

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 28 July 2026 17:35
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0945

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 28/07/2026 5:35 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Abingworth Nurseries Storrington Road Thakeham West Sussex
Proposal:	Variation of condition 1 of previously approved application reference DC/22/0773 (Variation of Condition 1 of previously approved application DC/19/1707 (Revised layout for Phase 3 of the Abingworth Meadows development (Original application ref: DC/10/1314) to provide for 75 dwellings including 26 affordable dwellings and community studio workshops). Amendment to buffer strip to reflect an additional swale with landscaping (part retrospective).
Case Officer:	Jason Hawkes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	18 Springett Close Thakeham Pulborough
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	For the attention of the Planning Officer, DC/26/0945 Application reference: DC/26/0945 Site: Abingworth Nurseries, Storrington Road, Thakeham, West Sussex Proposal: Variation of condition 1 of DC/22/0773 to reflect an additional swale within the landscaping (retrospective) From: [REDACTED], 18 Springett Close, Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 3RF (Plot 67)

We write as owner-occupiers of 18 Springett Close, a property directly adjoining the buffer

zone that is the subject of this application. Its purpose is to ask that the retrospective change be assessed against the original planning intent for this land, and to ensure the record reflects the limits of what this application can determine.

1. The change should be assessed against the original purpose of the buffer zone

The buffer zone to the rear of the eastern plots was required by condition as a minimum eight-metre layer of separation between the agricultural land to the east and south east and the housing, and to assist in preserving biodiversity. At the point of our purchase in August 2024 that was its function on the planning record, and the plans presented to purchasers showed it as landscaped green space between the rear boundaries of our properties and the wider edge of the development.

The swale, trench and associated regrading were introduced after most properties were occupied and were not part of the configuration approved at the time of sale. We would ask the authority to consider whether, as built, this feature still delivers the biodiversity and separation purpose the condition was intended to secure, or whether that intent has been displaced. In practical terms the swale and its banks now occupy the majority of the buffer, including a raised bank along the southern fence line that has affected privacy and site levels relative to the position approved and marketed, and the land remaining either side is of limited practical amenity value.

2. The safety and public-access considerations sit oddly together

The consultation responses raise safety concerns arising from the open water feature, and at the same time the buffer is described as public amenity greenspace intended for open public access. We would invite the authority to consider whether those two positions are consistent as the scheme is now built. If the feature is considered to require safety measures such as fencing, that has obvious implications for the open-access amenity function the land was originally intended to serve, and it is difficult to see how the space delivers meaningful public amenity once the swale and any associated safety treatment are taken into account.

3. Ownership and maintenance-cost allocation are not matters this application determines

We note that the consultation responses include proposals to divide the buffer zone and to allocate the ownership or maintenance cost of the swale portion to a subset of residents. We respectfully ask the authority to record that the allocation of maintenance liability between private parties is not a land-use matter capable of being secured by planning condition, and that the grant or refusal of this application does not, and cannot, determine who bears the cost of maintaining the swale. Those matters are governed by the transfer deeds, the estate management arrangements and the section 106 agreement, and fall outside the scope of this application.

We make one observation for the record only, since the point is raised in the consultation responses. The suggestion that the maintenance cost should fall on Springett Close residents alone appears to rest on an understanding of the estate management charge that does not reflect how it operates. The estate charge is levied across all properties on the estate, and owners already contribute to drainage and flood infrastructure elsewhere on the site, including the attenuation basin and private drainage system, irrespective of which individual properties any given asset happens to protect. A carve-out singling out one drainage asset for a benefit-based charge on a subset of homes would be inconsistent with that established basis. We recognise this is not a matter for the authority to resolve, and raise it only so that the file is not left with the impression that such an allocation is settled or agreed.

4. The section 106 obligation

We understand the transfer of the buffer zone to the Parish Council to be an obligation on the developer under the section 106 agreement dated 17 February 2021, and that this obligation does not pass to individual purchasers. We note that the Parish Council was previously prepared to accept the land on its original basis, and it is not clear to us what change now justifies departing from that. We ask that any conditions attached to any permission remain consistent with the section 106 obligation and do not have the effect of transferring to

individual homeowners a burden that the section 106 places on the developer.

We would be grateful if this representation could be taken into account in the determination of the application and placed on the file. We are content for it to appear on the public register.

Yours faithfully


18 Springett Close, Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 3RF

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton