

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 March 2026 11:46:40 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0266
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 09/03/2026 11:46 AM.

Application Summary

Address: Thakeham Mushrooms Storrington Road Thakeham Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3DY

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site to provide 150 dwellings, including affordable housing, land for the community land trust, works to public right of way and associated landscaping, open space and infrastructure.

Case Officer: Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 16 Pavilion Close Thakeham Pulborough West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: The original planning application and development of this land was rightfully ruled out by HDC and it's subsequent appeal to the SoS on sustainability, access and over development grounds last

year.

The same points still apply, as the village still has no suitable transport infrastructure for more addition vehicles of all types, no school, no real worthwhile bus service, no proper shop and no other essential services clearly required by an already massively enlarged village, due to this applicants Abingworth Crescent Phase 3 development which really struggled to sell last year.

What's changed by applicant in this application, just a reduction the houses to 150 in a partial planning application and to get it approved ? Then they can put for Phase 2 and 3 later for far more houses !!

The Local Planning Authority must assess the cumulative impact of the whole site's development potential now. To determine this application in isolation would risk piecemeal expansion that incrementally overwhelms local infrastructure and undermines plan-led development principles.

My objections are set out below:

1. Unsustainable Location and Car Dependency

Thakeham is a rural village with extremely limited services and public transport provision. Future residents will be almost entirely reliant on private vehicles for employment, education, healthcare and retail needs. This conflicts with the core sustainability principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which require development to be located where sustainable transport modes can realistically be used. Sharing cars is just not an options.

2. Highway Safety and Capacity

The local road network is rural in character, narrow in places, and already experiences congestion at peak times. Access arrangements effectively create a single principal route in and out. Any significant increase in vehicle movements raises serious concerns regarding:

- Highway safety
- Pedestrian and cyclist safety
- Emergency vehicle access
- Cumulative congestion from existing recent developments

The applicant has not demonstrated that the surrounding highway infrastructure can safely accommodate further growth, particularly when considered alongside potential future phases.

3. Pressure on Healthcare Provision

Local GP services are already under demonstrable strain, with limited appointment availability and extended waiting times. There is no clear evidence that additional capacity will be delivered in parallel with housing growth. The development would therefore place further unsustainable pressure on primary healthcare services.

4. Education Capacity

Local schools in and around the village have limited capacity. Without guaranteed and deliverable school places within reasonable proximity, this proposal risks increasing out-of-area travel and further traffic generation.

5. Drainage and Water Infrastructure

There are ongoing concerns locally regarding surface water drainage and foul water capacity which is already running at near 100% capacity and already needs increasing. Given the topography and history of drainage issues in parts of the parish, there is a

legitimate concern that existing infrastructure may already be operating near capacity. The applicant must demonstrate, with robust evidence, that the network can accommodate not only this phase but the likely full development of the site.

6. Prematurity and Cumulative Impact

Granting permission for this phase without clarity over the ultimate scale of development risks prejudicing proper infrastructure planning. Incremental permissions can cumulatively transform the scale and character of rural settlements beyond what was envisaged in the Local Plan. The authority should not allow the site to be developed in a fragmented manner without a comprehensive masterplan covering the entire landholding.

7. Market Absorption and Overdevelopment

There remain recently constructed properties in the area that have not been absorbed quickly by the market. This raises concerns that the scale and rate of development may already exceed local demand. Continued expansion risks unnecessary overdevelopment and long-term imbalance in the local housing market.

For all the reasons above, the Planning Application fails to represent sustainable development and would place further unacceptable pressure on highways, infrastructure and community services which is just not acceptable to this village.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton