buchan Bushcraft, show the educational aspects of the park, local land and nature reserves. National BBC news

earlier this year, events planned all through the summer for families etc.
http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/prow/pdfs/BuchanPark_Background-Objectives.pdf

The education service has undertaken school visits, holiday clubs, very able pupil courses, adult education courses and out of school group visits. The park is increasingly popular with cub and beaver groups• Such activities would experience safeguarding issues as the exact nature of people close to school, club and beaver groups could result in the educational aspect of Buchan park being lost to schools and cub and beaver groups.

http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/prow/pdfs/BuchanPark_Background-Objectives.pdf

West Sussex County Council holds the freehold for the Country Park. Numbers 1 and 2 Laundry Cottages are also owned by WSCC and are rented by the Senior Ranger and one Countryside Ranger. WSCC also holds the freehold for 2.5 hectares of unimproved grassland at the entrance to the park. This area does not currently form part of the country park. Since 2004 it has been threatened twice with development. In 2004, in a Local Development Framework consultation document, Horsham District Council identified the site as a location for housing. Following local opposition and representations from park staff and County Council specialists the site was withdrawn. In October 2005 the field was the preferred site option to re-locate the Broadbridge Heath Highways Depot. WSCC property department carried out survey work as part of a feasibility study. This proposal is currently shelved. Any development of this green field site will impact on the rural nature of the park entrance. If the site was to form part of the country park, there is considerable potential for use by groups for educational purposes. Improved access would also allow an additional circular route to Target Hill Local Nature Reserve. There are several Easements and Wayleaves applying to the park most notably regarding the installation of a water main over Target Hill. A small plot of land is leased to Cottesmore Golf Course.

An area of 5.3 hectares of Target Hill is under a 10 year Defra Countryside Stewardship Scheme for lowland heath restoration (appendix 8.4). This agreement expires in 2012. From 1996 to 2007 two Forestry Commission Woodland Grant Schemes covered the whole park.

In October 2000 WSCC entered into a 10-year management agreement with Crawley Borough Council to manage 3.36 hectares of land under a Countryside Stewardship Scheme for lowland heath restoration. •

Bio-diversity - The diversity of habitats and landscapes provide suitable interest for both amenity and educational use. The ecological diversity of some of the habitats is low, due to unfavourable management in the past, particularly felling of most of the woodland during World War 2. All the habitats present have been created by human management of the site over a long period and thus cannot be described as natural. However they have all been on the site for a great length of time and have a natural feel• . The presence of a site that has such high value for both amenity and nature conservation is rare in the context of the urban fringe of Crawley. •

Management Objective 1

Maintain a high standard of habitat management to ensure the site retains its Site of Special Scientific Interest and Site of Nature Conservation Importance designations.

Management Objective 2

Enable people of all abilities to safely visit, enjoy and understand the park and the wider AONB countryside, and involve the local community and volunteers in its development

Management Objective 4

Promote sustainability issues such as re-cycling, green energy, food miles and wildlife friendly gardening and the health benefits of an active lifestyle

Point 3 producing a programme of graded health walks in partnership with Crawley Borough Council and Gatwick Greenspace Partnership.

Management Objective 5

Liaise with local landowners to encourage landscape and bio-diversity improvements, as specified in WSCC Land Management Guidance Sheet HW2, to complement work at Buchan Country Park. We aim to achieve this by

Managing 3.36 hectares of restored heathland leased from Crawley Borough Council on Target Hill.

Liaising with WSCC Property and Trading Standards Department and grazing tenant to promote appropriate management of grazing land at park entrance.

Working with partners such as the Holmbush estate, Sussex Probation Service and Gatwick Greenspace Partnership to remove invasive *Rhododendron ponticum* from the parks immediate borders.

Developing a partnership with Cottesmore Golf Course to identify and promote habitat management to improve bio-diversity.

Working with Crawley Borough Council and Gatwick Greenspace Partnership to carry out the aims of the management plan for Target Hill Local Nature Reserve.

Management Objective 7

To meet all legal and other obligations

We aim to achieve this by -

Ensuring that the site is safe for the general public through regular risk assessments.

Nightjar details RSPB- red Status

Red list criteria

Globally threatened

Historical population decline in UK during 1800-1995

Severe (at least 50%) decline in UK breeding population over last 25 years, or longer-term period (the entire period used for assessments since the first BoCC review, starting in 1969).

Severe (at least 50%) contraction of UK breeding range over last 25 years, or the longer-term period

The particular habitat requirements of the nightjar (described below) means that its distribution and numbers are limited by the availability of suitable habitat. One component of that habitat - mature lowland heathland - has been decimated in southern England over the last century, and whilst today the remaining fragments of heaths are largely protected from further losses (and initiatives are underway to restore large areas of former

heathland) the habitat remains a scarce one.

Largely as a result of the losses of heathland area, the nightjar has declined dramatically over the past century, and by 50% nationally between surveys carried out in 1968-72 and 1988-91. Within the last ten years or so, the species has showed signs of recovering, and this is in part due to increases in habitat provided by clear-felling of conifer plantations.

Basic management requirements for the nightjar:

Site size: At least 10 hectares are normally required to attract nightjar.

Heather management: Cyclical heather management to maintain the long term vigour of the heath, on a rotation between 20 and 40 years and/or controlled burning.

Scrub control: Periodically remove invading tree scrub to prevent succession; the density of retained trees should ideally be kept to less than 10 per ha; above this the value of the heath for other species can become compromised, depending on local circumstances. Prevent bracken invasion of heath by herbicide treatment (N.B. mowing or rolling is unsuitable as a method of bracken control as it would have to be done during the nesting season of nightjar and other ground nesting birds).

Grazing: Extensive grazing enhances the vegetation structure, restricts invasion and incidentally increases the number of dung insects, some of which are important elements of the nightjars diet.

Bare ground: All the above help to create and maintain bare patches of 3-5 m² within the heather-dominated vegetation and at the base of small trees (1-3 m tall). This provides nightjars with suitable nesting habitat in areas where the heather cover is otherwise too dense for sufficient natural sites to be available.

Conifer plantations: Clearings (over 10 hectares) restocked within 10-15 years are preferred by nightjar. Continuity of suitable nest sites may be extended for two to three years by inter-row ploughing or rotovating.

Diversification of the age structure within the more even-aged plantations will ensure a continuity of suitable open space through the production cycle. Ideally the proportion of newly-created open space should then be maintained throughout the cycle. The inclusion of unplanted bays (20-50 m wide) in the form of wide rides can provide nest sites in undisturbed areas, which also provide heathland corridors through large woodland areas, providing sheltered feeding sites.

Buchan Park management Plan 2006 to 2013

http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtourism/prow/pdfs/BuchanParkMP_LowRes.pdf

ref DEFRA map distance 50 to 100m of the following protected areas

SNCI Citation WSCC Site of nature Conservation Importance

Status: Site of Special Scientific Interest notified under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

- It would be a shame to lose all the investment and the natural beauty of the park and area if this proposed idea goes ahead.
- A site should not be located next to a nature park which many people use and enjoy
- "The permanent travellers' site will have an irreversible, negative impact to Buchan park and should not be built for the following reasons:
- Buchan is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI)

- Buchan is a Site of Special Scientific Interest. (SSSI)
- Buchan Country Park has won the Green Flag Award which recognises the best green spaces in the UK.
- Buchan park is a key part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- The park is on the urban fringe so is already under pressure from the growing town's population.
- The land bordering the park proposed as the traveller's site, is an important buffer zone to the nature within the park.
- Crawley has several areas of derelict land sites (other alternatives), so why use risk an important SNCI/SSSI site.
- Buchan park is recognised as a site of National & scientific importance. It has been entrusted under the care & stewardship of our current Crawley councillors, to preserve this local treasure for future generations. With growing development pressures all over the south east, this site will be of growing importance for future generations. For the current councillors of Crawley to even propose endangering such a site, is an exemplary example of extremely poor, wreckless planning at the expense of future generations? "
- Broadfield kennels should not be used for a gypsy site as the area it surrounds is of natural beauty and a sanctuary for wildlife and fauna . Our precious green spaces are being destroyed
- Both proposed sites are on green fields; Broadfield Kennels would have an adverse effect on Wildlife especially endangered species such as KnightJar, Biodiversity, Waterways and wider implications on access to and from the site. The Broadfield Kennels site is surrounded by Forest and parks of outstanding beauty, the intended redevelopment would also involve cutting several protective trees and loss of the amenities.

Site not suitable – access/ traffic

- I believe that this site at Broadfield Kennels will be unsuitable due to the steep access to this site on a very busy bypass.
- There are no safe roads/paths/street lightening at Buchanan kennels.
- Land at Broadfield Kennels has previously been rejected for development on the grounds that the only access is via the fast lane of the A264, a busy, unlit dual carriageway. The development of the large Kilnwood Vale estate nearby will result in an increase in traffic along this stretch of road. The only pedestrian access is via an unlit, unpaved underpass and a steep, high bank with badly maintained steps. There is no disabled access and nowhere to provide a bus stop.
- The steep drop off to the south of the land also makes it an unsuitable choice for a residential plot.
- Not only will a travellers fixed site at Broadfield Kennels create untold misery for neighbouring areas, and the community but also congestion on the by-pass that runs alongside the proposed site.
- The Broadfield site is not easily accessible & the pedestrian access from Broadfield is unlit & little more than a muddy path.

- It is unlikely only 10 pitches will be on site. The Broadfield kennels does not have suitable access for caravans.
- Broadfield Kennels site. I do not think that it is suitable for the following reasons
- It is isolated from the rest of Crawley by a major road.
- access is difficult for both pedestrians and wheeled transport.
- the small site could preclude the provision of permanent supervision of the site.
- high cost of making the site suitable for occupation.
- Extra traffic it will cause Crawley on the whole is not an acceptable place for a traveller site.
- We have in the past lived near a Gypsy camp site and found that the crime wave went up and the property value went right down.
- Buchan Kennels is not the right place as there is fast road road A264 and will make it congested.
- It's not a suitable site for travellers + gypsies accommodation as the motor way is close by and could be dangerous.....

Site not suitable – infrastructure

- Also, the schools need to be considered as it could have a detrimental effect on them.
- In both locations it would also have a big impact on the infrastructure of the area.
- Broadfield kennels is not an appropriate site as it is too close to broadfield estate and there are not enough amenities for them, the schools are full up to capacity, The NHS are full to breaking point , the sewage etc are under strain as is the water pressure.
- Buchan park and this side of town will soon be bombarded by a new housing estate Kilnmead Vale which will create more activity around this side of town eg. , traffic schooling etc,
- The site is too close to the A264 road which is a very busy road, the land they would settle on has no lighting also it has a deep slope almost like a cliff edge, there is no public transport, no pedestrian paths (only a slopey dirt track with no access for wheelchairs or prams,

Alternative site – away from settled community

- I agree they need somewhere but maybe an option where it wouldn't affect the local community already established there... In France they have allocated sites for travellers and these are always located away from residential areas but within easy access of shops etc and these sites are always very clean.
- Could these sites not be included in a less populated area?
- Traveller communities and indigenous populations don't mix well and no site near housing areas will be conducive for either communities

- Both areas are too near residential areas. It would be better to provide a fixed site away from the general public and or areas enjoyed by the general public like Buchan Park. The Langley Green site has very limited access and is half the size of the Broadfield site but both are unsuitable.
- Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be anyway near residential areas.
- Broadfield already has a high population of deprived families with a reputation to go with it. Buchanan park is a positive area for Broadfield and is regularly used by families I and my family have been resident in broad field for ten years we live near Rathlin road playing field where travellers have set up illegal sites, they have broken into our garage and stolen on three occasions, so whilst I agree they need a permanent site it needs to be away from a residential area,.....
- Nowhere in Crawley should have a permanent site for gypsy traveller sites unless it is well out of the way of housing and business areas. Like in field out of the way of anything that could be surrounding it
- Crawley is an urban area and as such should not be required to house travellers who purport to be countryside dwellers.
- Outside of Crawley
- Somewhere not near residential areas...
- One in a different town.....
- No existing residents would want such a site near them....
- No land should be made available for Gypsies in Crawley.
- Gypsies are often accused of anti-social behaviour. To protect them for this any site should be remote from all standard housing. They all have transport so they have access to the services required. Airport noise should not be a consideration for temporary site.
- House them away from residential areas....
- Surely these sites would be better placed nearer to the main highways.
- Place gypsy and traveller sites away from residential areas - there has never been an instance where these sites have a favourable impact. make some land available in Manor Royal.
- No travellers / gypsies should be provided with any land for fixed pitches and if they must it should be as far out of the main town as possible!
- No to traveller and gypsy sites there must be plenty of green space away from residential areas
- Both sites I feel, are far too close to residential properties and places of natural habitat which will be a source of illegal rubbish tipping by the Gypsy Travellers..

Alternative sites

- The site considered and rejected for housing in Stephenson Way (5) might work better for a traveller site.
- I think a better site would be off the A23 near the Lowfield Heath roundabout the best way I can describe where is if looking from google earth it would be the field in between Gatwick and the long hall parking as this would have easier access for the caravans to enter be far enough away from residence but still with in the crawley boundary to

accommodate the requirement for a site, it also has a bus stop very close by.

- Gas Holder Site, North East Sector.
- The peripheral business/industrial area would afford good vehicle access and suitable transport links into the town centre to utilise local amenities.
- Next to delta force paint ball site
- What about the Forge Wood area?
- Stephenson way
- Horsham or Hayward's Heath
- Site should be provided by Horsham dc as it has a far larger land area to choose from
- There is land just opposite the M23 Moto service station at Pease Pottage (sometimes used as a car-boot sale area) which could be developed as a Traveller site. There would be little foreseeable access difficulties and disruption to existing residential areas.
- consider the old areas of the town. Industrial estates and further out of town towards the airport...
- The Broadfield site is the lesser of the two evils, however this is not ideal. Why not use the old industrial areas e.g. the old glaxo site or elsewhere away from the ... majority.
- Both sites are too close to existing houses..... then look for a suitable site on the industrial sites.
- Why has this moved from the pound hill area that was mentioned a few years ago to the above sites? Why are CBC always looking at LG and BF? Is it because you feel the people in them areas don't mind? Well we do, it's our homes and lives that will be affected. You have loads of other land that you can put this site at, e.g. In town centre, park area near Tesco's three bridges..
- None of the above. How about other open land in other parts of the town?
- How about pound hill area that's was mentioned a few years ago?"
- Industrial estate where there is no one to upset!
- If a site has to be in Crawley then why not Pound Hill on the green area by the Tavern on the green?
- Why not situate traveller's site in the new Forge Wood development? People who move into the new neighbourhood would know from the outset that a traveller's site was there, which is better than imposing it on people who never expected it. Also the new roads could be designed in such a way to make access easier for the travellers often large and heavy vehicles.
- Tricky, nobody wants travellers near them. Suggest more suitable alternatives in Crawley are (<http://www.crawley.gov.uk/pw/web/PUB194160>) map areas ref #9 #3 #4 #5 #6
- If a site must be built how about the industrial estate? There are plenty of empty sites there.
- Alternate sites Manor Royal / Stephens Way.
- How come there is no proposal for Worth or Pound Hill for these sights? Have they even been considered? I do not think you should be picking these two parts of town it is very discriminating.

- Turners Hill
- Is Horsham Copthorne or Crawley Down being considered for traveller sites.
- Maidenbower has a lot more room to accommodate the travelling community as it is more spacious.
- Poles Lane should be considered as it away from many people who are likely to reject Buchan and Cherry Lane
- Neither the travelling community nor local residents would wish the site to be in the middle of a residential area so the obvious site would be at Manor Royal or Stephenson Way where the site could be bordered by commercial premises. This may however create constraints on possible housing developments on such sites because a commercial builder may not find development profitable.
- 4) Many other areas of Crawley have land available for travellers (Ifield, copthorne, pound hill) why are these areas not being considered? It strikes me that you are trying to put this problem on already deprived areas because the residents of nicer areas of crawley will be more likely to complain. Otherwise it's a bit of a coincidence that you have chosen Broadfield and Langley Green as choices!
- Would not the use of a Brownfield site with existing infrastructure be more suitable?
- Industrial estate. Off A23 Lowfield Heath. Land from old British Legion Club. Same side as Gatwick Manor between car wash and roundabout going towards Gatwick
- How about a pitch nearer to the new housing development between Bewbush and Horsham or maybe up near the old gas works near Tinsley Green or even in Faygate on the land opposite the Holmbush Pub?
- Would not the use of a Brownfield site with existing infrastructure be more suitable?
- ... Give them a smaller space as law allows located at or near the airport.
- Why can't they go near airport?
- Put them near the airport
- Outside Crawley altogether.

Langley Walk site a better site

- Kennels site is far too isolated from the community. Access on foot is very poor. The Langley Walk site is more included in the community with much better access to facilities.
- The Langley Walk site would have better access to local amenities than the other site.
- This area is not suitable in my opinion because it is directly beside an existing community. Where as the Broadfield suggested site is on the edge of the town. The Langley Walk site is also half the size of the site in Broadfield. Would the Langley Walk site not be on greenbelt land??
- Using the Broadfield site may encourage overspill into the park. Langley Green would be better as within community so better restriction in place.

No provision should be made

- I live in Langley Walk, have worked very hard all my life to buy my house and I am not prepared to have all of that taken away from me. If we have a traveller site across our road we will never feel safe and will live in constant fear of our houses being burgled and our property being vandalised. We will never feel safe to leave our homes unattended. The children here like to play outside, but we will never be able to let them do this for fear of them getting hurt. It will be a living nightmare and we will never be able to sell our properties as no one in their right minds would buy a house opposite a traveller site, our houses would lose value and we would end up in negative equity. We only moved in to our house in July 2012. I am devastated to think that you are considering using this lovely area to accommodate travellers. This is a wonderful place to live. The fields opposite are full of wildlife, foxes, deer, rabbits and many people walk their dogs there. I would be too afraid to walk my dog for fear of her being stolen; I won't even be able to leave her in my own back garden unattended. You are going to be putting hardworking, honest people under undue pressure and already the thought of this happening is making me feel stressed and unwell. I bet not one of you that have been involved in this proposal live anywhere near this area and would not in a million years want a traveller site built at the end of your road! If you go ahead with this proposal you are compromising our safety, our health and our financial status. Think how you would feel if you were to be put in this position. There should not be a traveller site at all in Crawley, be it in Langley Green or Broadfield. It's not fair; we would all be living in constant fear.
- Out of principle, I cannot agree to providing any land for such use and any money being spent on providing for gypsy and traveller sites. I know there are problems with the existing non-arrangements but site provision will not solve the problems, they will just change the type of problems and raise costs.
- No site should be allocated from taxpayers money
- Great just what Crawley needs a travellers site NOT....
- I don't think travellers should be given sites at all
- We don't want them here,
- There should not be any allocated site for travellers in Crawley!
- No way, residents would be gutted.
- Don't want any travellers staying in Crawley
- None do not think we should have to accommodate for them.
- I don't care what anyone says we do not need any more gypsy sites in Crawley, the surrounding areas already provide enough for the gypsy community. Surely if they are travellers should they not be travelling or do they just want to travel out of Gatwick...
- I appreciate they need housing somewhere however they do not respect it when they have it.. it turns into a mess....
- No gypsy/Traveller site in Crawley.....
- I do not believe that Crawley should designate a permanent site
- Not in Crawley at all!
- We don't want gypsies or travellers in Crawley....
- No travellers or gypsy sites whatsoever to be provided in Crawley.

- Don't think we should give them land I am particularly worried about Buchan Park.
- This is a national and country wide problem, Crawley has very limited space for housing and must not be required to provide a site...WSCC should work with Crawley BC to find site (if really needed) I shall be contacting Henry Smith on this subject.
- I disagree in principle with the concept of Traveller sites....
- ... Totally unacceptable.
- Without a doubt No.
- I would hate to see Gypsy sites in the Crawley area, if this happens Crawley will never be the same again and it will be regretted in the future...
- We really do not want Gypsy sites in the Crawley area....
- I don't agree with any permanent sites being allowed
- As a generic rule, travelling sites cause problems in the local communities - whether or not individuals feel that this comment is morally correct or not, history shows it to be absolutely true. It would be unfair, dishonest and completely immoral to impose problems on current resident who have made their home in the area.
- None, why are we paying to accommodate them in out town?!
- No sites should be considered for permanent Gypsy/Traveller sites.....
- There shouldn't be a site at all full stop
- None
- There should be no permanent fixed gypsy and traveller site located on either of these two areas. Land should not be used in this way and such a development in any area will have an adversely detrimental affect on the local areas and town as a whole.
- Stop finding land to build new homes, Crawley is already unpleasant enough
- Don't have any gypsies here
- There is just no need for these developments.
- I disagree strongly.....
- There should not be a permanent gypsy or traveller site...
- I do not see why there should be any reason to encourage gypsy travellers in and around the crawley area!!!!
- There has already been an attempted to set up a permanent area for travellers but they broke their agreement and caused damage and trouble to the surrounding area. I would move out of Crawley if a permanent site was given to travellers, especially if it was Buchan Park which is very close to my home.
- I do not!! want travellers within the area of broadfield.
- No-one wants them anywhere
- Having lived in Edenbridge,Kent for many years, I have seen the problems caused by a permanent Gypsy site and therefore feel strongly against this idea for crawley.
- If this site is picked I will sell up and leave the town of Crawley, never to return."
- We should not have permanent Gypsy & traveller sites

- I don't agree that any sites should be used for a permanent gypsy and traveller site

Are they still considered to be travellers if they don't travel?

- As an aside, if they have settled in Crawley for more than one generation are they still considered travellers?
- Gypsy / travellers are just that and I have always understood this their lifestyle choice. If they have a fixed site they will not be 'travellers' anymore....
- If they are 'travellers' then they should travel, if they're not travelling then they are not travellers....
- But why are they called travellers? If they want to settle why don't they buy houses like everyone else if they don't want to TRAVEL??
- Traveller sites are by their nature "short stay" for Travellers so they wouldn't want to settle there, I'm assuming this is more a rest stop?
- There aren't any the point of travellers• is that they do not stay on one fixed location, so why do they need as site?
- Gypsies want it 3 ways, temporary sites for the ???, permanent van sites and housing. They are not travellers if they stay in one site.
- Having permanent sites for gypsy and travellers is a contradiction in terms. However, overall I have no objections to sites being established around Crawley so long as the gypsy and traveller community pay council tax.
- Why do we need to provide a fixed site for 'travellers'. Either they are travellers or they are not. Why should we provide the best of both worlds for a way of life they chosen. We object most strongly to a fixed traveller's site anywhere in the uk.
- Well they wouldn't be travellers if they had permanent fixed sites
- They are Travellers so they should keep travelling. It's what they chose to do....
- Travellers should keep on travelling

Comments made about Langley Walk site

- Land North of Langley Walk, floods every year and overflows on to road. Strongly against works to be done on this land, since more houses have been built on land in Walnut Lane road floods more to the point footpath and road can not be used.
- There are horses on the land in Langley Green and they should not be kicked of the land ...
- Langley Walk with the nearby access road are already not safe for vehicle there are permanent obstruction on the road (too many cars parked irresponsible on the verge which the council doesn't care about the constant complaint) rushetts road has been taken as a short cut by too many driver in the morning is impossible to come out of the driveway just waiting for a fatal accident to happen you have already authorized a bed & breakfast house on the corner without due reason to parking congestion it causes

- Langley Green access road is too small, and is a very quiet residential area....I really feel for these poor residents. Not only that building this near other people's homes will decrease the value of houses. This is a FACT as I no people who have had there house values and have been told with just the consideration of the area they will never get what there house is worth.
- We need to keep some 'green' areas for: wildlife habitats, flood protection, areas for recreation for children & families, dog walkers etc. etc. Crawley has already had considerable 'green' areas consumed by new builds and is gradually becoming a concrete jungle. Langley Green itself has already had four major builds within the last for years. If you pack residents in too tightly you create problems, social tensions, vandalism and crime rates rise.
- Langley walk has houses right next to the fence of the planned area. Their garden would back onto the gypsy site. The road way is narrow and it is a quiet residential area.
- It would be an environmental hazard, and with the position of a new runway coming for Gatwick, this will be in very close proximity to any new development in this area.
- Bad access and only through housing estates.
- Bad access. Middle of housing estate. Do any of the people involved in planning actually live in Langley Green? I can guess the answer to that one.
- Too near airport. Bad access. will spoil surrounding countryside and wildlife. caravans will be passing through housing estates at all hours. Try putting this site elsewhere....
- I think it interesting that for the Langley Walk site you consider that it may be unsuitable due to noise levels from Gatwick, does that not apply to homes?
- Why do we have to accommodate Gypsy & Travellers in this area! I live in Langley Green and have already had to endure a Hindu Temple opposite my House which the residents were against it! It still went through.Find a large field somewhere away from residential areas if you are determined to accommodate them.....
- The surround road is very narrow, the area floods and became very boggy
- Potentially, this could cause an increase in traffic on narrow roads which already suffer at busy times. Also, there is the risk of an increase in noise in a quiet residential area....
- Langley walk is essentially a one lane road because of all the parked cars and caravans would be too large to go down it. Both area have good wildlife and it is not clear these even is a need for a gypsy park.

Integration

- If an integration of the gypsy and traveller communities is one of the aims for 2029 more needs to be done about the local's attitude and awareness of these communities before utilising such nice open spaces. Also more needs to be done to address the Gypsy and Travellers cultural attitudes towards waste etc before permanent pitches are made on such nice areas of land and in such close proximity to local communities.

- With gypsy and Travellers the biggest challenge is to integrate them and create opportunities for them to genuinely participate in the city. It's about urbanizing people not urbanizing land...
 - Travellers do not integrate with the community....
 - Both these sites will cause too much animosity in an already tense area. And there would be no way of integrating the traveller people effectively
- **Concerns about how a site would be managed**
 - This site should only go ahead if they are going to pay towards the site (council tax), rubbish collection etc.
 - Travellers regularly appear on TV and openly admit/brag that they do not pay their way, i.e. taxes, utility bills etc and rip off local people. The only way they should be allowed a permanent site is if they pay council rates up front in advance and with regards to utilities they should be issued with a top up key.
 - Neither site is suitable. A criteria that appears not to have been taken in to account is the possibility of illegal extensions to these sites. This has happened at a number of sites during the past, most notably at Dale Farm in Basildon. This possibility should be designed out at the planning stage; fences and banks can easily be removed overnight behind both proposed sites to facilitate illegal occupation. The removal of such trailers sited illegally can be exceedingly expensive to local authorities with legal & policing costs rising to millions of pounds. The only way to prevent this would be to enclose the site with other buildings.
 - ... Are the council so stupid that they think "10 fixed sites" will mean anything other than 100 crammed in caravans.

Site unsuitable – too small

- It too small in Broadfield
- Not enough space for accommodation.

Other

- That site would be much better used as a family eateries/ public house like what Tilgate park has which would bring in business to the area, plus this could have a plus side like Bewbush got rid of the Dorsten and it improved the area get rid of the imperial and turn this into flats and hopefully that would help improve that shopping parade
- I do not think that land next to open space such as golf course or forest is suitable for either traveller site or other housing development.
- Please take a look at the position of the permanent traveller site just off the A12; between Kessingland Village and Lowestoft, Suffolk. It is separate from any other residential areas. Enabling privacy and security to both travellers and residents. I think the residents of Crawley should always be the first and main concern of the council.

- I just received an information about the Broadfield kennel sites last night 30/06/2013. Just wondering why the council forward planning did not disseminate the information earlier than last minute.
- Why do we need two sites?
- It is my view that this possibly more contentious issue will distract from the need to make a robust response to the whole Planning Strategy itself. CBC forward planning department (FPD) also needs to encourage residents to view documents and make their responses, complaints and views known directly to CBC, their MPs and their CBC Councillors and engage fully in consultations. FPD must ensure that all information needed to do this is made available to the residents through the websites, notice boards and from Councillors and the Office.
- Don't know of any suitable sites in Crawley.
- Everyone has a right to live their life in their own way, but I cannot think of a suitable site within the borough. It is stated that the Langley Green site will be exposed to airport noise. There are a number of issues concerning how these sites operate including the noise and pollution caused by generators. I do not think it is suitable to have a site near existing housing or a country park.

Comments about the proposed site at Broadfield kennels

- 606 people submitted the same response to this aspect of the consultation – please see below

Crawley is not a suitable town to accommodate permanent Gypsy and Travellers site given its central location; fast access to motorway, A23 & A264; and close proximity to Gatwick Airport. This would mean that more Gypsy & Travellers would be attracted to the town than the allocated provision, which would result in illegal placements and increased littering and anti social behavior and traffic. The proposals are for 10 fixed pitches (not caravans) this would go up as families expand.

The Town is already under heavy pressure from housing developments and added demands on its schools, health and other services, which are already, outreached their capacity against demand. CBC's finances have seen some far reaching cuts in last few years. How this extra cost will be met where existing services to the residents are marginalised? Both proposed sites are on green fields; Broadfield Kennels would have adverse effect on wildlife, Bio-diversity, waterways and wider implications on access to and from the site. It is my view that this possibly more contentious issue will distract from the need to make a robust response to the whole of the Planning Strategy itself. CBC forward planning department (FPD) also needs to encourage residents to view documents and make their responses, complaints and views known directly to CBC, their MPs and their CBC Councillors and engage fully in consultations. FPD must ensure that all information needed to do this is made

available to the residents through the websites, notice boards and from Councillors and the Office.

Broadfield Site – those people who DIDN'T KNOW whether it was a good site or not

Comments about the Langley Walk site

- Land is liable to flooding
- Problems at Langley Walk with flooding - this year has been particularly bad.
- Flooding - there is a high risk of constant flooding in the area. Any new properties or travellers site will increase the run off for the area and increase the risk of flooding.
- There is a high risk of flooding. Water runoff will be an issue, clean water drains and sewerage would need to be increased.
- The area is prone to flooding.
- The area is prone to flooding.
- This land is NOT suitable, it floods.
- Reasons: flooding.

Site unsuitable – wildlife and environment

- This area has nice fields and is not suitable for a gypsy camp. Keep the green areas and develop brown field sites.
- Living in close proximity to this proposed site, I strongly feel a fixed Gypsy and Traveller site here would negatively impact upon my existing quality of life. During any spare time, my family and I enjoy walks in and around this area which is the only green belt in close proximity to where I live where I can enjoy a little peace and quiet. Parking and infrastructure are already stretched to the maximum in this area
- Environment - the area is ancient historic woodland and the surrounding area is also designated as one of outstanding natural beauty.
- The area is ancient woodland and designated as one of outstanding natural beauty and a nature conservation area.
- Will spoil the wild life.
- Loss of wildlife, threat to mature oaks.

Site unsuitable - noise

- This area already suffers from noise pollution from Gatwick Airport; Travellers seem to play loud music incessantly.
- This area at Langley Walk is a potential site which may be significantly adversely affected by noise levels from Gatwick Airports operations.

Gatwick Airport therefore does not consider the site to be an appropriate location for a housing allocation.

- Infrastructure - an intolerable burden will be placed on the existing community.
- Gatwick Airport - if a second runway is given the go ahead, there will be a dramatic increase in noise pollution and public health issues due to additional kerosene discharge from increased aircraft movements.
- If the Gatwick Airport 2nd runway goes ahead this site will be blighted by noise pollution. Health issues due to kerosene discharge from Aircraft. The Langley Green site is half the size of the Broadfield Kennels site for the same 10 pitches.

Site unsuitable – Access/ traffic

- Access is limited
- Access to the side would be difficult.
- Site unsuitable. Poor access also
- Access to Langley Walk is already very congested
- Access from Langley Walk and surrounding areas - the road infrastructure is not capable of taking any more traffic. Langley Walk is very narrow without pavement on one side. It is totally unsuitable for any heavy traffic to undertake any construction work.
- Langley Walk already has parking issues. More housing, etc would add to this congestion.
- Concerns regarding access to the site, Langley Walk is a cul-de-sac.
- The road infrastructure is not capable of taking more traffic. Access to the site whilst under construction is unsuitable for heavy vehicles.
- Access via Langley Walk is limited with the road being narrow.
- Langley Walk is a narrow road and should not be developed further.
- This site is too close to homes. Junction of mulberry road and Langley walk already busy as used as a cut through.
- Road is difficult as it is.

Site unsuitable - infrastructure

- Capacity at local school. Children from the local area are already being sent to schools across the town. Utilities will have to be provided at Langley Walk.
- There may still be a problem with the provision of school places.
- School capacity will.
- Too close to already well built up area. Existing amenities and infrastructure already under pressure.
- Will impact negatively on existing infrastructure and housing prices in nearby vicinity.

- There have already been electrical power problems in Langley Green due to underground cable burning out; this will only exacerbate the problem.
- Poor infrastructure, overload on local amenities.

Site unsuitable – negative impact on community

- Close to housing and children's play centre.
- This suggestion is absolutely wrong, what about those people living directly opposite the site?
- Also, on a personal note, I have had dealings with travellers before - they are noisy and messy, they have little regard for the law and little or no respect for those non-travelling folk. I take my toddler down to the playing fields and play area down on Langley Walk. I can imagine that play park becoming an undesirable place to take your children.
- Too close to existing housing and community that consists of a large number of elderly residents who already find noise and loud youngsters playing in small areas around housing sites stressful.
- Far too close to existing well built up area and housing. ..Security implications are also highlighted.
- and Langley Green is over crowded, with much street litter and parking problems, making the area run down without exacerbating the problem.
- Langley walk is right next to existing housing ... not even a twenty metre gap of open space.
- House prices will fall considerably meaning we will be in negative equity making it virtually impossible to ever be able to move.
- When we had travellers in Cherry lane they completely spoiled our fields so I did not want to walk around there with my family.
- Being on the edge of Buchan Park/Forest - possibility of rubbish being dumped taking in to account gypsy's occupations(s) local residents could also be uneasy
- This site is adjacent to established residential housing; the occupants are all too familiar with way of life of the Travellers. To have to endure a Travellers site so close permanently would cause tension and distress.

No provision should be made in Langley Green

- As a resident of Langley Green/Ifield I am getting fed up with everything being put onto our doorstep we are already a very diverse neighbourhood and have our share of facilities i.e. new Mosque, Psychiatric hospital, new Temple The house prices in my area have already fallen and looking online since the travellers site proposal has fallen another 5% are we to be compensated for this? Also if the new expansion for Gatwick goes ahead won't the money spent building this/ putting in amenities, widening roads be for nothing?. This area proposed is in the middle of a residential area that will have a huge impact.
- I object very strongly to the notion of building a traveller site at Langley Walk.

- As we live on the road to the said land we know the area very well and there foresee a definite problem with access and travel. Langley Walk at present has a lovely countryside a peel (the reason many of us residents set up home here) to it. Horse riders, dog walkers, joggers, ramblers and cyclists use our walk daily. With this proposal and the ridiculous housing proposal (why no room to add our thoughts and concerns on your previous page?) our road will become unsightly and unbearable with noise, disturbance & safety concerns regarding the amount of traffic.
- Why not use land at Poles Lane for gypsies
- This area of Langley Green is a particularly affluent and quite pretty part of Langley Green. It is common knowledge that gypsy sites have a detrimental effect on people's perceptions of an area, property prices will be reduced and amenities (that are already stretched) will be further impacted.
- That side of Langley area has already being overdeveloped with the addition of new flats opposite Squirrel Close and those on Rushetts Road near the parade. Besides, the roads in that area are quite narrow with heavy amounts of on the road parking. There is too much congestion and not enough parking as it is without adding the potential of 20 extra vehicles - probably vans.
- There is limited road access to the proposed site in Langley Green with quite narrow roads and considerable road parking which makes access to the site very difficult with large caravans and vehicles. The location is extremely close to a dense residential area and will have an adverse impact on property resale. What impact does the plans for additional runways at Gatwick have on this site. There would be concern over noise, mess and anti social behaviour - How will the council control this and monitor it to stop the site being expanded by the travellers
- Gypsy site already tried in Langley Green a few years ago near to recycling centre, the adventure playground was burnt down, horses released from farm stables and various other anti social acts. We already have to put up with a noisy airport on our doorstep and a strong possibility of a second runway being built close by. It would not stay 10 fixed pitches....
- The area identified at Langley Walk is only half the size of that at Broadfield Kennels for the same number of pitches.
- I realise that councils are obliged to house gypsies but don't agree with it With regard to Langley Walk it is very near Cherry Lane where children play football etc parking could be a huge problem, plus dumping of rubbish, there are also horses kept nearby. There is also lots of housing around here therefore not fair on residents as the housing prices would drop hugely. There is so little greenery around this area it would be unfair to take away what little there is.
- In addition it is a lovely area of Langley Green and residents are against the site.

Broadfield is the better site

- Broadfield - no knowledge of the local area but there are utilities already available at the kennels.
- Broadfield Kennels is a site of last resort. What would happen to the existing kennels. How would Buchan Park be affected - which is not even meant to be in Crawley's borders and is well used by people in Crawley and Horsham.
- The site at Langley Walk is within an existing community, that at Broadfield Kennels is not, we believe that travellers themselves prefer to be further away from residential properties.

Alternative site – away from built up area

- Any further building and incorporation of identified fixed Gypsy and Traveller site on only green belt still locally available for neighbourhood recreational and countryside exposure between housing and airport will negatively impact on prices of existing housing in the area and quality of life.

Alternative sites

- Why the hell would you want to do this? Surely there must be better sites. How about Stephenson's Way for a traveller site? Nobody lives next door to that site.
- Too close to residential area. Should be at Pease Pottage well away from the town.
- There are large parts of manor Royal Business Park unoccupied - is there any space that could be used there for a small site?"
- The site labelled '5' at Stephenson Way Industrial site, as a housing site, should be considered just as much as these above sites. Gas holder site could also be considered.
- Industrial estate.....
- The area by business units by roundabout near Gatwick by farm. If we have to have one.
- Please explain why the gypsy and travellers cannot be housed at Pole Lane site.
- There are several large vacant sites on the Manor Royal estate that have been unoccupied for a number of years.
- Surely there must be a better site that is more suited away from close communities.
- One of the ones you don't consider suitable for housing. Gypsies have their own transport, don't need normal access to work etc, and aren't bothered by noise/pollution as they stick their caravans anywhere. ...

Seems ok

- Will be ok as long as not impacting too much on being able to access Buchan Park or cherry lane fields

No sites should be found in Crawley

- No alternative sites to be in the Crawley area

I need more information

- I know very little about the Gypsy and Traveller community and would prefer to have some idea of what their requirements would be before making a decision on either of these sites.
- I think there should be a space but don't know which would be best as both have issues (access and noise)
- Broadfield site could make the travellers feel more isolated from the rest of the community. Is this something they prefer? To what extent are they a travelling community that want stopping off points for a few days at a time? Or are they looking for a fixed site where they stay for long periods - or permanently? If what is needed is a stopping off point, then perhaps Broadfield site is more suitable, providing the access can be organised.

This group should not be treated differently

- It is discriminating to have ghetto sites for travellers. We don't have 'sites' for other ethnic minorities in the town - it is not right. Travellers housing needs should be dealt within the same way as everyone else's - through council housing list
- I am not familiar with these sites

Other

- The West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service have a responsibility under the Fire Services Act to accommodate any future development and the current and future strategies will be designed to manage the risk appropriately
- I will be leafleting the local area to ensure others are fully aware of the situation and make their feelings known, which I am sure will be similar."
- Langley Walk site might be more suitable for housing - has this been considered as a possibility?
- If these travellers want to be travellers then let them travel.

Appendix C - Cemetery

Comments made regarding the proposed site of a new cemetery at Ewhurst playing fields

People who said yes thought...

It is needed

- Seems a 'no brainer'. If snell hatch is full and we want a cemetery in the town then this has to be a good proposal.
- Every person has the right to be buried in the town where they have spent their life. Providing a place for people to come and pay their respects is a good way to ensure that certain areas are maintained to a certain standard. A cemetery is not an offensive or disrespectful site and could potentially be used by many community members.
- We need a new cemetery
- I agree that Crawley needs a new cemetery.
- It is a good idea. People need it. To be buried near family. Near their locality to go to memoried their death.
- Seems to me to be a good idea it's got to go somewhere, toilets are there also a church, easy access to main road on the way to crematorium
- Necessary because of the growing population in Crawley and the plan to build thousand of houses just makes it a priority.

If that is the only site ..then I agree

- I would prefer it to be elsewhere however if that means going out of town then I would consider this option. Although if another place does become available then I would like to consider it.
- If another location in Crawley can be consider then that is preferred however if not then I would rather the cemetery stay in town.
- If another location can be found in Crawley then it preferred however rather then going out of town I would then keep it here. But still not an ideal place for it
- If this is the only area suitable I think it will be important to some to have a central cemetery for paying respects, however from a personal viewpoint I would be happy for a new cemetery to be outside of the town.
- Would rather see a cemetery here than houses, least the residents of lfield wont get disturbed by there new neighbours.
- No concerns. Better than houses!
- I would prefer it to be else where however as it is proving difficult to find another site in town then this site is better then going out of town. If another site becomes available then I would like to consider that and then give my opinion.

- If another site becomes available in Crawley then I would like to consider it. I have selected yes only because I do not want it to go out of town otherwise I would have selected no as I do not really agree that it is a suitable place for a cemetery.
- Whilst I feel it would be a great shame to lose such a decent area of "free space" which is regularly used by a great many members of the community, I do agree that the need for another cemetery does need to be addressed for obvious reasons.
- Although not ideal at all, I understand that this has to be done and that it has to go somewhere. It just seems a shame that it is proposed that so many open green areas and playing fields may be lost.

Alternative sites

- Could the land at the side of Goffs Park just over the railway line from Snell Hatch be utilised first?
- Maybe alternative near crem. Balcombe Road area.
- East of Balcombe Road would make a good cemetery.
- I would say yes but I would say Site 7 Tinsley Lane equally has good bus routes to it and has enough drains on it for toilets in several locations & the dust from the industrial units next door won't worry people. and the deer living in Summer. Wood would be safer without people living up close to them.
- Can this proposal not be incorporated into the NE sector development?
- But I suggest to look outside the borough for burial grounds also. This is in my view a viable alternative. Land in Crawley is scarce and we need any spare land to build homes for Crawley people (affordable homes not private)
- Although 'yes' also look at other sites within and outside the boundaries of Crawley
- I am unaware of the soil conditions but the land near the crematorium near Forge wood not suitable?

Good central location

- The site would probably be a good location for a new cemetery especially as it also has the bushes already surrounding the proposed area.
- I agree with the new siting, it is central for those people that will access the cemetery, the flooding at Snell Hatch is beyond belief, when I visit Snell Hatch after the rain, I have to wade to the plot,

Proximity to existing cemetery

- Proximity to existing cemetery makes this site seem best option.
- Seems a sensible place, much needed and close to existing site.

Don't forget the leisure use in the design

- Alternative, improved sports facilities should be provided in a new area to compensate for the loss of this facility.
- It would be a shame though to lose the facility of sports and play over the entire area and I feel it should be considered as to whether part of this area could remain as a playing field.
- Although the playing fields are well used, it is hoped that the proposed cemetery would only be built in stages, to allow for the gradual relocation of the sports facilities.
- Only 50% of this land should be used for this but we still need to keep a park here.
- We need to make provision for our town's future, the playing field is barely used and those who do use it can use the Ifield Playing field off of Rusper Road.
- Ifield has a variety of parks/playing areas, so this would not mean taking all these areas away from the local residents.
- Yes BUT only if other playing fields are enhanced in Ifield - playing field facilities must not be reduced - it is not the way to go.
- I can understand the argument for placing the cemetery where you have but the prospect of all the playing field being taken up is a shame, would there be a solution to only designate up to 3/4 of the space for cemetery use thus preserving some recreational use?

Not worried about losing recreational space

- Don't really think it should be used for sports as people like peace when visiting the cemetery.
- We currently have a few recreational areas in Cawley (if you don't build houses on them!) so extending a cemetery so local residence can be laid to rest is a good idea.
- There is a set car park and good access routes to/from the site and the area is large enough to last a long time. I can see no reason not to have this here the field are used by dog walkers and a couple of football teams which could easily go elsewhere.

Don't forget to screen the site

- If this is the only place it could be it would be nice if it wasn't visible from the road. Seems a bit too central.
- Site must have discreet screening from main road to provide barrier from the view and noise of the A23.
- The area should be enclosed with fast growing/tall trees to obscure the graves from the homes overlooking the area. That would mean tree planting along the back of the houses along The Mardens and in front of Ifield Drive. This should be a serious consideration please; otherwise there is no objection for the site to be used as a cemetery in the future.
- Also - consideration should be given to any residents who may suffer, e.g. views of the cemetery from their houses, or a drop in property value. The

new cemetery should be landscaped in a way that there is a border of high shrubs and trees on the lfield side.

Ideas about how the site could be used

- CBC need to ensure that there is sufficient provision is made for faith based burials e.g. Muslims and Jews.
- Implement a rule that a note is put on each existing grave, if it is not removed within one calendar year, and the grave is claimed, fig it up, burn any remains and store the ashes within a large building with plaques on the walls and then reuse unused graves for new deaths.
- I would like to see head stones standing or laying down (there are little drawings of the head stone on the survey)
- The layout I agree with my Husband
- Possibly a pedestrian link between Snell hatch and new site.
- There should be thought given for those who would prefer a GREEN burial as the nearest field is miles away and getting there defeats the whole E.C.O. ethics

No to housing

- At least it wouldn't mean even more housing in already-full-to-capacity lfield.
- I would rather it wasn't and that people were encourage towards cremation however I would rather the site remain greenish rather than housing.
- At least here it would stop any more housing on this plot of land.

Think about the impact on local residents

- Point well made. I don't plan on being buried so not a problem for me but looking outside my box; this is a question best asked to those that live beside the site.
- I know the area well only one set of flats overlook the site so there will be minimal disruption to locals.
- Compensation should be given if it can be proved property values have dropped.
- Existing car park would need extending as it gets very busy when parents are delivering and picking up pupils of St Margaret's school. The Mardens is full with cars at these times and congestion is common.

Other

- In respect, the playing field are so many Crawley, yet we have not produce and International start any sport apart from Box. Therefore make a good use of the land for the cemetery good ?? with the existing cemetery.
- People should be encouraged to use cemeteries in neighbouring towns.

People who said no thought...

Don't take our playing fields/ green space

- It seems slightly immoral and depressing building a cemetery opposite an old people's home and using land that is needed for the local school and our local children to remain active and healthy.
- Using playing fields would mean less space for community sports, football, green areas.
- If Crawley has no statutory duty to provide a cemetery why are we doing so. As we are so short of suitable green land and the pressure is on over the coming years for very more housing should we not fight to keep our much needed space for recreation.
- Further development of playing fields should be avoided if at all possible.
- As space in Crawley is so precious/scarce, can we afford to use ground in this way?
- We have very limited open spaces in Crawley as it is; you are taking away more green fields and building on every available space.
- This country already lacks the open playing areas and now you want to take yet more away! This is absolutely ridiculous! You also state that sports will only be able to be played for short term, where are people supposed to go then to walk their dogs, exercise, play sports, and enjoy the open space and fresh air once you take over the whole area with a Cemetery which is not welcomed?
- The ***** council are already taking away all our playing fields, and the ***** county council are selling off school fields.
- Keep the playing field for the people of Crawley.
- There are not enough playing fields in Crawley so using one for a cemetery is not an option.
- Do not take anymore green space.
- Yet another Playing Field to be taken away from the youth of Crawley
- A new cemetery should not be placed in Ewhurst Park because it is essential to keep the green land we have to keep kids active and to avoid turning into a concrete city like Croydon!
- In my view the recreational facilities of the town should not be converted for other use.
- Ewhurst Playing fields have been there for the use of the living since the building of Crawley by the New Town commission and to take it away now would be a crime .As for what the local residents & Councillors think of this proposal just wait & see.
- At a time when there is an identified need to improve the health and fitness of our young people, how can you even consider removing this facility? Is it really a good idea to suggest that sports should continue alongside a cemetery? Neither party would consider that to be acceptable - the noise and bustle of football etc is hardly conducive to the (expected) peace AND quiet of a place of rest.
- I do not feel this is a good idea, do you not feel that enough playing fields are being lost already. Ewhurst playing field is by far the best soccer pitches

in Crawley with fantastic drainage and just about suitable parking for the fields and the near by school.

- Activities for kids are limited and areas should remain for family sports
- Losing a valuable recreation space such as this would be a real shame, as it is always so well used by the local community.
- Taking a recreational ground for this purpose does not seem sensible considering the lack of alternative areas for general outdoor activities.
- Leave the playing fields alone.
- We are losing many green areas already. With government encouraging people to exercise more to combat obesity levels, green spaces like this must be preserved for Crawley's rapidly expanding population.
- There are few enough sports fields in the town without using this site.
- But most of all losing another green area is totally unacceptable, especially with all the new flats being built in Crawley which do not have access to a garden.
- But most of all losing another green area is totally unacceptable, especially with all the new flats being built in Crawley which do not have access to a garden.
- Please leave our playing fields alone!
- There seems to be an attack on playing fields . There must be more suitable sites for this other than losing another playing field
- Loss of playing fields such a precious commodity
- This Playing field was considered by the planners of the new town in the 50's to be an important part of Crawley's recreation and open space and has served us well for many years. It is totally unacceptable to deny future generations of young and older people the opportunity of enjoying this playing field for a whole host of recreation activities. To destroy one amenity to provide another is criminal in my view and this crazy idea should be rejected.
- This site is totally unacceptable to Ifield residents. It takes away a vital green space that is highly used and the only space available to people living in that area without travelling some distance.
- This is a playing field for the local people, the only one left would then be in Rusper Road which is within the plans for housing. The people of Crawley require their own green spaces.
- This is important playing field and the air ambulance has landed here before. No access to this site from the other cemetery. Surely we should build a cemetery at the crematorium.
- As an existing open space for all recreational needs for the residents of Ifield, I would be appalled if this site was turned into a cemetery.
- No council should consider building on this playing field we are running out of green space across Ifield & Ifield West as it is.
- Protect recreational space.
- We need to retain as much parkland and green space as possible and no one wants to live next to a cemetery so why stick it in the middle of housing.
- Totally against the original ideas of Crawley New Town when it was built. This is green land for children and people to enjoy.

- Playing fields within the town should not be developed. I do not believe this can be the ""only suitable site"" as you state. You should consider further and look wider a field if necessary.
- We cannot lose anymore playing fields.
- We cannot afford to lose more playing fields.
- I do not think they should use this site as it is recreational ground for children
- The area as it states is a PLAYING FIELD and is used for recreation purposes for the community.
- As we should be keeping the playing fields for our children to become healthy citizens
- I think it would be better to use land that is not recreational.
- It needs to be kept as playing fields for children to play on
- Community green spaces/playing fields should not be considered for the new location of a new cemetery. The Government and the Health services are always talking about the rise of childhood obesity, therefore to take away this popular playing field makes no sense at all. If we lose our green spaces we will become a concrete jungle like Croydon.
- We are encouraged to take more exercise and there is general concern about the increase in obesity in our children and at a time where school playing fields are being sold off for development, housing or super markets, we should be looking to maintain these sports fields for the use for which they were developed.
- We are losing more and more green space in current residential areas which is NOT acceptable and should be challenged. I do not live in this area but object as this will impact everyone in the short and long term!
- Too many recreation grounds are being taken away!!!!
- I believe the benefit of local sports facilities, which can be used every day by the residents, outweighs the inconvenience of having to travel outside of town to visit a cemetery. From my personal experience, people only visit cemeteries on significant dates- 2 or 3 times per year.
- We must do all we can to keep our green areas available for future generations otherwise we will find ourselves with a lot of residents and no space for activities. We do not want an unhealthy town and we should encourage residents to use the fields.
- NO RECREATION SPACE OR GREEN SPACE should be used for anything other than it was intended when Crawley was developed.
- This land is in the middle of an existing residential area and is currently used as playing fields. I strongly disagree that ANY green space that is STILL available should be LEFT for the purpose that it was intended and for the obese society that we are becoming.
- The government's policy is to make the population fitter and leaner. How is the loss of open spaces helping? With more and more housing the green spaces are precious.
- Loss of sporting facilities particularly for youngsters.
- How can we encourage our children to get fit and enjoy the outdoors when you taking away all the local free playing areas.

- Crawley is very populated and it would be unfair to all the residents that live here to deprive them of open playing fields and areas for a vacant space such as a cemetery.
- Like so many of the proposals, the council seem to be considering all the current Playing fields/recreation areas, it is no wonder our children have weight/fitness problems if the council take away these areas, also many other people loose areas to relax in, especially now new properties are so small, open areas are going to become more and more important, not less.
- I accept it is urgent to provide a new cemetery site. but not to take Playing fields..
- Playing fields should not be built on for any reason, these should be left alone.
- Ifield & Langley Green have already suffered from a number of building developments in recent years; housing developments in Ifield Green, Friston Walk, new hospital & community buildings in Langley Green, development of the previous ICC site without even mentioning the proposals for further housing & a travellers site in Langley Walk.
- Crawley has a diminishing number of green open spaces, particularly suitable for sports & leisure use and it is important to maintain these strategic gaps/"lungs" to halt the reduction of the local quality of life for the community; of which sports plays a major role.
- This is only park in that part of Ifield.
- Most definitely not, another area where kids play football, how many more playing areas will be taken away?
- Also, Ewhurst Playing Fields should remain as playing fields which are lungs of the town so that the new town can breathe and not suffocate (see 1947 map of town hall).
- Ewhurst playing fields, were put there for the recreation of the people of Crawley and this should not be taken away. We have too few open spaces and to lose this one would be criminal.
- Yet more green space ruined!
- We need to keep our playing fields and green spaces.
- I am tired of playing fields being hi-jacked for other purposes especially when government want children to be more sport active.
- There needs to be playing fields for people to use to encourage a healthy way of living and tackle the obesity problem that seems rife everywhere.
- There is plenty of space in Crawley without taking the playing fields.
- All this area should remain as playing fields. This is development at the expense of recreational space.
- All this area should remain as playing fields.
- I don't believe that playing fields should be used in this way
- Loss of the public playing field and playground for local residents does not seem sensible.
- The idea is outrageous. Once an agreement is made to use this wonderful green space it will be filled up in no time.
- I think this is an unsuitable site for a cemetery as the local community will be losing a very well used public playing field and at a time when the local population is growing, there will be an even greater need for this open space so it should therefore be kept for future generations to use and enjoy.

- Playing fields are essential for children,
- Keep playing fields for playing on.
- Loss of public playing field, which is closest to both Langley Green and Ifield.
- There is already a major obesity epidemic that needs to be addressed. Taking away the few grounds which enable people to live an active life is short sighted and will lead to an increase in deaths, thus requiring a new cemetery site sooner.
- Definitely not there will be loss of the playing fields were kids currently go.
- The playing fields are used all the time and were would you suggest the children of that part of Ifield play???
- I do not think it is in the correct place If The Council continue on using recreation/ green space there will not be any green spaces/recreation left in Crawley for residents & Local Communities to use.
- Ifield has lost Holy Cross, its large playing fields and the Orchard area to development already. The people in the area are against this site. It is important to have open spaces inside the town to break up all the housing in Crawley.
- Local people use local amenities. Crawley was planned as a town with open spaces for people to enjoy. They need to be able to access them by foot and have them situated at the centre of the community.
- I note in the Strategy document that the Breezehurst Drive site contains the words although there is also the option to retain a larger open space for the community to enjoy. It is interesting that the same does not apply to the residents of Ifield and West Green. By using the Ewhurst Playing Fields as a cemetery, you are planning to take away one of the only open spaces between the Town Centre and the western edge of Crawley. This type of space is essential for the well being of the population. You state that if a new site is not found, people will need to be buried outside of the town in the future. I would prefer that option rather than forcing people out of the town to find a green space to enjoy.
- Public open spaces should be kept. If the government wants to encourage a fit and active life style then they need to keep the space to do that. If this park is removed then there is no other local playing fields.
- Loss of public playing field - and football pitches, with further housing developments in the area all open and green play areas will be required.
- This is one of the only playing fields in the immediate area and would be difficult on the younger generation who have fewer and fewer places to play and play sports in a safe environment.
- With more houses being built in the town, it is definitely not a good idea to be taking green space away, as loads more children are needing use of green space. It allows for better community, rather than a cemetery!
- There will be NO areas for our children and grand children to play in, if they keep taking away our green areas
- Ewhurst playing fields are enjoyed by many young and old people, enabling them to exercise and enjoy their sport. Obesity in the young is a major problem in this country, playing fields should be preserved to help fight this serious problem and the Olympics legacy should be encouraged.

- This is the only area for young children can play and have fun. So many things these days cost but this one area they can have picnics , play ball, rounders etc for FREE.
- There is precious little green area in Ifield - the land at St Margaret's has in the past 25 years been massively developed removing play areas from Children. The land was designated a green area when the town had 50,000 people - now there are over 100,000 surely the last thing we need to do is loose this precious area. It is government policy to make people more active.
- Structured groups like football that are keeping children healthy like government policy will all stop. It is no good preaching to children at schools if you're going to take away all their green space to exercise.
- As a long term resident of Crawley, I am sad that more and more of our open spaces are being used for development. I know it is a long time and people need homes etc but if we do not object to these plans, what will be the future for this town!
- First and foremost, this green space is the second most used area for the local community to play football. Green spaces are there for the people. What about the Olympic pledge about more playing fields for communities? Not less
- We object to the current proposal at Ewhurst playing fields as it is again taking away our local (very much used) playing field. Reasons we gave previously on this questionnaire regarding using playing fields apply.
- I would also like you to consider that once our fields have gone that's it there is no coming back from that.
- I think Ewhurst playing fields are well kept and well used, I appreciated by locals, give many children, young people a good playing area. This is a very busy area, especially at school times, I therefore object to this proposal
- In my opinion the playing fields are for the children and supporting activities, they are used by football teams' regularly.
- Most other older residents in Crawley moved here from far and wide! Not only are the playing fields used for football but they are used by families with young children, dog walkers and for people wishing to keep fit by running around the perimeters. The Children's play area is also very well used.
- This is an area for the living. Many children use this area which should be left for them to play safely.
- This is recreational ground used by people/too close to housing and limited parking/ too close to school
- We need to keep all of Crawley's green spaces green for future generations. If it was right for the previous planners to designate these green places as the towns population expanded, we most certainly need to keep them for the future residents of Crawley.
- There are few enough green spaces around and this area is very residential.
- There are not many open spaces in Ifield and to remove a popular one is not very sensible. Children and adults need open spaces which are free to use for exercise and recreation. The Government is forever citing the increasing obesity of the population so to remove a facility is not a sensible option. The population of Crawley is increasing so we cannot afford to lose our open spaces.

- Why take away playing fields away from children which they have somewhere to play to keep them out of trouble
- Protect Open Space.
- Playing fields should remain as it is
- Playing fields at Ewhurst should remain as it is. You should come every day and enjoy the fresh air here
- Playgrounds are being taken away in Ifield and Bewbush so the Ewhurst Playing Field should be left.
- Government/radio have stressed the need for more exercise and I gather this site is well used for a variety of sports (I used to play tennis there when I was younger and lived in West Green) It used to be used for Crawley Carnivals. Taking all of this in to account - a very bad idea.
- We need green space for the living. We encourage people to get fitter. Do you only mean those that can afford to join a gym and fill the pockets of private commerce.
- Playing fields should be protracted by the council, for us. Which 'person' even thought of threatening our playing fields? Now they've been listed well have this battle every ten years or so. Well done! Obviously this person hasn't seen why Crawley has its green spaces. We do not want to be another London!
- This area was designated over 50 years ago as recreation - and for use of the community as part of the Crawley new town and should stay put for future generations. If house building in Crawley continues - especially ifield - continues it will need as much open spaces as possible.
- Ifield is one of the small areas in Crawley. We already have had two temples built on green space. So leave our football fields alone.
- These playing fields were designated as playing fields in the 1950's when Crawley was beginning. We have had enough of our open spaces in ifield being taken. Our future generation needs open spaces and playing fields.
- The playing fields are vital to keep, especially in such a big & expanding community. It is much more necessary to have fields & play areas for children/adults to enjoy. So many new builds are flat/apartments or very small houses; children need space to run/play etc. A cemetery would not be of a benefit to the local residents (that are living!).
- This again [is] another playing field, so I disagree strongly. But basically on a more serious note you can't keep taking the playing fields.
- Keep the playing fields.
- How can the young be encouraged to partake of outside sports/activities if we keep taking away playing fields?
- I am appalled that the Council has ever considered the idea of using any of the town's recreation grounds for a cemetery or housing. With the projected increase in the number of young people in future it would be a criminal act to deny them the opportunity for physical recreation and sport. The Council should be encouraging more people to take more physical activity.
- What has happened to the Olympic Legacy? Shame on you!
- The Ewhurst playing fields should be left as playing fields which is what it was designed for. It is in regular use by young and old alike for exercise and leisure pursuits.
- Please keep playing fields for people to use

- The loss of valuable [space] for playing fields for the young and old
- Open green space which is lacking in this area for the general public
- I do not believe we should be losing sports facilities replacing with such a use as a cemetery.

Ewhurst Playing field is well used

- This is a well used space and should not be designated for a cemetery.
- This playing field is well used by the locals as well as other residents of Crawley for football etc.
- This field is used for sports by all ages and the play ground is used by many families.
- If you continue to build on all the fields in ifield then you may as well change its name to Nofields as that's the way it's going.
- It will be taking up valuable land where children play
- We seem to be taking all the children's play areas away .We need to leave them space to play and have a large space in which they can do this.
- Can't believe this site is even being considered, it is an extremely popular playing field and park.
- This area is used by the local community for walking their dogs etc. There is not another play area for children near by.
- Children and adults alike use these fields regularly for sport and recreation - surely this is important?
- This site appears to be well used as a playing field/ leisure area & is too close to residential properties
- The fields are used by many local people for dog walking. There are football matches on thee fields every weekend.
- Ewhurst playing fields: the playing field is used many days for football and children bring trained for football for the future, used a lot for dog runs - children playing which is nice to see.
- These fields are used constantly by children and football teams. By placing a cemetery here it would be the first thing you see as you come off the lfield roundabout and also this field regularly floods.
- This field is the heart of the community and is used throughout the week by clubs. The only field currently available in the area for recreation of the community.
- Valuable playing field. Used more since Ladies Wash and Junior moved onto site. Also used by small groups for play. Families organize games there. Walkers, runners, picnics and people just enjoying the open space.
- This field is in constant use by all ages of people. Families, dog walkers, footballers, school children, shoppers.
- Most of the time it's used a lot for parents and their children, dog walkers, family picnics, football, rugby - it is in constant use. [Would] be a shame to lose it.
- This land is used by local sports clubs, families and dog walkers. This space should be available for these activities to continue. The closest alternatives are too far away. This park is used by not only lfield residents but as it is on

the border of Langley Green and West Green as well, it is used by these residents also.

- This park is used by Dog Walkers and Adult/ Children's Football Clubs, and if the Councillors cared to come and look in the park during the week and especially on a Saturday and Sunday morning they will see that this is well used and loved area of Ifield.
- This is a very important recreational site for families surrounding the area in Ifield, West Green and Langley Green. I am extremely surprised to discover that you are even considering turning this pleasant green space into a Cemetery. I do not believe this can be the only suitable site. Please do not go ahead with this.
- This should NOT be allowed to happen. The playing fields are widely used and this will displace children and adults that use both the fields and recreational facilities here.
- More importantly over 150 girls and boys are playing football every Saturday and Sunday as well as training during the week
- This area is currently used by local people for a number of reasons, Exercise dog walk etc. But more importantly the fields are used by the 2013 Sussex County Girls Football Club the Crawley Wasps Ladies Football club Football is played Wed, Thursday and Sunday. The Crawley Wasps are an excellent advert for Girls Football in Crawley and they consistently achieve well in the FA League football. This open space is much valued & used.
- The location is currently used by children and adults to play and exercise and walk dogs.
- It would be very unfortunate for this facility to be lost. Keep it for the Living especially the Kids who are happy exercising and enjoying life.
- This playing field is well used by football teams of both sexes for most of the year. It is one of the few sports areas that has access to a small dressing room and access also to water. It is well positioned as far as access to the roads is concerned.
- It would be a sad day to see such a frequently used piece of green land used for this purpose. It is used almost every evening for football training and dog walking and for socialising. I believe if too many playing fields are built on that the youth of today are being further restricted in the places they can go which would in turn increase the risk of anti-social behaviour to increase.
- This park is used by Dog Walkers and Adult/ Children's Football Clubs, and if the Councillors cared to come and look in the park during the week and especially on a Saturday and Sunday morning they will see that this is well used and loved area of Ifield.
- The football pitches and park are in constant use.
- The playing fields are an essential local amenity. They are in use from 530am every day by dog walkers, runners and walkers. The fields are also used by a range of youths clubs for football, including children's teams. To replace the fields with a cemetery would be a disgrace. This is a residential area that needs local playing fields. The high level of usage of the fields indicate how valuable they are to the local community.
- This is a well used playing field with park area, and should not be used.

- Apparently plans say that they are going to start burials at the far end of the site and one of the reasons for proposing this site was it already had toilet and parking facilities. Both these facilities are at the School and Retirement home end!
- It is a well use playing field and deserves to be left as is.
- This is used as a football pitch not only by Sunday teams but also by coaching and training for both boys and girls to get them taking up a sport.
- Ewhurst Playing fields are currently well used both by organised sport and the exercising public; it would be a great shame to see them disappear.
- This playing field is well used by the locals as well as other residents of Crawley for football etc.
- Those fields are used by the public as recreation area.
- Ewhurst Playing fields are well used for a number of sporting activities for children and adults. It also includes a well used play area and is used for dog walking. There is no other playing fields nearby for the residents of Ifield to use.
- Where will youngsters and adults play sport, if there are no playing fields left!
- Of the large playing fields areas in Crawley, this has a significant amount of use for the local community on an on-going basis, which should be considered as part of the sporting legacy left by the London Olympics.
- This playing field is in constant use.
- This provides vital recreation space for sportsmen and women of all ages. If it is a cemetery and never should be
- It's an area where children play, there is very little play area and we want our children to be more active so somewhere out of town
- It shouldn't be used. Kids play football there
- There is very little green space left in Crawley. Ewhurst is used by football teams to play on & children play there all the time. Such a popular area I'm unsure as to why this is even a consideration.
- We take our grandchildren over to play also their dog can go as well so we don't want it on our doorstep, I live in jackdaw close which is just through the woods.
- In use by football clubs, dog walkers, walkers and people enjoying green open space.
- This is used by many dog walkers throughout the day and lots of children use the fields for the park and football training and matches.
- The playing fields are used daily by me and my family as well as the local community. Please honour your commitment to project open space for future generations to come. Look after the community and protect our playing fields.
- The playing fields are well used. ALL school playing fields in Ifield have already been built upon. No More.
- This land is a playing field for many sports and is close to a school. I want my children to carry on enjoying playing in the park.
- This is a busy recreation area for the people of Ifield East and West Green.
- This site is often used by dog walkers, joggers, football teams and for casual kick abouts.

- People use the field. If we are to be proud of our greenbelt, we are to embrace it. It serves as recreation space and an aesthetically pleasing site; like many, I think it acts as nice green barrier between Ifield's neighbourhood and the A23.
- This is development at the expense of recreational space, and potentially to the detriment of the local youths health, as it is frequently used for sporting recreational activity.
- Where will children play or train for activities if this will be used for other priorities/ where will children play? Encouraging them to stay indoors?
- This is a playing field? Where will the child be playing when this is gone?
- This is development at the expense of recreational space, and potentially to the detriment of the local youths health, as it is frequently used for sporting recreational activity.
- This would only be a short tem solution and therefore not worth the loss of such a well used playing area.
- The field is widely used by children after school and at the weekend for football and other activities with their parents (ball games, flying kites and recreation of all kinds). there are frequently very small children walking and playing with their parents.
- Exercise should be encouraged to lessen obesity in our young people. Adults can be seen daily walking and others run or use the field for fitness training in the open air.
- Extensively used by children for games including football. Other games are family orientated- cricket, rounders, kite flying etc. Used for dog walking, exercise by both young and old.
- At the weekends many children play organised games, keeping them healthy & out of trouble.
- Playing fields that are massively used at weekends
- This playing field is used a lot by the youth of Crawley were many. Football matches are played and enjoyed by children And their families
- This is a greenfield site that is in constant use, and serves a large population in both Ifield and West Green. The fields are used daily by local people for many different activities. At the weekend, they are fully used for sporting activities. The closest open space behind Sainsbury's is used primarily for cricket, and does not have the capacity to take three football pitches.
- I believe this site has been chosen due to the limited number of houses adjoining the area in the hope that nobody will object. What you have not taken into account is the number of people who use the area.
- This is a very well used public space. People walk their dogs, play football, take out their kids and just relax in the park - it is constantly being used by many people. It is also in a built up area. It would upset local residents and users of the park greatly.
- This green space is used by a lot of young children and should be kept for their use.
- This is a space regularly used for sports and recreation and should not be used as a cemetery. Local residents need these spaces for their current intended purpose.
- This field is regularly used for sports by both organised teams, individuals and dog walkers.

- I feel it would be a great pity to take over the very ancient and beautiful Ewhurst field. The field is used frequently by well organised groups of children as well as by football teams and the town should be proud. I love to take a deck chair out there as we do not have a sitting space in Miffield Court Gardens.
- It is used constantly for sport, for children and adults and keeps children from hanging around and getting up to mischief out of boredom. Can not give any opinion about other parts of Crawley as I have only lived here 5 years and not familiar with other parts.
- The field is used continually every Saturday and Sunday..... There are various clubs who also use the field. I am strongly against the cemetery there put in the playing fields as that of the residents gave the field and they would not ... is the looking at a cemetery there. The government are always getting children to be more active and on the field there are a be of children playing games- a cemetery.... ruin it all
- Everyone needs outdoor space to relax in- it is nice to wander around a sit down on a bench and this scheme would take this away from us. In the summer people like to picnic- play games, walk dogs and generally enjoy open space but the scheme would end this. It is intimated that if the scheme went ahead it would be beneficial to people attending funeral or visiting after because they would be easy access. The crematorium is on the outside of the town (no bus service) but is used far more than a cemetery - so why can not a cemetery be built on the outskirts also? Youths clubs would have to go to West green evidently - are youngsters expected to cross the dual carriageway? All the clubs that used these playing fields love playing here and the car parking is so good.
- Ewhurst playing fields are necessary green space for families to use for leisure activities
- Well used by children, dog walkers, families, people just out for walks
- Playing fields are for children to play in, swings are provided and people take dogs so they can run about.
- The fields are well used by football teams for matches and training. More girls are taking up the sport my great granddaughter aged 9 plays and comes to Ewhurst playing fields from Tilgate
- B) This would deprive the community of much valued recreational space - many organised sports groups use these playing fields as do informal groups. Also used by dog walkers
- This is a very popular playing field with all age groups. Local football and rugby teams use this field for training and for matches. Families use it for recreational purposes. Walkers and joggers together with dog walkers use this field.
- A lot of football and other sports are played there and there are a lot of houses that would have to look at it. It's not the right place.
- The playing field and park is used extensively by the local community, youth football to seniors training and matches, plus dog walkers and fun days.
- This playing field is used by footballers, dog walkers and children at play. During the summer school holidays families picnic on the field.
- Football clubs use this space at the weekend. Not much open green space in this area.

- My son has trained and played football for years on this playing field.
- Also the fields are used for football training and football matches, families and dog walkers
- Ewhurst playing fields should not even be considered. People use them on a daily basis for leisure activities.

The land should be for the living

- If people want to be buried it should be made an expensive option. Why let dead people take up the space that living people should be using.
- There is not enough space in the town to bury people. Preference for the dead over the living is bonkers. If people's religious beliefs mean they have to be buried then they should make private provision for this. I thought there had been separation of church and state a long time ago.
- I feel very strongly that the land should be used for the living; they are called playing fields for a reason!! playing. The dead are dead, and see no reason why a cemetery cannot be found outside of the town in the future. The playing fields will be enjoyed by many people for generations to come, it is important to keep these green areas in the town, we do not want a town where family's and people playing sports, picnic, dog walking etc have no where to go and we are a complete concrete jungle. The dead cannot play football or enjoy these functions and am sure would not be bothered where the cemetery is located.
- This space should be used for housing the living not the dead. Move the existing graves where they are no longer tended and reuse them.
- We need to think about the needs of the living rather than the dead.
- What is wrong with cremation, areas need to be keep for living people to enjoy.
- Children should not lose their playing fields to accommodate dead people and I certainly wouldn't want to be buried in a field knowing that I took space away from the most important use of the land--the children!
- There is no way this playing field should be used as a cemetery, it is needed by the living, and we don't have enough playing fields as it is.
- The land should be for the use of the living not the departed.
- Bury out of town as the living need the open space, children need areas to play. The dead will not mind
- Should the dead, once buried, take precedence over the living?
- People should be encouraged to choose cremation on their deaths.
- Disgraceful. Take away a play area and green space and give it to the Dead.
- Should the living not have priority over the dead!
- This site should be kept as playing fields, It is for the people living in this area, not for the dead.

Look at different ways of managing the dead

- Sanitizing land by using it for cemeteries is also not a good use of a limited resource - cremation is a far better option
- You should encourage people to be cremated rather than buried.
- Regardless of who they are, cremate them or make their relatives pay for a burial somewhere else.
- I suggest encouraging people to be cremated rather than buried - possibly by taxing burial plots.
- I think we should be looking at other ways of disposing of dead bodies being placed in the soil i.e. Cremation for everyone
- I believe Surrey and Sussex crematorium could be expanded to cope instead of using recreation ground...soon recreation will die out altogether and we can just concrete everywhere which seems to be the council agenda...
- Re use plots at Snell Hatch Cemetery like Jewish Cemeteries do in cities across Europe. They dig up remains after say 100 years and reintern the remain in a smaller plot allowing the existing plot to be re used or alternatively put coffins into the ground vertically allowing more burials.
- No way do I agree, this is a beautiful piece of land my grandson loves the swing park. I think this day and age people should think more about cremation, alternatively graves that are close to falling down, so old their crumbling, never visited, should find so way of being used again.
- People should be educated to use the crematorium.
- As it is so expensive many people would prefer to be cremated.
- We need space for the living. The dead should be cremated
- Not enough space to solve the problem in years to come. Snell Hatch can be extended as the original plan provided in Goff's park as was originally intended why the change now?
- I support the idea of removing existing graves (for example those over 75 years old) and re-using this land for new ones.
- Burial of bodies is not a good use of scarce green space in the town. Those who, for whatever reason, insist on this would - I hope - accept the inconvenience of having to travel outside the town. Perhaps a much smaller area for the burial of ashes would be reasonable?
- Also in this day & age we should not be burying people as the land is more important for growing food or building houses. What about burying people standing up you could then get 3 bodies instead of 1.
- As the population expands, cremation should be the only option, apart from religious reasons.
- Cremation should be encouraged even more than it already is. Memorial and plaques can be placed in the cemetery serving the same purpose as a headstone and the crematorium is a lovely place for people to visit and remember their loved ones.
- Being buried is I think a selfish request. It takes up room that as you have rightly said we don't have enough of any more. As much as I sympathize about the problem, I still refuse to let another green space be taken for dead people to be buried in when it is currently being used for children/teenagers to better their health, elderly people walk their dogs and families can enjoy it.... I think that now our town cemetery is full, it should be a choice of - be buried somewhere else, or be cremated and take up 0 space. Simple!

Traffic problems

- Town area is already congested approaching town is difficult.
- Why take away our playing field and cause total traffic congestion with funeral cars. The new housing is already going to create a traffic problem - perhaps doing a traffic count. The excuse of the lfield station being in close proximity is rubbish - eg there is no rail link for the crematorium!!! No No NO
- This is valuable leisure land and would cause traffic problems.
- Residents will be adversely affected by what is already a very busy junction both from Langley Green and also the roundabout from Gossops, Town Centre and the Industrial Estate. Access into lfield is already limited with a small mini roundabout.
- Very close to the school which would cause lots of congestion
- Both lfield avenue and the A23 is very busy especially in rush hour, a slow procession of a hearse and cars going to a funeral could lead to a complete traffic standstill
- Another issue relating to this location is the amount of traffic using the surrounding roads. The boundary at one end of this site falls at the busy junctions of lfield Avenue / lfield Drive and Crawley Avenue. There are a total of four schools and three pre-schools located in lfield Drive and every school term day sees endless queue's of traffic at least twice a day as parents deliver and collect children. Add to this the anticipated general increase in traffic which is bound to arise from the additional housing on the site of the old senior schools in Lady Margaret Walk. It is difficult to see how the addition of slow moving funeral traffic will improve this situation.
- The road access seems extremely dangerous.
- Would think there would be an awful lot of traffic disruption.
- Traffic access & road safety.
- Should be out of town. Help with easing traffic congestion in lfield av already the traffic through that area as increased tenfold
- Traffic issues, already traffic congestion in that area. This has again increased due to new housing. Next to temple and access to airport should be out side town.
- As a parent of a child at St Margaret's School, I am aware of the significant level of school traffic that uses the existing car park that would be transferred onto the surrounding roads. There would be significant safety issues for the local school children of any additional traffic in this area as the current levels of risk are already, I would consider, too high.
- Also traffic is already a problem on lfield Drive.
- Too small a site and too near a roundabout always congested with traffic
- Situated as it is between and increasingly used lfield Drive (traffic) providing access to local primary schools and limited parking close to one these schools (St Margaret's).
- Traffic very busy in this area already.
- Issues around traffic as there are already parking and traffic problems around St Margaret's schools where any increase would add to current issues.

- Ifield roundabout and Ifield drive have traffic congestion in the middle of the day as well as driving rush hours. Traffic will increase when the large housing development in Lady Margaret Rd is completed. The car park is already full during term time and for over flow from the Mardens
- Traffic congestion is a big problem with regards to the school; added traffic would cause chaos
- Transport is horrendous between two main roads. Ifield roundabout is normally grid locked at peak times!
- The surrounding area is totally unsuitable in terms of additional traffic and is also in very close proximity of St Margaret's Primary School which already suffers parking / traffic congestion at the start and end of the school day so encouraging additional traffic to this area would be a very unwise and hazardous decision.
- At least Snell Hatch is mostly nicely tucked away and not visible from the A23. The Ewhurst Playing field is such an open space and highly visible to passers by, and so very close to the residential area, where traffic concerns are already high due to the nearby school and the limited space for parking.
- This site would cause concern for the elderly care residents and so unfair.
- Also schools near by would suffer as the traffic builds up when delivering children and collection them and if funerals were taking place as well which of course sadly is always busy then it would just be chaotic. I am quite sure there is land around to that could be a better location.
- With a school not very far from this location would cause parking and congestion problems to an already busy area.
- With a school not very far from this location would cause parking and congestion problems to an already busy area.
- The current traffic using the road already causes much congestion, with the school and residents in the area.
- The loss of the fields would increase the number of car journeys in the area as people travelled to other sites.
- The school near the proposed site already causes parking issues in the peak times of the day. With the new houses built on Friston Walk, that has already caused more traffic along these roads.
- Finally, the very noisy A23 is right next to it and would make it unsuitable for a cemetery as people prefer silence to mourn and pray for the deceased loved ones - not noisy roads and busy neighbourhoods.
- If this goes through, it would be a disaster... this once quiet road is now a very overcrowded by the nursing home and school.
- The Mardens is also often impassable from traffic due to parents collecting children from school or dropping them off, there is also a thriving church which completely fills the road on weekends and family parking here to visit residents at Melville court.
- Location wise this proposal is also in our opinion unsuitable: Sandwiched in between a very busy dual carriage way and a very busy residential road, plus at one end a block of retirement homes (lovely view it would be for them ?). Not a very peaceful and private cemetery it would be.
- Also the field is well used and the car park is used as a school car park. This would cause a lot of disruption to the local area twice a day at school pick up and drop off.

- In addition, the traffic flow along Ifield Drive does not seem to have been considered. Every morning and evening traffic is jammed up from the mini roundabout at the junction of Ifield Avenue and Ifield Drive all the way past the car park that is going to be designated for the cemetery. This traffic flow is set to increase with the building of 125 houses on the old Ifield Community College site in St Margaret's Road as West Sussex Council has refused access to the A23 their only option will be to use Ifield Drive. At present access to Ifield Drive from Ardingly Close and Findon Road is difficult and will become more problematic.
- road access is very congested at certain times of the day
- Also, it has a lot of traffic if it was turned into a cemetery it would not be a peaceful place.
- What an awful place to have a cemetery right on a very busy road and so near the A23. Cannot believe you are even considering putting one there. It should be a restful place and Ifield Drive is anything but. People drive like lunatics on that road.
- Too close to the schools and relevant parking problems at drop off and collection times
- The playing fields are in the middle of two VERY busy roads with a school next to it and there will be twice as much traffic in Ifield Drive caused by a new housing estate being built on the site of the old schools
- Traffic congestion very bad being major access from A23, linking ifield to town centre, airport, etc.
- Road Access.
- Already heavy traffic on Ifield Drive.
- Thirdly, you state there is already an existing car park on site. This car park is full twice a day for parents to park whilst dropping off and collecting their children from St Margaret's School. In addition it is full on 3 nights a week and most weekends by people using the football pitches together with local people who use the field.
- The traffic on Ifield Drive is extremely busy at all times of the day. Introducing slower traffic will cause severe problems for all users. If the car park is not big enough for multiple funerals, the road will become clogged, impassable and dangerous for the local school, whose entrance is near the existing car park.
- There is not enough parking for funerals and visitors.
- The car park is full twice a day with parents taking and collecting their children from St Margaret's School. The chaos with funeral cars in addition doesn't bear thinking about.
- The existing car park is small and would need to be extended massively to cope with a Cemetery and the large number of cars that attend any funeral.
- Close to a school which already causes parking and congestion problems.
- Mums doing the school run use the car park daily - where would they park if a funeral was in progress
- The car park is full every morning and mid afternoon during term times. You do not state where you intend to start this project; the car park and toilets may not bear the proposed cemetery. Traffic access to Ifield Avenue from Ifield Drive would be more difficult than it is now and at Ifield Roundabout.
- The car park mentioned is quite full at times during school days

- At certain times of the day these would not be adequate parking space as the parents of children at St Margaret's school use the car park. It is really not necessary for the new cemetery to be near Snell Hatch.
- The area is already congested with traffic and the car park next to the field will only hold up to around 10 cars. What will you bring for the residents when there is a funeral and the street is congested with cars parked on the road, blocking traffic?
- Parking is already an issue on my street (The Mardens) with the Church and primary school and a cemetery will only add to congestion.
- The car park is frequently used by footballers, people using the park, used by parents picking up their children from schools nearby.
- c) The car park is not suitable and cars will be parked on Ifield Drive
- No parking at peak times.
- Car park not suitable at least twice a day overflowing with school cars. Staff and visitors use it plus visitors to Millfield Court.
- The car park is used by local schools as parking in the area is a premium.
- It is also mentioned by the Council that this an ideal site as there is already a car park there, which may I add is also used by families dropping and picking their children up from St Margaret's School, and would cause chaos if this couldn't be used during certain times of the day.
- I do not think it appropriate to have a cemetery that close to a school. The parking at the school is already considerably difficult as the school is on a dead end road. Residents are already inconvenienced during drop off and pick up times. If a service was taking place at 3pm, it would cause chaos. The car park is currently used daily. If someone monitored how much the car park is used they could see that this proposal would cause a massive strain on the roads and residents around ifield. The car park is integral to the school. The chances of accidents occurring along the road would be increased as parents would simply let their children out of the car by themselves as they would have no where to park. St Margaret's school does not primarily intake via catchments. Most parents live further out and are forced to drive. Walking is not an option for many parents at this school. That is why the car park is essential.

Negative impact on the local community

- All my windows of my flat overlook Ewhurst playing fields- it is so pleasant but would not like to look out on a cemetery- so depressing.
- It would de-value my property - who would buy a flat overlooking a cemetery? It is very insensitive to have a cemetery next to a retirement block and will have an adverse effect on the value of Millfield Court flats
- Lastly, I do feel this is an insensitive proposal for the residents living in the newly built retirement homes which overlook these playing fields.
- You have built old people's' apartments by the side of this & I feel this is also disrespectful. They will be able to view the plot they will be buried in!! This is a ridiculous proposal, how can the Council even consider this? Are residents supposed to look out of their windows/houses and constantly be reminded of 'dead people'? How is this child friendly? You state there will still be 'some'

space for sports but what children want to go and play next to a cemetery? Children will be too frightened to even visit the field!

- A Cemetery is looked upon as a dark and some what scary and dull atmosphere and place, why would any resident wish this upon themselves or their families? Residents pay their council taxes not for you to bring this upon them!
- Has any consideration been given towards residents of the area? I believe the answer to this is no!"
- Definitely unsuitable. Far too close to the school. Could you imagine burying your loved ones with children shouting and playing out in their school field at break time and lunchtime not to mention sports days and after school sports clubs! Also there is a nursery in the grounds of the school. Crying toddlers etc. Nightmare! I
- This location has elderly retirement flats near it; I think it would be in bad taste to expect elderly retirees to be overlooking their possible final resting place. The site is too prominent; it would need to be landscaped to shield it from view of residents in area.
- I can't believe this is the only site available for a new cemetery. Its location seems totally unsuitable, in full view from a new development of retirement homes and taking away the sports/play facilities that are much used. It wouldn't have any of the quiet atmospheres that make a cemetery a peaceful, reflective place for bereaved relatives to visit. The noise from the bypass would be very intrusive.
- It's a play area and also it's overlooked by a main road at the moment. Not very private.
- One side of the park is overlooked by Ewhurst Road which has both an old people's home as well as all of the houses being occupied by elderly people waiting to take up their places in the proposed Cemetery. This is hardly fair considering that many of them have only just moved there.
- I don't live near this site so personally would not effect me but I believe a lot of residents maybe upset by this and believe a site should be found which does not affect local residents.
- This site is totally unsuitable for a cemetery for numerous reasons. Too close to residential areas including retirement homes.
- I realise that you have to find somewhere to build a cemetery but it is hardly a good site, in the middle of a built up area surrounded by busy roads, close to schools and next to a retirement home.
- Any new cemetery should be on a peripheral location which is easily accessible yet not going to cause problems for local residents as is the case with the proposed Ewhurst field site.
- Where are kids going to play, in the road?
- To put it in the field would not be fair to the existing residents and schools who already have a problem with parking.
- In a residential area, very popular fields with families (one of the most popular in the area), if you take away all the green space, where are our children going to play?
- Plans say initially fields could still be used for play etc until cemetery more full, who would want their children playing by some graves and what grieving

families would want children to play there? Bad bad idea and there MUST be other options in more remote locations

- I don't think a cemetery on a part of public play area is a very good choice. It will be close to a school which is also wrong. The playing fields are used for football matches and there is also a play area which makes this an unsuitable site.
- To close to school children shouldn't see grieving families.
- I visit friend in the Mardens that overlook Ewhurst Playing Fields. One of my friends bought her flat because "the view" was pleasant. She feeds birds and I have seen flooding on this field in wet weather, we watch families walking their dogs. It's safe for children to play football. Personally I would not like this to be the site for the much needed cemetery. I see that the community need it and it is well used. The elderly need to look out and see people.
- Don't want to look out on a cemetery thank you.
- I agree with other residents comments in the area about retirement homes over looking a cemetery being a depressing sight, along with the rest of the comments.
- I would also like to say
- This is a beautiful play ground and walking area don't spoil the area which is used to play and walk. We need some area for children and young mums too. People can be buried outside area. But we need the play area for our children. Next to school you want to create cemetery? Why? Let this happy area HAPPY!
- Apart from the sports use, this green space is used for dog walkers and the like. I believe there's a retirement block of flats overlooking the field so I feel this is insensitive. It maybe accessible, but there's no parking and the road and area is very busy during school times.
- Very insensitive of the planning people to put a cemetery near old people retirement home.
- There is a recently built retirement home complex been built in The Mardens and so that will be for some of these elderly residents 'looking onto their final home'
- Not fair to the young children on their way to school to see a cemetery
- This shows no consideration for elderly people living next to site
- It's very insensitive to build a cemetery next to old age home. Also I don't like the idea of having a cemetery right in the centre of Crawley.
- Parking. The car park is used by sports people, people visiting the Mardens old people's flats, parents taking and collecting children from the school and also people attending the church.
- It's not very nice for old people to have to sit in their flats and overlook a cemetery.
- It is to close to residents homes and parking would be a real issue.
- It would look awful and it is not a pretty site for people to live close by.
- Insensitive to residents at retirement home.
- Finally, there is a significant amount of insensitivity by proposing this in plain view of the recently established retirement community in the Mardens. The planning Dept. should hang their heads in shame at this level of insensitivity.

- Would you like to look out of your window and see graves all day. The one that thought if it should go and live there. Thank you! PS this is a place where old people live.
- As this site is overlooked by flats owned by elderly residence I find this very insensitive.
- Our kids love playing there! We walk past this park to school every morning and I would hate for them to walk past a cemetery everyday! It will definitely be an eye sore and wouldn't be a good location. We don't need it in the middle of our neighbourhood! Please don't destroy our neighbourhood and the best park around.
- Cemeteries should rather be on the outskirts of town!
- View from my house is entirely of the playing fields - one of the main reasons I bought the property. By building a cemetery on this land you will be forcing me and my family out of our home and devaluing my property in the process.
- I have worked hard to afford a special home that will see my family grow up in and won't stand for the council to force me out as a deflated price.
- I do not think it is a right place for a cemetery, being it will be very close to retirement housing. To me it seems not enough thought has been given to people's feelings.
- It needs to be outside Crawley not near residential properties or next to a retirement complex, are you insensitive!!!
- Also why should the residents of the residential flats for the retired next to the park have a cemetery to look at? A very insensitive decision by someone.
- Unsuitable location next to Retirement Homes and playing field. We already have a crematorium, why encourage more land usage.
- It is also near to a complex for older people and I feel it would be a little insensitive to the residents including those in Ifield Drive and Ardingly Close to have to look across at the cemetery and put up with additional traffic it would bring.
- Totally the wrong place, between the A23, Ifield Drive, Ifield Avenue, a Junior School and retirement homes overlooking.
- I don't know if others share my concern with the fact that this land is actually within close proximity to the McCarthy & Stone project, and may seem rather insensitive to subject elderly people, on mass, to a depressing view.
- All this area should remain as playing fields. It is too close to residential and retirement homes, causing distress to residents, with the cemetery in view. This is development at the expense of recreational space.
- It is too close to residential and retirement homes, causing distress to residents, with the cemetery in view.
- It is too close to residential and retirement homes, causing distress to residents, with the cemetery in view.
- Depressingly close to too many houses.
- Next to a residential home for retired people? Really?
- As a resident of Millfield Court I do not want to look at a cemetery all day long!
- Site is overlooked by a retirement home. This proposed shows a lack of consideration for resident and is a potential cause of a fall in property value

- Additionally, it's rather odd the land identified happens to be directly next door to Retirement homes!
- Additionally, it's rather odd the land identified happens to be directly next door to Retirement homes!
- Too close to resident and retirement homes and too close to a school.
- Not near school and retirement apartment.
- Very close to residential accommodation
- Close to retirement homes, causing distress to residents, very insensitive.
- It is also very insensitive having a cemetery so near to a retirement home.
- We live in this area; our children walk past the park to school every morning. This would be a tragedy and also take away the park they love to play in!
- It would not be appropriate to place the cemetery so close to houses.
- From a purely personal point of view, the cemetery would detract from the value of all the properties, not only mine, that overlook the playing fields, which includes the Mardens, Ifield drive and Ardingly close
- It's too close to people's houses
- Too close to housing/ parking issues/ school children would prefer to walk in a recreation ground/playing field
- Also, the residents of the nearby retirement flats will not take kindly to looking at their final resting place each day.
- Too busy around that area
- Inappropriate and insensitive site.
- This is not a good location for a cemetery as it would be
- in a residential area
- At present Millfield Court. Which is retirement apartments, look out onto the peaceful well used Ewhurst playing fields and if a cemetery were to be built there it would not help the health and wellbeing of us elderly folk.
- Proposed site insensitive to elderly local residents and will only last for 50 years - once our playing fields are developed for any construction we will not be left with anywhere for future generations to enjoy local sports amenities.
- To place a cemetery in a residential area is ridiculous; surely it would be more appropriate on the outskirts of the town. It would only serve to devalue property prices and the ability to sell one's property.
- I have a flat overlooking this site which I bought for the view. I don't want to sit in my lounge looking to where I will be going next.
- Many residents living in the retirement apartments would overlook the proposed cemetery this is extremely insensitive and the council should hold its head in shame
- The site is in close proximity to various schools and residential.
- Living near to these fields I strongly disagree with this.
- It is also very close to the new retirement homes built.
- The value of homes would fall too.
- Also it will overlook a block of retirement homes.
- To be that insensitive to the new elderly flats that have just been built and overlook the proposed site, beggars belief.
- Houses overlook this site and traffic will increase, I am sure the people that overlook this site would not want to see a burial taking place daily,

- Unfortunately location adjacent to newly build Milfireld Court housing elderly residents who need exercise facility and pleasant environment for health of wellbeing both mental and physical. A cemetery on this plot would be an eyesore, depressive and totally unsuitable from all angles.
- Adjacent to infant/ junior school. Millfield Court- so designed that got windows overlook proposed site. Not pleasant/happy outlook for the residents in their retirement
- g) This is not a suitable site as it is in the middle of a residential area, near a busy main road
- Insensitive to the feelings of the residents in the newly constructed retirement homes. Access would be difficult.
- Not an appropriate site in the middle of a residential area and with A23 on one side.

Too much noise

- This is not a quiet site; it is surrounded by noise from traffic
- This is a little piece of green in an otherwise built up and busy area. It is hardly the serene spot where loved ones should be buried! Definitely an inappropriate proposed siting!!
- Land considered unsuitable because of noise pollution could be considered for this use i.e. near Gatwick
- The playing fields site is not only surrounded by busy roads it also is subject to the noise from fire engines and ambulances. The roads around this site are extremely busy is this a good place for potentially vulnerable people to be exited onto. There are already issues with accidents when people are not fully paying attention because of the quantity of cars waiting at the roundabout junction add to this emotional visitors to the cemetery and you have the potential for a massive increase in accidents and siren noise when emergency services are having to deal.
- Also, I don't think a garden of remembrance should be sited next to the busy A23 - surely a more tranquil site could be found.
- As a lifetime resident of West Green and Ifield I was appalled to learn that a new Cemetery would be situated in Ewhurst Park, I agree with **** that a Cemetery should be a quiet restful area to say goodbye to loved ones, and being sandwiched between the A23 and Ifield Drive is certainly not the right area.
- The road that runs along side this land is noisy and very busy so would not be a quiet place for grieving families to lay their loved ones to rest.
- It is also mentioned by the Council that this an ideal site as there is already a car park there, which may I add is also used by families dropping and picking their children up from St Margaret's School, and would cause chaos if this couldn't be used during certain times of the day.
- As a lifetime resident of West Green and Ifield I was appalled to learn that a new Cemetery would be situated in Ewhurst Park, A Cemetery should be a

quiet restful area to say goodbye to loved ones, and being sandwiched between the A23 and Ifield Drive is certainly not the right area.

- The cemetery needs to be in a place with peace and quiet, not next to a major road.
- My idea of a site would be a nice quiet and peaceful place, this is certainly not. Snell Hatch was opened in 1925, prior to the new town being built; therefore houses and buildings were built around it.
- On a busy road
- People need to pay their respects at a cemetery, how can they do this along such a busy road?
- The proposed site is much too near a school. Parents use the car park at least twice a day. You can imagine the noise generated by these children being dropped off, not conducive to persons attending a funeral. Also you can hear playground noise morning, dinner time and afternoon during playtime, not a nice background noise for a solemn occasion so much for a calm and peaceful setting. It also has very busy roads on all three sides of the site.
- The Crematorium has a peaceful setting surely people being buried have the same right.
- Very noisy due to being surrounded by main roads, not exactly a peaceful place to rest!
- It's not quiet.
- Constant noise from the A23, Ewhurst playing fields should stay as it is.
- This field is in the middle of a built up noisy area and those coming to mourn their loved ones should be able to do so in peace.
- This is a busy site bordered by the A23 and Ifield Road, and does not seem to be a very peaceful and restful site.
- Exposed to the road noise.
- I find it totally inappropriate for a new cemetery to be built on Ewhurst playing fields for the following reasons:
 - The proposed site is next to the noisy A23 and the busy Ifield Drive
 - People who visit grave yards expect peace and quiet which you would not get at Ewhurst playing fields.
 - The site is totally wrong, being in a noisy traffic area.
 - Also traffic noise and levels too high for a cemetery to be placed there.

Flooding

- Ground floods in very bad weather
- It floods regularly
- When it rains the whole field is quagmire as the drainage is not good.
- Drainage is not good as it becomes boggy during prolonged rainfall.
- The Council state that the field has good drainage, then why does the field develop a large pond near to the playground every time it rains, and anyone driving along Ifield Drive when it rains will see the water flooding out of the field.
- The Council state that the field has good drainage, then why does the field develop a large pond near to the playground every time it rains, and anyone

driving along Ifield Drive when it rains will see the water flooding out of the field.

- The playing field often flood and water flows across Ifield Drive.
- The site is subject to flooding.
- It DOES flood.
- The land was once farmland, the area now containing the children's playground was a pond. The pond was eventually drained into the culvert that runs parallel to the A23, Crawley Avenue, to enable the land to be used for sport, namely football. At times of high rainfall this area remains prone to flooding and the land becomes waterlogged.
- The house of Ewhurst Place is moated, though unsure of the source of the water there is a good chance that it is fed from a natural spring that is known in the vicinity as can be confirmed by inspection of the natural well located at No. 36 Ifield Drive. It seems to me that there is a distinct possibility that the course of this spring could run beneath the land suggested for use as a cemetery.
- And has an in depth study of the ground water conditions been done and how much will it cost to dispose of the leach out from the site.
- Ewhurst playing fields we very sure of flooding in bad weather. Also is a very popular and necessary walkway a playing space for children.
- In recent years, the site has suffered from significant pooling in poor weather and any additional development would widen this problem to the wider, local community.
- It makes no sense to move a cemetery here especially since the area gets really boggy during rainy periods.
- Bad drainage.
- Ground is also prone to flooding.
- Drainage is in fact poor! After heavy rain the field is like a swimming pool for days.
- Liable to flooding - on the site of a future farm pond.
- Contrary to the statement in the Plan, the soil and the drainage by the existing Ewhurst play area by the oak trees is horrendous. Every time it rains, the area floods, and large amounts of water leak onto the road leaving every pedestrian with a choice of being sprayed by cars or crossing over the road. The eastern end of the area is most unsuitable for anything other than a football pitch.
- The Ewhurst playing fields do not enjoy good drainage; in fact some paths are waterlogged for most of the winter months.
- Firstly, the soil and drainage conditions make it a good site because of the following local knowledge: Local residents have known for years that these fields become waterlogged so much so that water is regularly seen to be pouring out of the field into Ifield Drive. On many occasions the drains along Ifield Drive only just cope with the flow of water one reason for this may be that the field used to have a pond located where the children's playground area is located.
- This area along with many other parts of the field regularly get water logged so much so that the secretary of the Ladies Football Team the Wasps who use this field to train and play their home games on reported to me on 24th June 2013 that,

- The last game played on the top pitch was Saturday 13th October 2012. The next days match had to be postponed due to a severely waterlogged pitch (in fact the Saturday game should not have played as the water was 2 inches deep in some places, but they decided to carry on). The next date it was playable was 21st April 2013, it remained waterlogged until that date (¾ of the pitch with a water level above ankle depth for the majority of this period) and even then it was still wet enough for the line paint not to transfer in some places. The 11 a side pitch next to the pavilion was waterlogged at the A23 end enough to make it unplayable (water level above football boots laces) such that only 2 games could be played between 23rd October 2012 and 21st April 2013 (we had 7 postponements). With this amount of water logging has appropriate advice been taken on the possibility of contaminated water from the proposed cemetery leaching into the ground water?
- Not suitable, floods.
- The drainage conditions are not good throughout - several boggy areas in wet weather
- The suggestion that this field drains well is totally incorrect, this playing field floods badly after heavy rain.
- Contrary to Council Planning belief, this site becomes very water logged in wet weather. Large pools of water can be viewed after very wet weather.
- Ideal site for your new cemetery would be Tinsley lane slightly away from built up area, bus routes nearby (10, 20, 527) although dust and night noise is a growing problem, with the asphalt works nearby the sight near an ancient woodland would seem ideal. I cannot see anyone would want to purchase a property at this site with dust pollution and noise as the main London to Brighton rail line is close by. You will also have to consider the removal of a herd of deer that live in the area
- This field and park floods but
- It is definitely NOT a good site for a cemetery because it floods every time it rains causing a big drainage problem. This is because there was a natural pond there which was fed by underground springs and STILL is.
- It floods.
- Also originally a pond was located in this field and drainage is not good in bad weather.
- The field floods in winter, due to an ancient pond, and old wells, which used to service the farm cottages."
- The land has poor drainage - floods in the winter.
- Drainage not suitable play area floods as this used to be an old pond when it was farm land.
- e) The play area for swings etc regularly floods as this used to be a pond when the area was a farm

Alternative sites

- The crematorium is out of town and I see no reason why the cemetery has to be built in town. The proximity to Snell Hatch should in my view not be a

consideration. Again is there not space adjacent to the Crematorium or on Manor Royal possibly.

- A cemetery should be located outside the town
- Site the cemetery out of town.
- Are there not more spaces nearer the outside of town that could accommodate this better?
- Why not consider a larger cemetery outside the town boundary in conjunction with an adjoining council that could last both councils a long time into the future and build decent transport links and facilities e.g. over towards Crawley Crematorium or under Gatwick flight path where noise is not an issue.
- Gas holder site near existing crematorium would seem more suitable.
- As for alternative sites, I understand that the Outreach area off Ifield Avenue / Bonnetts Lane should be considered as it fits with the crematoriums location of "edge of town" or perhaps a location near the crematorium would be a consistent approach."
There must be somewhere else.
- There are not enough public parks and a cemetery is not right to be placed on that site. A better location would be disused office space near the CAA building in manor royal.
- This is just a crazy lazy proposal .Cemeteries do not need to be in a central area but on the outskirts of towns as is our present Crematorium.
- Couldn't a section of Goffs Park be used? There is a pedestrian bridge between the sites and it is much more secluded and private (how a memorial garden should be!)
- With the development of The Orchards estate and the massive Hindu temple at the other end of Ifield, I suggest that you leave Ifield alone and look at alternate possibilities.
- Cemeteries should be kept on the edge of the town, NOT in the middle of it. How are children meant to keep fit and healthy if we take away playing fields?
- Once again something that is good in Crawley would be ruined where possibly nearer a church or the surrounding fields in Ifield would be a better idea than along Ifield Drive which is struggling to cope with the traffic already.
- Lots of other sites to be used.
- Why can't we use Goffs park this is convenient to existing users has a car park and toilets is extremely peaceful, a great location for public transport and doesn't get used for activities anymore than the Ewhurst Playing Fields."
"
- I suggest the site at the old Bewbush Leisure Centre it is larger than the Ewhurst playing fields.
- I suggest the gas holder site would make an excellent place for a new cemetery.
- Another suitable area must be found, why not in the North East Sector near to the Crematorium?
- Another suitable area must be found, why not in the North East Sector near to the Crematorium?

- The lower part of Goffs park would be more appropriate. Move the pitch and put.
- Forge Wood near the existing Crematorium would be better.
- This area is too much of a residential area and whilst a cemetery is "quiet" (so to speak) people already living in the area won't want to overlook a cemetery. It is too much of an open area that is why the area in Langley Walk would be much better, as it is much "greener".
- The new site should be out of town.
- I do not see why a cemetery could not be located on the outside or outskirts of the town, as is the Surrey and Sussex Crematorium.
- Is there anyway Snell Hatch can be extended?
- Land near Ifield Church would be better. An alternative to Ewhurst would be the park between Town Mead and Sainsbury's. It affects fewer houses and has a green buffer of trees around it making it less obtrusive.
- Any cemetery should be out of town and not on open space designated for public use. The new cemetery could be built on the Gas Holder site (map ref 14) or land east of Balcombe Rd (map ref 12).
- Why not build a cemetery outside Crawley???
- If you intent to use these playing fields, then only logic is for housing. If you must place the cemetery in centre of Crawley you could use the area of land south of Snell Hatch and part of Goffs Park used only for dog walkers and pitch and put up to Brook access off Crawley avenue south of railway and before traffic lights. Foot bridges and path could be adjusted. Should not ??? then you should look at site 9, 12, or 13 which you have rejected once again.
- Consider land to the rear of Rusper Road.
- Cemeteries should be located on the outskirts of any town, let alone Crawley
- Using up another green space where children play is not the answer. Buy a plot out of the town big enough to last 100 years or more - Snell Hatch will have served for 90 years when it is closed. Looking at the short term is false economy.
- 50 years only? Snell Hatch has done 90 years. We are being told the population is exceeding housing, therefore more houses are required, then surely we will require a much larger cemetery in the future. Find a larger site first and prevent yet another recreational area from being developed.
- It is suggested that Ewhurst Playing Fields are the only suitable site for the location of the cemetery which is questionable. For example what is wrong with the site east of the Balcombe Road, labelled 12 on the general map and close to the Crematorium. The site was rejected for housing only because of the noise? Not a matter for concern to the residents of a cemetery. Viewing the map there is also undeveloped land adjacent to the Crematorium, has this been considered? It would not seem out of place to have both a cemetery and a crematorium on adjacent land
- There is nothing at all wrong with having a burial site outside Crawley. Why not put the new cemetery near to the crematorium use the land beside it or on some of the land the other side of the Balcombe Rd where housing is proposed which, in my opinion isn't suitable as it's under the flight path

- Another site should be found perhaps the area 'ear marked' in Langley Green for a travellers site.
- A green field in the countryside should be used with restrictions on size of memorials and the amount of concrete in any plot to maintain the essential green nature of the field. Cemeteries can be very green if planned appropriately. There is no need for an in town cemetery.
- There are more suitable sites for a new cemetery - further out of town and maybe near the current crematorium; there is plenty of used land that I am sure could be obtained for such a purpose; NOT someone where in the middle of a residential area!!!
- The cemetery doesn't need to be near Snell Hatch - the Crematorium isn't.
- Use fields on edge of town for new cemetery spaces. There are plenty of them out in Charlwood or Horley direction.
- Perhaps it would be best to start looking for sites outside of the town and access the suitability of these before using more land within the town centre.
- Can land near to the crematorium be considered?
- Land to the West of Rusper Road..lfield
- A new site should be considered outside of town
- A more suitable plot would be somewhere similar to the crematorium
- Why not use lfield Park instead? It's close to the cemetery that is there already and is used a lot less often than Ewhurst playing fields.
- Personally I believe an out of town area should be found, if for no other reason but to keep at least a small part of Crawley green.
- What is wrong with land by the crem.
- Why not situate the new cemetery in the new Forge Wood development? The cemetery will be close to the crematorium and may therefore encourage cremations rather than burials, which would relieve pressure to find burial grounds in future. People who move into the new neighbourhood would know from the outset that they will be living next to the facility.
- Adequate sites can be found out of town.
- Why not use the Buchan park kennel area for a new cemetery
- Why not develop lane near where the crematorium is.
- Outreach Three Way is the best alliterative for a cemetery. If this site fell though because it might become part of the new Gatwick Runway, that would only apply if there was a wide-spaced runway. If there is a narrow-spaced runway, there would be no problem having the cemetery. Hopefully the power-that-be will choose an narrow-spaced runway.
- Why can't a new cemetery be housed on site 12 near to motorway.
- Build less offices that stand empty, what about next to the crematorium?
- As an alternative East of Brighton Road might be considered for the Cemetery
- Maybe the land east of Brighton Road, earlier suggested as housing, would be excellent, or even the Brighton Road site should be another contender for the traveller's site, with whom some people seem to have a problem with living among.
- Has lfield Brook Meadows been considered or land to the rear of Rusper road, or purchase of land immediately outside the borough?
- The council need to look outside of Crawley in conjunction with another authority for a longer term option.

- The playing fields should be retained for their current use and a new cemetery sited on the town boundary.
- The town needs a longer term answer outside Crawley.
- The Crematorium is on the edge of town, why not this cemetery. The government is always banging on about children and exercise. Is this the right way to keep our children healthy?
- Put the cemetery on the edge of town and leave playing fields alone.
- Cemetery should be on edge of town.
- How about expanding the crematorium site to accommodate burials also?
- Should consideration be given to locate this on the outskirts of Crawley?
- Outskirts of town should be considered instead.
- Should consideration be given to locate this on the outskirts of Crawley?
- Could it not be located near Ifield Church or the Crematorium.
- I suggest you consider part of the land north of the land you refer to as Malden around St Margaret's church which already has people buried in it's church yard or the old school site for Ifield Community college (known by people who attended the schools as Lady Margaret and Sarah Robinson schools)
- Use the pitch and putt area in Goffs Park for continuation of Snell Hatch Cemetery
- Burials outside towns and cities was good enough for the Romans. It should be good enough for us. We simply do not have the space in Crawley for it and it should be moved out of the centre.
- A site on the outskirts of town with room to enlarge would be a better option.
- A much better site could be found closer to the present Crematorium.
- Should be Rugwich Road Playing fields as its quieter also if the council had not sold off the land adjournment to this field they would have plenty of room to expand.
- It would be far more preferable for people to be buried outside the town in a quiet location rather than in the middle of an existing neighbourhood and major access roads.
- Land to the rear of Rusper Road should be considered.
- I feel a site edge of town is better than this short term measure.
- Although still not large enough the land referred to in ref.2. or another large area which would provide a beautiful site if re-designated is Goffs Park.
- I do not see the difficulty in having a burial site on the edge of the town, just as the cremation site has been accepted. I am surprised that sufficient people are still buried - as they would come from different area surely they would not object to a site outside the town.
- Has any consideration been given to requests for green burial sites in the Crawley area? Could this not be combined with a conventional burial site on the outskirts of the town?
- The soil must be similar at West Green field, it us nearer to Snell Hatch, access would be better and I understand that it is used unlike Ehwhurst which is used all year by groups of organised children. If this site isn't suitable it should be out of town as the crematorium is.
- The cemetery should be located at the edge of town. Possible site is the gas holder site.

- A site should be found beneath the flight path of Gatwick Airport as noise constraints may not be a major issue. There is a tongue of land on the western end of Langley Green ward that if purchased would last much longer than the area selected at Ewhurst Playing Fields and allow the valuable recreational area to be retained
- The field behind St Margaret's was built on, there is no public park local to the schools, and who wants to walk there children to school past a cemetery, or in fact have a junior school that close to a cemetery, cemeteries should be on the outskirts of Crawley, and on a bus route for all, to be able to visit, not in the heart of Ifield. definitely NOT!!!!!!
- Probably better to find a place outside town and improve public transport!
- Has Langley Walk site been considered for cemetery? - Would keep the area green - outstanding natural beauty. Playing fields off St Mary's Drive could be suitable?
- A new cemetery should be built on the outskirts of Crawley like the crematorium and well away from any residential area.
- All cemeteries should be outside of town, not on residential sites being overlooked by houses. What happened to the Government's rule about saving playing fields after the Olympics?
- Alternative sites should be considered otherwise local residents from West Green, Ifield, Langley Green have to travel further to use green space and parks. Suggest the playing field at Rathlin Road Broadfield that hasn't been used for football etc for 5 yrs or more be considered. It is close to main road and transport infrastructure would easily accommodate burials for the foreseeable future. Not in close proximity to residential estates.
- Gas holder site - it's near the crematorium and will be no less peaceful than some of the large London cemeteries. It will also not impact on too many houses nearby. No one will have to overlook it as it is shielded by roads. There is a reasonable bus service in the area too and you are not robbing people of green space and play areas. Alternatively, land off Tinsley Lane considered too polluted for housing.
- If we have travellers one end and a cemetery at the other our outlook doesn't look good does it?
- Strongly oppose site is unsuitable, Should be located out of town area.
- All burials carried out at crematorium vicinity
- I don't mind if we had to be buried outside of the town in the future.
- The crematorium of "outside of the town". Why not a cemetery? I imagine the local would hate being reminded on a daily basis of their mortality!
- Agree a cemetery should be inside town. Surely there must be a site other than a playing field. One end of this site has very poor drainage. What about Tinsley Lane, not sure how big it is; or east of Brighton Road, looks big enough.
- Hold talks with Horsham for creation of joint cemetery with Crawley - adjacent to the Horsham Road.
- I can not think of a solution but am unaware of other Towns building new cemeteries - have they their own solutions - share existing sites with neighbouring towns?

- A cemetery outside of the town is acceptable in the circumstances. Crawley will expand further and a cemetery is a destination most often reached by car - Snell Hatch cannot be said to be well served by public transport.
- Balcombe Road East - keep near crematorium.
- Should be localied outside town
- h) You should look for a site to the east or north of Crawley, perhaps near to the present crematorium
- What about Tinsley Lane - it would make a wonderful cemetery.
- Use money to buy land on the edge of the borough for a cemetery instead of loaning it to other boroughs.
- This is a playing field and I am sure another quiet part of town would be more suitable, perhaps the land behind the crematorium.
- The Crematorium is out of town so a burial site would make no odds.
- There is plenty of space on the edge of Crawley to accommodate a cemetery where people can grieve and mourn in relative peace and quiet rather than doing it with rush hour traffic in the background.
- A new cemetery would be ideal near the crematorium.

Not a good site – other reasons

It would have to be out of sight.

- Should be out of the way
- Unsuitable land, access is poor.
- The changing rooms which house the toilets are not sufficient for the needs of a cemetery, and the only reason that has been included as a reason is for the plumbing.
- Very bad idea of thinking cemetery in the vicinity of the town
- Council not thinking of the resilience near the proposed site
- Fourthly, you refer that there is a toilet on site. It is ironic that the Council allowed the Wasps Football Team to keep a storage container on site for 5 years to assist them in raising funds to convert the toilets from a male only changing facility to one that could be used by both sexes. You also state that there is an option that some of the playing fields could be retained. Does this mean that there will be a sharing of the facilities by those using the sports field for changing and those people visiting the cemetery?
- Part of the ground is built over an old farm so there may be issues of what is already buried underneath.
- d) The toilets are not suitable
- Toilets not suitable.

50 years – short sighted

- 50 years is a very short term view.
- How can you build a cemetery for only next 50 years???? And right beside a main road.....
- A cemetery is a luxury. 50 years is not a very long time.

- This site may last a few years but as it has a defined boundary; it also will run out of space.
- 50 years also doesn't seem that long a period to accommodate burials.
- I also oppose the cemetery here as the area is in relative terms quite small - in a few years you will need to find another area. This will create such a piecemeal approach to this.
- Snell Hatch was built before most of the houses near it and now the space there has been exhausted the site being suggested is not large enough to accommodate the amount of graves that an expanding town will need and there will have to be another site found in about 30 years. A much bigger site would be more appropriate.
- Finally, you state the site has enough space to accommodate burials for the next 50 years. This seems to me a short term solution for a long term problem.
- My reasoning for this is as follows. Snell Hatch Cemetery was opened in 1925 and the expected closure is in 2 years time, as burial space has been predicted to run out by then. So by 2015 Snell Hatch would be closed after being open for 90 years.
- This is not only a Crawley dilemma but a national one. In 2007 Harriet Harman the then Government Justice Minister said all designated burial space in England and Wales will be full in 30 years.
- Yet the present day planners of Crawley Borough Council want to close down a very active sports field and much valued green space which will only be available for 50 years as a cemetery.
- Please tell me where the forward planning is in this decision... The planners have determined that the 'life span' of its new cemetery will be 40 years less than its old one!
- This then raises the future question of which Crawley green field site in 2065 will the council have to use then?
- With this in mind, the solution is clear; the only site for a new cemetery which can be used longer than 50 years is outside the borough.
- Clearly the treatment of the dead is a sensitive subject. Ewhurst playing field should remain as a playing field. By your own calculations, in fifty years' time this new cemetery will be full, then what will we do? If everyone currently in Crawley wanted to be buried, in one hundred years' time we would need 100,000 graves. I simply do not know where they would go.
- Cemeteries can only be used for a short space of time before another one would have to be found.

Not a good enough reason

- As a current user of Snell Hatch Cemetery I can't see how the Ewhurst Playing Fields is the only suitable site.
- Why is it so important that the proposed cemetery is close to Snell Hatch.
- Although it is close geographically to the existing cemetery it is not a quick journey between the two by foot/car.
- As a new cemetery being close to existing should not be a consideration.

- I don't see the relevance to the comment 'It is also close to Snell Hatch Cemetery'. Why do the dead 'need' to be buried near each other?
- Secondly, its proximity to Snell Hatch Cemetery in West Green with good links to the road network. This is a nebulous statement; everywhere in Crawley and West Sussex has good links to the road network as most people use cars. Also, why does its proximity to Snell Hatch Cemetery matter? Did these criteria apply to the other 40 sites you considered for a cemetery?
- f) Being near Snell Hatch is of no advantage
- Being near Snell Hatch is not relevant and is some distance if using a car.

Other

- We object strongly to this proposal and will try to fight it in what ever way we can.
- The Council also states that it is a good site as it is near to Snell Hatch Cemetery; I think it is totally irrelevant as Crawley is not a large town, and anywhere in Crawley can be reached within 15 minutes.
- This is a delicate topic for many people and the consultation time scale imposed and method of consultation with this immediate development requirement hidden amongst many other development topics that require longer term plans is, in my opinion, an unacceptable consultation method. A separate consultation should be started for this topic and fully publicised.
- With the underpass across the street we have also been victims of anti-social behaviour and a cemetery will only attract more especially in the evenings.
- Removing much needed playing fields access / access to and from site of A23 insensitive site schools / old peoples home.
- Snell Hatch was built before the majority of the houses near to it so people had a choice whether they lived there or not. The fields also acts as a natural noise barrier to the A23
- A small percentage should be considered for more housing, but with the majority left as playing fields.
- The consultation period should be extended to at least 8 weeks.
- One foot in the grave
- No additional cemetery should be considered as nowhere suitable.
- Ifield is small. We already have two temples; we certainly do not need a cemetery.

People who said don't know thought...

Don't want to lose open space

- Crawley needs it green space for the well being of its residents.
- I live just around the corner in Findon Road and take my granddaughter to the park regularly, so would miss it if not there.

- Obviously we need extra burial space but not with the loss of somewhere for children to play safely. If Ewhurst Playing Fields are used then replacement recreation areas should be put in place.
- I appreciate that space needs to be identified but I don't think the playing field should be used. Other Towns must be facing the same problem, have other ideas been considered?
- Losing a community recreation ground/green space is a concern. Perhaps part of the site could be retained permanently as a recreation ground.
- Crawley is a lovely place to live which is in part due to the open spaces and playing fields in the town. It would seem a shame to prohibit the younger generation from enjoying the benefits of Crawley that the older generation as enjoyed

Playing fields well used

- If you take away the playing fields where will footie .be played, dogs walked children play.

Short term solution

- If you use the land just in the short term, it means you will eventually take the land in the long term does it not?
- 50 years doesn't seem very long for a growing town

Negative impact on the neighbourhood

- The siting of a cemetery is always going to be difficult - especially when 'dropped into' an existing neighbourhood. I can imagine that the retirees currently occupying Millfield Court, which overlooks the proposed site, might find its close proximity somewhat challenging. There is a difference between accepting that our lives will come to an end one day and having a constant reminder of that fact. If this site is used, it will require careful planning to make it acceptable to its neighbours. Unfortunately, I cannot think of an alternative!
- I'm not sure it's a very nice area for a cemetery. Can't see how it would look nice and fit in. I don't want to be buried there that's for sure.
- The only concern I have that it is next to the houses on the other side of the road ,but snell hatch has always been in the middle of some houses as far as I can remember .It all depends on whether you live next to it
- No further room for further development, next to new retirement home ! Not very sensitive.
- Not sure of the area but don't think people will be happy playing sports next to a cemetery and don't think families of those buried there will like it either
- Also think it is very insensitive to site a cemetery in full view of newly erected retirement homes.
- I think council should look at very carefully re: people living at properties already there. What cost to THEM.

- I have concerns for the residents of Millfield Court, some of whose rooms overlook the playing fields.

Alternatives

- I assume additional space is required for a new cemetery and ask if space might be allocated on the edge of the towns boundaries rather than in the centre.
- To me the proposal to use land at Ifield Hall makes more sense even though it could end up under the flight path.
- I can totally see the need for a new cemetery but would the natural secession not make sense just to go over the railway and use some off goffs park with I'm sure would be a much nicer place to be a final resting place being somewhere that once you would of come and enjoyed the place as a family as I'm sure almost everyone in Crawley has been to goffs park, I'm not saying use it all but maybe if we lost the pitch and putt bit it would just make sense as snell hatch is just the other side of it
- and then make the rest off goffs park a historic park "
- However, I believe there to be the old CBC tree nursery on the opposite side of the A23, which is adjacent to the existing cemetery. More ideally situated and closer to the existing site, with access on and off the A23. "
- Think Goffs park would be a better option as it is adjacent to Snell Hatch.
- I agree that land has to be found for a larger population, If & only If land in Langley Walk has be considered then a cemetery would be my only choice.
- On the contrary, the ear north of Langley Green is vast and a for more peaceful environment for mourners to visit. Further, the traffic volumes would not exceed what the area could handle, with minor adjustments.
- Very close to town centre doesn't somehow seem the right place. Broadfield Kennels would be a better option. Peaceful location near the park. Seems more respectful and not too far on edge of Crawley. Subject to land suitability.
- Alternatively, has CBC thought of using a site within the high noise envelope of Gatwick? It might not be appreciated by those who like to visit graves of loved ones in tranquil surroundings - but is worth consideration.

Land is for the living

- Personally I feel land used for burial at the expense of playing fields and housing is unacceptable. In this day and age we should use cremation and those who demand burial should finance it.

Suggested site too noisy

- I have relatives at Snell Hatch and you can go there and it is fairly quiet. I have a bit of a problem with the fact Ewhurst is surrounded by three fairly main and noisy roads.
- The cemetery should be in a peaceful location

Traffic problems

- Plus it is near St Margaret's school so there would be a problem with parking around there.
- While the need for a larger cemetery is fully understood, the Ewhurst Playing Fields may not be the best choice in my opinion. The area is surrounded by busy roads which so not make for a peaceful setting.

OK with suggested site

- However, we need some where to bury our dead and if it is the only option then it is better than out of town."
- At the end of the day, if a cemetery is needed, then one is needed. And if this is the only place to put one, then there's not much else anyone can do. I read about a home for the elderly overlooking the field, or something to that effect, but if there is no other place for a cemetery, then the only other option is to move the home, of which I'm sure there are many places it can be moved to.
- I am not in favour of losing any green spaces in the town but it is also unacceptable for Crawley residents to be buried outside the town
- If it doesn't compromise on existing sporting facilities then yes.
- Ewhurst fields at least, are not overlooking any properties (there is a good distance from the field to surrounding houses) and access would be easy on and off the A23.

Different ways of managing the dead

- I think with GPS technology we can move away from the idea of cemeteries, and marked graves, and be buried in a country park.
- If you build all the houses you have planned you will be looking for more burial land in less than 50years. Surely better to encourage cremation and find space for a garden of remembrance? Less space and less upkeep needed.

Ideas for design

- Depends on cemetery type / design / policy / management. Attractive landscape design oriented / parkland / lawn cemetery / strict 'no junk' grave policy would be ok.
- Current car park needs to be mainly retained for sports use parking with a new cemetery car park at the "wet" end adjacent to Ifield Avenue. Substantial tree screens need to be planted between the cemetery first stage and the sports area and later another to screen the second (existing) carpark and the retirement homes.

- I really don't know, it would depend on the extent the park is used, perhaps the playing area could be maintained with small peace gardens and a cemetery.
- We are reluctant to see another recreational area go, but appreciate the lack of space in the town. We suppose that the proposed site could provide an open space for wild life providing it is appropriately planted.
- Looking at the existing cemetery, residents are no closer than would potentially be in the new site and views could easily be obscured with sympathetic planting etc.
- Any cemetery should be in reach of bus route.

Other

- Although I see it very important to the community that they have somewhere local to bury their loved ones I'm not sure where would be the right place
- A partial allocation should be considered.
- "YES & NO!!

Appendix D - Historic Parks and Garden & Local Green Space

Local Green Space – other areas that have been suggested.

BEWBUSH

Bewbush West Playing Fields

As per my previous comments regarding Bewbush playing fields, I believe that these should be protected for the reasons I previously explained.
(Resident of Bewbush)

Bewbush West Playing Fields as they are important to local community as stated previously. (Resident of Bewbush)

The land you are proposing to build on in West Bewbush near Kilnwood Vale.
(Resident of Bewbush)

The Bewbush West playing fields and the playing fields at Breezehurst Drive should be two in my local area that should be protected and not used for development.(Non-resident)

Community use / lack of other garden or green space

Bewbush West Playing Fields should be protected because it is one of the few open spaces available for children living in the surrounding area. Many of the properties that face on to the fields do not have gardens so it is used by many local children and it is essential to enable them to live an healthy and active childhood. Without this space they will be left significantly disadvantaged. The area is used by local football teams and is a key area for dog walkers. Bewbush West playing fields should also be protected because it will be the only green space separating Crawley from the massive Kilnwood Vale development. (Resident of Bewbush)

Contrary to the study the council paid £10,000 for, I can assure you, as a Bewbush resident located near to the Bewbush West site, that this area is very much used and valued by the local community. Not only is it used by teams for football games and practice, it is also well used by the public. Maybe your consultants observed that area for 1hr in the middle of January before drawing their conclusions. It is completely unacceptable to preserve sites in well-off Tory seats, such as Rusper Road playing fields and destroying those in the supposed ghettos of Bewbush and Broadfield. All green space should be covered by this plan. (Resident of Bewbush)

The playing fields of west Bewbush should be protected as lot of properties near are flats and maisonettes and have no garden space. (Resident of Bewbush)

Bewbush West Playing Fields should be protected because it is the only green space separating Bewbush West from the Kilnwood Vale development and it is essential for the children in the area. It is widely used by local residents and is key to the local environment, (Resident of Bewbush)

Breezehurst Playing Fields and Bewbush West Playing fields should be designated as a Local Green Space as they provide access to Buchan Park and the countryside to the West of Crawley. (Resident of Bewbush)

Bewbush west playing field, Bewbush Green and Skelmesdale walk part of Breezehurst playing fields - with the development if kiln sale right next to Bewbush it is really important we protect our fields (Resident of Bewbush)

Bewbush west playing fields, it has been left as a locally important green space since I moved this way over 20 years ago, used by children, dog walkers, bridle paths, etc. and I believe it should be left this way for our children's children!! (Resident of Bewbush)

Wildlife

There is an abundance of wildlife including badgers foxes bats and various bird and insects species. Desecrating this last green area would be criminal

and detrimental to the neighbourhood and just add to the urban ghetto sprawl making life here even more miserable and depressing. (Resident of Bewbush)

Need a balance

A suitable compromise would be to protect the western of the two fields and develop the back corner of the fields the other side of the football pitch. Bewbush already has issues with youth disorder and low-level anti-social behaviour, the removal of this open area completely is likely to both increase this problem and push it further into the residential estates or focus it around the shops in Dorsten Square." (Resident of Bewbush)

Breezehurst Drive

Breezehurst Drive playing fields. This is the only open playing fields for the Bewbush neighbourhood.

Breezehurst Drive playing field should be protected, and greater use encouraged. Bewbush is seen as one of the less desirable areas of Crawley and the removal of this green space will significantly add to the poor perception of the area.

The Local Plan should be looking to protect as many open public spaces as possible. The Bewbush West playing fields and the playing fields at Breezehurst Drive should be two in my local area that should be protected and not used for development.

Bewbush Millpond

Bewbush millpond and surrounding banks. A haven for bird life (Resident of Bewbush)

I live right next to the lake in Bewbush and think we are so very lucky to have such a beautiful, green and woodland space. The wildlife is wonderful and the whole area is enjoyed by young and old alike, so this area needs to be protected and continue to be maintained. (Resident of Bewbush)

The Mill Pond area should be protected, it is of great value to the local community of both Ifield and Bewbush, both areas being densely housed, it is a breathe of fresh air (Resident of Bewbush)

TILGATE

Ely Close;

Community use/keep green lungs

There are a number of what might be described as green lungs, small areas of undeveloped land that are used in ad hoc ways by residents, which may mean little to the council but are important for local residents - an example of this is the small area at the back of Ely Close which the council officers recently sought to develop but which was found to be totally unsuitable when the plan came before the planning committee (resident of Tilgate)

Close to my heart is the Ely Close, Tilgate green space, one of a couple of green lungs that make Crawley a special place. This space has been enjoyed for many years by many residents, some as far back as when this area was first developed. These green lungs were left for a reason for the enjoyment and health of the residents. It is still enjoyed to this day - a community has grown closer again due to the threat of development - this lung is even more special now. Although personally I did not take this space for granted, I enjoy it every day - we as a community have really pulled together and the bonds & relationships now formed have made this space even more precious.

(Resident of Ifield)

Ely Close field in Tilgate has been a recreation space since the 1950s. It is valued by local people as a green lung, a space to enjoy both visually and actively. Over 360 people supported the recent campaign to save it from development. It is surrounded by houses, and so is very close to the community, it is special by virtue of its recreational value and tranquillity, and it is a small, local space. People moving to Crawley are attracted by the green spaces, trees and parks. With Tilgate's congested, narrow roads, Ely Close field is one of the green spaces we need for the quality of life of future generations. (Resident of Tilgate)

In particular I am interested in Ely Close and ensuring it is seriously considered being designated as a Local Green Space. This particular area is used by the majority of the houses surrounding it and many other residents who live nearby, it has been a much-valued green space by everybody including those whom have lived in the area since the houses were built. These small pockets of green space should not be considered for development in any neighbourhood and consideration needs to be taken in to account for existing residents." (resident of Tilgate)

Any small greens [illegible] as at Ely Close in Tilgate and areas in other estates must be kept for recreational needs of its local people as its lungs, and for the needs of our children to play in safely.(resident of Tilgate)

Chichester Close

land at the rear of the garages and the children's play park at the end of Chichester Close Tilgate. This site has already been rejected by the Council as being suitable for development and I feel that the adverse effects on the already chaotic egress and parking on Chichester Close, Canterbury Road Winchester Road and Durham close would be totally unacceptable, especially if access via Chichester Close was considered. It would make the entrance to Desmond Anderson School even more dangerous. It would completely alter the ambience of Chichester close. If any of the present garages were to be demolished it would make the parking situation in the surrounding roads completely unacceptable. I sincerely hope that this green space will be protected under the Local Plan (resident of Tilgate)

Yes, the open land adjacent to children's play park, which borders Chichester Close, Winchester Road and Durham Close. It has already been denied building recently as there is insufficient space for road widening to accommodate any new tenants access to the area (resident of Tilgate)

Ashdown Drive

Green space behind Ashdown Drive, Nash Road, Whittington Road and Chantrey Road. I feel that this space should remain as it is so that my grandchildren and other children who live around it have space to play. This is very important in view of the obesity problem which we are faced with at

present. It is also important for the existing green spaces to left as was originally intended as breathing spaces amongst the houses (Non-resident)

Yes, the open space behind Ashdown Drive, Nash Road, Chantry Road, and Whittington Road in Tilgate is used as a safe space for local children to play together whilst being overseen by their parents and neighbours. It is a lovely secluded and safe space which is becoming very rare. Vehicle access to the green space is exceeding difficult and so it is unlikely to be reasonably practicable to develop in any case and would be strongly objected to on that basis. " (Resident of Tilgate)

There are a number of green / open spaces within the neighbourhood of Tilgate, all of which are a very important part of the local community. They are the green lung for local residents provided tranquil and most importantly a safe place for youngsters to play. They provide a haven where people can hold gathering and they contribute to the areas just the same ways as village greens. The sites are as follows:

Ely Close

Peterborough Road

Chichester Close

Caxton Close

Whittington Road (Resident of Furnace Green)

Tilgate other

Wildlife

we need open public space to allow the few of us that still enjoy getting out and about walking there dogs and going for walks in Tilgate which i am disgusted that it is now a proposed land development site. This area is teaming with wildlife and is used by people all year round. why destroy the part of crawley that elevates it above the other boroughs. No sense .once that part of Tilgate is gone its gone forever along with trees that have stood for hundreds of years and a well established wildlife including deer, badgers.. No thought is given to there future housing problem. so go ahead and bludgeon out yet another housing estate...just don't tell the families of all those beautiful

creatures that live there just yet...i mean what would be the point they don't get a say anyway do they? (Resident of Broadfield)

BROADFIELD

Broadfield Park

Rathlin road playing fields and Broadfield park along the dual carriageway from the stadium to Cheals roundabout should all be protected. (Resident of Broadfield)

Broadfield Park/playing fields.

Target Hill Broadfield.

Land around Buchan Park and adjacent area." (Resident of Broadfield)

Broadfield Park. Lovely park used by the local community that are unable to get to Buchan Park or Tilgate park. (Resident of Broadfield)

Broadfield Park - where the discovery school is and lake Broadfield Conservation area with the duck pond and with the wood where bluebells grown and including the playing fields (Resident of Broadfield).

Broadfield Park and Rathlin Road playing fields are important to young people because they give them somewhere to meet up with friends without "intimidating" other people at places like the Barton. (Resident of Broadfield)

Rathlin Road

The area located opposite Cheals roundabout running towards the Broadfield football stadium currently a nature reserve, playing fields and children's play area should remain so. (Resident of Broadfield)

Protect Rathlin Road playing fields (Non-resident)

Rathlin road playing fields and Broadfield park along the dual carriageway from the stadium to Cheal's roundabout should all be protected. (Resident of Broadfield)

Wildlife

Rathlin Road flood pond & meadows has a variety of trees which shelter a wide variety of wildlife, It is also a flood plain. The pond would benefit from some maintenance by the Council. (Resident of Broadfield)

Other Broadfield

Broadfield meadows and playing fields along the A23 and between the football stadium and the Horsham road. This area has already lost the play centre to flats and a large area of open space to the football stadium. Broadfield is an area with 12,000 plus people, is not affluent, but is blessed with open spaces. In addition, it has a large percentage of younger people. Broadfield greatest asset, by far is its open spaces. The open space along the A23 also provides a buffer zone between the busy A23 and housing in Broadfield. (Non-resident)

Tintern Woods (if not already); area in Broadfield adjacent to A23 (Broadfield woods and pond area); fields around old Ifield (opposite Bonnets Lane etc). (Resident of Gossops Green)

4) Woodland to the west of the A23 near K2 and south of the Stadium & Highwood Park road. (Resident of Maidenbower)

The land opposite Cheals roundabout, previously designated a nature area but revoked when talk of building a new fire station started. An important green artery next to a busy road.

Wildlife/historic

Broadfield Brook and Pond area. This is an important site of nature conservation with distinctive vegetation and wildlife. Local legend maintains that buried far beneath the site are Roman remains and artefacts. This would

suggest that it might also be a site of historic importance. (Resident of Broadfield)

LANGLEY GREEN

Willoughby Fields

Willoughby Fields as it is a barrier between Crawley and Gatwick Airport
(Resident of Langley Green)

Wildlife

Adjacent Willoughby Fields across to Cherry Lane, in Langley Green. This would help create and preserve at least some kind of green corridor and space for nature in the advent of Airport expansion or other development.
(Resident of Langley Green)

Willoughby Field and Brook should be protected as a local green space and conservation area because of its distinctive vegetation and wildlife. There are bats, kingfishes, deer, foxes, rabbits, bees, butterflies, owls, etc, all Living there. (Resident of Langley Green)

The land currently not developed adjacent to Langley walk through to Willoughby fields should be protected due to its vast array of wildlife which is increased by the flooding. This makes the diversity greater. The trees in the local area provide the community with a noise buffer from the airport whilst maintain a very country feel. The aesthetics of the area is of country rather than concrete! (Resident of Langley Green)

The land currently not developed adjacent to Langley walk through to Willouby fields should b protected due to the variety of wildlife plants and animals, also the trees etc provide a natural buffer for the local community against the airport noise. the regular flooding increases this diversity of animals flora and fauna the local area. Yes

.... Moreover, I would like to put forward Willoughby Fields (the area north of Langley Walk) as a public space that should be protected. These fields are

home to an abundance of wildlife which has recently been documented by artist and nature enthusiast. It is also used by a multitude of walkers, on a daily basis. (Resident of Langley Green)

Community use

The area around the rugby club in Langley Green is thoroughly used and enjoyed by walkers and dog-owners and dogs alike. The greenery is just beautiful, adding to health for all who use it or drive along that area. The Orchard has already been filled with homes and the Hindu Temple. Greenery in this area needs conserving. (Resident of Langley Green)

Other

Willoughby playing fields and adjacent area (Resident of Broadfield)

Langley Walk/Burlands

Yes more protection is needed, people have to live somewhere and looking at the proposed Langley walk/burlands site, while I try to be fair and not be a nimby, i realise you will cram in as many as you can and maybe take as much as you possibly can without too much care how you do it, please tell me i am wrong (Resident of Langley Green)

Wildlife

The land behind Burlands/Prestwood close and next to Langley Walk, where there is proposed housing should be protected open space. This area has ancient historic woodland and the surrounding area is designated as one of outstanding natural beauty and a nature conservation area. The trees/woodland also provide a natural sound barrier to Gatwick airport, which would have a significant detriment if removed or thinned out. (Resident of Langley Green)

Langley Walk should be protected. Mature trees provide cover for airport noise and pollution. Thriving wildlife and plant life populations. . West Green Park - original part of the new town. (Resident of Langley Green)

Open space to be protected is land / fields from Langley Walk to Bonnets Lane, to include Willoughby Fields, there are deer, foxes, rabbits & rare bats and many birds, wood peckers, See PC

Wildlifephotography@yahoo.co.uk/pennyseverythingnature

This young lady has photographic evidence of bats. There are many wild flowers & insects, in these meadows that are just going to be lost if developed on. (Resident of Langley Green)

Pollution

Land north of Langley Walk, Burlands is a strategic gap between the existing residents and Gatwick Airport. Significant noise and air pollution is already a major consideration and in view of potential addition of a further runway, this area should suffer the threat of no further development as it has already suffered enough (Resident of Langley Green)

No other green space

The land between Langley walk and Gatwick Airport should be protected. Tilgate & Furnace Green have Tilgate Park; Southgate has Goffs Park; Three Bridges & Pound Hill have Gratton Park and Ifield has Brook Meadows Bewbush has Bewbush Water Meadows and Gossops Green has Ifield Millpond area. With Broadfield having Buchan Park as its open space, it seems that Langley Green could be one of the two areas without a green space if the fields north of Langley walk are not protected. If, or as many people in Crawley think when, a second runway is built at Gatwick Airport, the area north of Langley Walk to the new airport boundary will be much reduced and what remains will be even more vital for Langley Green as it's only local green space. (Resident of Langley Green)

History

The land at Langley walk Little Balgir should be kept green space as this also holds a great deal of history being the place where the author Frederic Knott came home to his parents house and wrote the famous book Dial M for Murder on this plot of land. It would be a sad day if Crawley was to lose part of its history!!!! (Resident of Pound Hill)

Community use

Encourages walkers. (Resident of Langley Green)

Cherry Lane Playing Fields

cherry lane playing fields and all the adventure playgrounds (Resident of Langley Green)

Cherry Lane playing Fields should be protected from any future development. (Resident of Langley Green)

Other Langley Green

Greenbelt in Langley Green. This area of town doesn't enjoy parks and the existing area near the playing fields provides the only buffer between this area and the airport that should be preserved as a place for local residents and walkers to enjoy some recreational peace and tranquillity (Resident of Langley Green)

Keep any green area in Langley Green as such. Don't spoil existing remaining green belt between residential area and Gatwick airport. (Resident of Langley Green)

Wildlife/community use

Langley Green green area should be protected to keep the wildlife and to keep it for the local community to walk and enjoy as there are public right of ways in the area. (Resident of Langley Green)

IFIELD

Ewhurst Playing Fields

Ewhurst playing fields - next nearest green space to the town. West Green Park - original part of the new town. (Resident of Langley Green)

Ewhurst Playing fields, Ifield. (Resident of Ifield)

Yes - see attached re Ewhurst Playing Fields. (Resident of Ifield)

Community use

Ewhurst playing fields - used by local people all the time and no other nearby open space for children to play on. (Resident of Ifield)

Yes, Ewhurst playing fields. People from Langley Green, West Green as well as Ifield use this facility. It is very important to the local community. It is also the only accessible space within walking distance for those residents of Millfield court retirement apartments with limited abilities. This site could be enhanced with some picnic tables and benches." (Resident of Ifield)

Yes. Ewhurst Playing fields. People from Langley Green, west Green and Ifield use it. It is very important to the local community. It is the only accessible green space within walking distance of the retirement apartments with limited abilities (Resident of Ifield)

Ewhurst Place playing field used for football & children's play area. Only space available Lower East Ifield & West Langley Green. (Resident of Ifield)

Ifield Brook Meadows

Ifield Brook meadows is an important site that must be conserved and remain unchanged. Please work hard to ensure this area is protected and not built on (Resident of Ifield)

I am opposed to any development on Ifield Brook meadows or Rusper road (or any other open space, park, green etc.). However, i doubt that a space being designated as a local green space protects it from development. For how long is this protection granted - for ever? Buchan park is a country park,

but it didn't stop them building a dual carriageway through it. (Resident of Bewbush)

Community use

It is too close to Ifield Brook Meadows which is to be designated a local green space and hopefully later a local nature reserve. We need to preserve such areas in close proximity to area valued by the community.

Q19. We support designation of Ifield Brook Meadows as green space (a) for its environmental diversity as a former water meadow (b) for its place on the greenway millennium walk (c) for its link between two historic areas of Ifield (Resident of Soutgate)

The land at Ifield Brook is running and used by many for recreation such as dog walking. It would be fantastic to keep this area as a local green space. (Resident of Pound Hill)

Ifield Brook Meadow is a beautiful part of old Ifield and enjoyed by young and old and nothing must be built on this site (Resident of Ifield)

Wildlife

The area west of Ifield Brook Meadows should also be designed as a local Green space (ie land within the marked landscape character edges. This will allow Ifield Brook Meadow to "breathe" as a local green space and also as a local nature reserve at a later date.

Flooding and therefore not appropriate for housing

Thank you for the proposal of Ifield Brook Meadows as a Local Green Space. But really the whole adjacent area to the west, extending to Rusper, is a flood plain - as anyone who has partaken in the organised walks will tell you. Unfortunately this comes under the Horsham District, although the area has Ifield Post codes and as such should be part of Crawley. Cannot CBC push for a boundary change? (Resident of Ifield)

Ifield Brook Meadows is unsuitable for housing due to frequent flooding. The area supports a wide variety wildlife (Resident of Ifield)

Buffer zone between the airport

We agree with all the reasons you give for the designation of Ifield Brook Meadows as a Local Green Space. In addition the meadows contribute to the 'well integrated' boundary between the built up area and the farmed countryside to the west of Ifield Brook. This part of Crawley characterises the original concept of a new town within the countryside.

We need to keep a buffer zone between Crawley and Horsham Ifield Brook Meadows is part of this (Resident of Ifield)

Other suggestions for usage of Ifield Brook Meadows

I disagree that this area should have housing, but, what about a cemetery? (Ifield Brook Meadows)

Whilst I believe we should keep the area around Worth Church and immediately round Ifield Church should be protected - Ifield Brook Meadows could be used for housing - it is only flooding which may cause an issue.

The Millpond

Ifield Mill pond and lakes in bewbush/gossops green area (Resident of Ifield)

If it isn't already protected, then Ifield Millpond (including the Gossops Green side) should protected.

The land surrounding Ifield Mill Pond should be protected (and probably already is), and West Green playing fields should also be protected because it is an oasis of green in an otherwise fairly built-up area. (Resident of Ifield)

Ifield General

More should be done to protect what little there is left of the old part of IFIELD. The land previously used for the social club - opposite The Gables Nursing Home in Ifield Green should be purchased and developed as a recreation ground to replace that used for the new cemetery. (Resident of Ifield)

This land forms a fundamental part of Ifield Village conservation area and as residents it is important to keep this as local green space as it is a unique area for wildlife, flora and fauna. If the new runway is to be built in a few years and Ifield and the surrounding countryside loses a vast amount of its green space it is essential that this area is retained for the public and nature." (Resident of Ifield)

Rusper Road is already being used by traffic from Ifield West. Rusper road and surrounding roads cannot take any more traffic. (Resident of Ifield)

The land off Ifield Avenue, next to the Pope's Mead Bowling Club and the Rugby Club is ideal for such protection, all the way to the back of County Oak. (Resident of Ifield)

SOUTHGATE

Goffs Park

Goffs Park should also re-house Crawley CC. The club has lost its identity since moving away (Resident of Three Bridges)

Q16. Friends of Goffs Park particularly welcome the proposed designation of historic park and garden. Through museum contacts we know that the park has served as a research topic for both undergraduate, post graduate studies our history walks in the park are always well supported. (Resident of Southgate)

Don't protect certain areas of the park.

I have issues with Goff Park the majority by the child play area is very pretty and worthy of protection on the other hand you have probation services in one of the most beautiful houses in Crawley. the 'triangle' is frequented by drug users and should be closed off from the public (this is within Goff Park) the areas off Rusper road shouldn't be built on for flood reason in my view however this is not to say in the future they shouldn't be therefore we shouldn't protect it.. (Resident of Pound Hill)

Southgate Playing fields

The woods and playing fields in Southgate between Furnace Green and Southgate home to the skate board park among others (Resident of Southgate)

Southgate Playing Fields and the woodland by the Hawth should be protected both providing much needed open space in the centre of town. (Resident of Southgate)

Other Southgate sites

The land next to the allotments at Baker Close/Malthouse Road. This is used by children playing ball games and also by dog walkers. In any case, access would be very difficult if houses were to be built here. (Resident of Southgate)

POUND HILL AND WORTH

Burley's Wood

Wildlife

Burleys Wood also should be retained as a protected area, this last section of Crabbet Woodland has been sadly neglected ever since the housing development of this parkland was started, the woods should be maintained as they were in years past. A haven for wildlife and wildflowers and trees (Resident of Pound Hill)

Burley wood should be protected as it homes many species of trees, plants & wildlife. It is an area greatly used by the local Pound Hill community, this

includes families with young children as a play/walk area, dog walkers, horse riders & cyclists where old & young come to meet socially. The surrounding area is already highly populated with no other green area. (Resident of Pound Hill)

Community use

Burleys wood is used everyday, whatever the weather. People drive specifically to walk their dogs here. Sometime, its full if picnics, winter and snowfall encourages children to play outside. Having this area creates s community feel, everyone stops to talk to each other. A friendly neighbourhood is a safer neighbourhood. (Resident of Pound Hill)

The removal of historic status especially of Burley Wood should not happen. This is part of the old estate which can still be accessed by the tunnel uner the M23. I feel that being an historic area at least protects it from becoming yet another housing estate. Crabett Park has only one green space which is use by walkers children and equestrians alike, WE NEED GREEN SPACES. I understand you may well say that it's only taking off the historic status but its the thin edge of the wedge, protect what's left of old Crawley (Resident of West Green)

Council already has plans for the area.

RE Burleys Wood, just because Planners in the past have damaged features doesn't mean you need to devalue the land anymore by removing its protection status. I suspect a hidden agenda here that in years to come you will develop the area as access route to The Old Hollow, which you want Mid Sussex District Council to build homes on according to other planning documents (Resident of Furnace Green)

It seems obvious from your proposal to remove Burleys wood from the historic sites that you are already planning to resurrect the plan to extend Coronet Close to an even greater extent than the plan submitted, opposed & rejected in 2000. This area is extensively used by the local population & should not be altered. (Resident of Pound Hill)

The woodlands between Pound Hill and Worth, and Buchan Park (Non-resident)

Grattons Playing Fields

Gratton Fields (Resident of Furnace Green)

1) Grattons playing fields and adjacent green fields east of railway line. Maidenbower

Milton Mount

Milton Mount and surrounding lake and parkland.

Worth Church

Please keep the open land around Worth Church free from any development. Please ensure that Pound Hill playing fields are never built on. (Resident of Bewbush)

A) Ensure the land around Worth church remains free from building

B) Keep Pound Hill playing fields free development. (Resident of Pound Hill)

The green space around Worth Church is most important, ancient woodland, unploughed meadows, ancient quarry, lakes, ancient scheduled monument. (Resident of Pound Hill)

FURNACE GREEN

The Hawth wood if it is not already designated as one then it needs to be (Resident of Southgate)

3)Woodland to the west and south of the Hawth Theatre. (Resident of Maidenbower)

Furnace Green playing fields and all other playing fields (resident of Ifield)

I believe the playing fields in Furnace Green parallel to the railway line, this is an important space for the residents of both Furnace Green and Maidenbower. (Resident)

GOSSOPS GREEN

Woldhurstlea woods. Gossops green (Non-resident)

NORTHGATE

The open space adjacent to Northgate Avenue, next to the footpath behind the collage, and at the back of houses in Friars Rookery. This land is an historic part of old Crawley and used to be an attractive green area when the trees were trimmed and the grass cut by the council. Apart from the memorial gardens (no vending vans please) this is the only green space left in the town centre and would improve the look of the approach to the new North Crawley Development, if it could be taken over by the council. (Resident of Three Bridges)

Keep the Memorial Garden. (Resident of Tilgate)

Northgate Park (Resident of Northgate)

The area of open space at the rear of Central Sussex College along which a public footpath connects Haslett Ave East and Northgate Ave, should be obtained from private ownership and maintained as a public open space. The land provides a useful open space between the commercial centre of the town and the residential area. (Resident of Three Bridges)

OTHER SITES

Buchan Park

As well as protecting this area, the area adjacent to Buchan Park should be brought inside the umbrella of Buchan park for its future protection and development to enhance the environment for the species that inhabit and visit the area. eg Nightjar on the RSPB red status. (Resident of Broadfield)

Buchan Park (Resident of Tilgate)

The woodlands between Pound Hill and Worth, and Buchan Park (Non-resident)

The whole of Buchan Park including where the kennels used to be (Resident of Broadfield)

Buchan Park, and the playing fields which are currently used for Crawley FC... These fields and Buchan park play a monumental importance for those in Bewbush, as it is a big big open green space where children can play, families can have picnics, dogs can be walked, sport can be played here and it is easily accessible by bus service. (Resident of Bewbush)

Ifield Green. Buchan Park, The Woods and open space North of the Broadfield Brook and south of A23 from Cheals roundabout to Crawley Town FC. Playing Fields off Dormans, Grattons Park, Cricket grounds, Three Bridges, Langley Green Playing fields off Ifield Avenue. (Resident)

OTHER TYPES OF SITES IDENTIFIED

Allotments should be protected;

All allotment sites should be protected. (Resident of Southgate)

All current allotments. Also consider designating any spare sites for use as allotments. These are beneficial to local community cohesion. (Resident of Ifield)

Playing fields

I am very concerned at the number of playing fields under threat with this plan. Protection of these should be part of the Olympic legacy (Resident of Pound Hill)

All playing fields (Resident of West Green)

The local plan should protect ALL of the towns existing playing fields. (Resident of Bewbush)

The local plan should protect ALL of the towns existing playing fields. (Resident of Bewbush)

Play areas

Its best to keep some green land we never get it back when it gets taken away. Please Keep our Play parks! (Resident)

People who felt all green spaces should be protected felt so because;

Generally all sites should be protected

Yes, generally, green sited should be protected (Resident of Ifield)

All parks should be protected (Resident of Southgate)

Preserve all of our town's open spaces! (Non-resident)

All open spaces should be kept. ,,there are plenty of brown spaces that could be used. (Resident of Tilgate)

All green spaces are important in any town & should be protected where possible. (Resident of Bewbush)

All playing fields. (Resident of West Green)

All parks and open spaces should be given protection status. (Resident of Langley Green)

Personally all open spaces should be protected and not filled with every opportunity with house and flats (Resident of Ifield)

We need to protect all parks and playing fields. (Resident of Ifield)

Any open public space needs protection for congregation alone. (Resident of Langley Green)

As many open spaces as possible should be protected (Resident of West Green)

This is a well used and beautiful area (Resident of Ifield)

Yes, If it was right for past planners to designate these green places each time Crawley expanded its living space since the start of the New Town in the 1950's when it only had 50,000 residents we certainly need them now in 2013 when we have 106,000 how many residents will Crawley have in 2029? We need to protect as many green spaces as we can. (Resident of Ifield)

Any other space would be acceptable as well as the Ifield Brook Meadows area. (Non-resident)

The Local Plan should be looking to protect as many open public spaces as possible. (Non-resident)

Every green space in our town should be protected, Buchan, Tilgate, Goffs, all of the playing fields... everything. Stop taking away our green spaces and start protecting them! (Resident of Bewbush)

I propose that there should be no more development anywhere in Crawley (Resident of Bewbush)

It's an asset which is utilised and needed by the community

Yes. Open recreational space is an asset to the community and allows people to have quality time with their friends and families.

As much priority needs to be given to preserving and creating open recreational space for our growing population if we do not want to see Crawley deteriorate into a mass urban sprawl devoid of any sense of pride and pleasure in their community. (Resident of Pound Hill)

Green space is important to the town and building here would destroy this for the footballer, dog walkers, walkers, kids playing and the history of the area (Resident of Ifield)

we need open public space to allow the few of us that still enjoy getting out and about walking there dogs and going for walks in Tilgate which i am disgusted that it is now a proposed land development site. this area is teaming with wildlife and is used by people all year round. why destroy the part of crawley that elevates it above the other boroughs. No sense .once that part of Tilgate is gone its gone forever along with trees that have stood for hundreds of years and a well established wildlife including deer, badgers.. No thought is given to there future housing problem. so go ahead and bludgeon out yet another housing estate...just don't tell the families of all those beautiful creatures that live there just yet...i mean what would be the point they don't get a say anyway do they? (Resident of Broadfield)

Children need space to play in a safe environment, outside of their homes. How many new homes will be allocated to European families. It should not be the responsibility of Crawley rate payers. Government should look out for its own citizens first! (Resident of Langley Green)

Open spaces are very important for all residents when walking in these places it gives a feeling of enjoyment and freedom. For sick people it is important for their development and getting well especially people who are depressed and we know more people are stressed and depressed now. Walk in open areas and fresh air is so important. Also for all health reasons where are people going to walk? Crawley parks and gardens are one of the best kept secrets of Crawley. Do not lose them, build elsewhere! (Resident of Pound Hill)

Any open space that gives people pleasure should be left for the community to enjoy.(Resident of Langley Green)

Green space is important to the health and wellbeing of Crawley residents, we can't keep losing it. Most of the larger schools have already lost their sports fields, we can't keep surrounding the youth of this town with concrete.

Part of my housing needs should have been met with the building of the new estate between Faygate and Bewbush. Who made the decision to take responsibility for it but not to insist that ensure Crawley's housing needs were catered for, not just Horsham's. Not a very good move. And where were the political moves to insist that the developers stuck to their remit for affordable homes? I also question the number of those questionnaires being made available to local residents. (Resident of Langley Green)

These meadows are used by many people, dog walkers, people just getting out for exercise. Where would they go if these were no longer accessible[?] (Resident of Ifield)

All areas that are green should be protected by the council and the council should fight the government on this issue. The working people of this town need green areas to spend their leisure time.

Beautiful and interesting Historic park and gardens and necessary for

1. people to go to for relaxation and meditation and to be associated with history while being close to nature
2. to combat pollution
3. tourist attraction YES

Absolutely these green spaces are an asset to the town. (Non-resident)

Preserve for future generations

We need to keep all of Crawley's green spaces green for future generations. If it was right for the previous planners to designate these green places as the towns population expanded, we most certainly need to keep them for the future residents of Crawley. (Resident of Ifield)

We need to protect these sites for our future generations. (Resident of Bewbush)

Yes we need to protect open space for future generations. (Resident of Ifield)

Children need open spaces to play and learn about nature. (Resident of Pound Hill)

All of our town's open public spaces should be protected for future generations to enjoy for years to come. Even though Crawley is a large town, the initially well thought out development plan from the 50's ensured future populations would have lots of recreational areas to enjoy, lets preserve them and not risk a housing block on every corner! (Resident of Langley Green)

It is already built up in many areas and we should strive to keep our green spaces for future generations to enjoy. (Non-resident)

We need to protect the physical environment and look of Crawley

All green spaces within neighbourhoods should be protected by the Local Green Space, where they are surrounded by existing dwellings. These areas are considered invaluable by residents and locals-alike, as we all live in densely populated, built-up areas, surrounded by the concrete of houses and shops etc., these green spaces provide a much needed breathing space between those living there. (Resident of Furnace Green)

I feel very strongly that we should keep any GREEN AREAS in the Town, we are in danger of becoming a complete concrete jungle. There are other areas in the Town the Industrial Estate has been laid bare Thales and Edwards for example could be used for housing. (Resident of Ifield)

The whole ethos of Crawley new town, it is the idea of an open town with it's green spaces being it's unique selling point. To keep slowly reducing it's green sites, would turn Crawley into a concrete conurbation. (Resident of Broadfield)

Because it is the original part of Crawley (Resident of Ifield)

To much of our green space has been taken for development over the years we should keep as much as possible so as not to become a concrete jungle like London (Resident of Broadfield)

Crawley is very scarce for new residential space, however we can not allow to plaster every bit of green with concrete. Council should find other ways than just on expense of existing residents. Let's not change Crawley into another Croydon. I wouldn't have to drive outside of Crawley with my family to enjoy open green spaces, I hope. (Resident of Bewbush)

I think it is important we keep the look of Crawley with open areas available.(Resident of Tilgate)

I think we should always do our best to protect our green spaces after 56 years living in Crawley I have seen many changes on balance we as a town are slowly running down. We desperately need all our green spaces to breathe once gone we can't bring them back and we owe it to those following on to leave something we should be proud of. (Resident of Northgate)

Crawley is a green town and over the years. We are losing all our space to housing. Green space should be preserved as much as possible (Resident of Langley Green)

It is very rare nowadays to find protected areas of open space in busy towns. This is a good opportunity for Crawley to take a stand and be proud of these areas and encourage the community to be proud of them too. (Resident of Bewbush)

We cannot think of other areas that are as good as this, hence we have not come up with other suggestions. (Resident of Ifield)

I think that all current public spaces should be protected otherwise Crawley will lose its green lungs and become too built up. At the moment Crawley does look green and with huge sites being developed into new neighbourhoods on the edge of town the public green spaces are becoming more and more important. (Resident of Tilgate)

Pollution

I think all the fields, parks and open spaces in Crawley should be left alone or improved (adding more wildlife) otherwise the town would become too polluted and that would have a negative impact on residents health. (Resident of Broadfield)

Beautiful and interesting Historic park and gardens and necessary for

1. people to go to for relaxation and meditation and to be associated with history
while being close to nature
2. to combat pollution
3. tourist attraction YES

We should protect wildlife

it is important to protect for wildlife even small areas left for wildlife are crucial for helping butterflies bird etc In Crawley it seems its build build build no matter if historic buildings are involved or wildlife instead of building more hotels etc this land should be used for housing more environmental consideration required (Resident of Northgate)

Important conservation of wildlife. (Resident of Bewbush)

As well as protecting this area, the area adjacent to Buchan Park should be brought inside the umbrella of Buchan Park for its future protection and development to enhance the environment for the species that inhabit and visit the area. eg Nightjar on the RSPB red status. (Resident of Broadfield)

The land adjacent to the gas holder site where there is a lake and woodland with lovely wild flowers. These should be protected as a wildlife corridor. Wildlife corridors are very important both for the amenity value of residents and wildlife.

Need to have a balance

I think some of this space should be used, but not all of it. (Resident of Langley Green)

It would be good if we could protect these open spaces, but housing people takes priority. This is why I would like to see more high rise buildings as it is a more efficient use of the land. (Resident of Northgate)

it is important to maintain the equilibrium between developing areas and maintaining enough open spaces for everybody to enjoy (Resident of Langley Green)

There has to be a limit to the amount of open space that is taken for housing. Crawley must be reaching saturation limit. The council have a duty to consider this. I can only speak for the open space in the Pound Hill, Burleys Wood area. They've had a number of attempts over the last twenty years to build on

the few open spaces that we have. Someone please stop it! (Resident of Pound Hill)

Some but not all put them to better use. (Resident of Broadfield)

Should be more developed, partly (check if comment relates to specific area). (Resident of Langley Green)

Would it affect future development?

British Airways would object to the designation of any protected open space, in the vicinity of Gatwick Airport, which would prevent any future prospect of airport expansion. This would include the potential for the creation of an additional runway. (Non-resident)

Other

New Town neighbourhood planned spaces e.g. Rye Ash? Punch Copse? Crossways? Northgate Avenue? Allotment sites? Space between College and Priors Walk? What about Haslett Ave East / Tilgate Drive plantations? Hawth Woods? etc. (Resident of Three Bridges)

Historic Land, Road network too busy now and wouldn't be able to handle more traffic.

Maybe a smaller area of the site could be used!

The open spaces which have be re-designated from historic should be carefully protected in this category to ensure that every locality has green and open space. (Resident of Furnace Green)

Please please protect our parks and woodlands (Resident of Pound Hill)

Please build more cycleway so I can enjoy open spaces (Resident of Bewbush)

Area not stipulated.(may be referring to Ifield Brook Meadows)

My favourite place. It needs some tlc. I love feeding the ducks, the heron and other birds are interesting. (Resident)

Beautiful place. A real jewel in Crawley's crown. (Resident)

This is an outstanding area of unspoilt countryside used by many dog walkers and as a meeting place for dog walkers where dogs can run off the lead in relative safety and without being a nuisance to anyone. (Resident of Pound Hill)

Q14 & 15 We would like to ensure that the pond area shown on your map is re-incorporated into the park (it is currently fenced off) also we support your other designation proposals. (Resident of Southgate)