

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 September 2026 18:04:17 UTC+01:00
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 27/09/2026 6:04 PM.

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, biodiversity net gain bank, public open space, storage building, ancillary parking and all associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 22 Nursery Rise Thakeham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment
Comments:	I am writing as a resident of Thakeham to object to the proposed development of 150 homes on the former Mushroom Farm site. I understand that Thakeham needs to accommodate some new

housing and I am not against development in principle. My concern is that 150 homes on this particular site is simply too much for a small rural village, particularly when the possibility of a further 85 homes on the western part of the site is still being retained.

Thakeham is classed as a smaller village, and I don't believe this development is appropriate for the character or scale of the village. The Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan was produced with considerable local involvement and identified particular locations where housing development should take place. The Mushroom Farm was not identified as a housing site. In fact, the Neighbourhood Plan's policy for the Mushroom Site envisaged agricultural/horticultural use continuing, or lower-impact alternative uses if that was no longer possible.

I am particularly concerned about transport and the roads around the village. Anyone who regularly drives through Thakeham will know that the roads are narrow, winding rural roads. There are already occasions where large vehicles have to move onto the opposite side of the road to pass safely. I do not think it is realistic to add the traffic generated by another 150 households without this having a significant impact on the village.

The limited bus service is another important issue. Thakeham does not have the sort of public transport network that would allow residents to easily get around without a car. There are also limited facilities within the village. For many everyday journeys, including getting to school, larger supermarkets, work, healthcare and other services, residents will need to travel outside the village.

This means that a development of 150 homes is not simply 150 new houses. It potentially means hundreds of additional people making journeys in and out of Thakeham, with a large proportion of those journeys likely to be made by car. This was also a significant issue with the previous proposal. When Bellway's earlier application for 247 homes was appealed, the Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal, and Horsham District Council noted that the limited facilities in the village and distance to key services would result in residents being highly reliant on car travel.

I am also concerned about the cumulative impact. Although the current application is for 150 homes, the applicant is retaining the option of seeking permission for another 85 homes. I don't think the eventual impact on Thakeham can sensibly be considered without acknowledging that possibility. The difference between a development of 150 homes and potentially 235 homes is considerable for a village of this size.

There is also the question of the landscape and setting of the village. Thakeham is surrounded by attractive rural countryside and is close to the South Downs National Park. This is part of

what makes the village a desirable place to live. I am concerned that continued large-scale expansion around the edge of the village will gradually change the character of Thakeham and the relationship between the built-up village and the surrounding countryside.

I also think it is important to remember that this isn't a situation where the concerns about the location are completely new. The previous 247-home proposal was refused and the subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. The Inspector concluded that the proposal should not proceed.

I appreciate that the new proposal is smaller and has been revised. However, reducing the number of houses does not, in my view, remove the fundamental problems with the location. The roads are still the same, the bus services are still limited, the village still has limited facilities, and the site is still in the same rural location.

I therefore ask Horsham District Council to consider whether this is genuinely a suitable and sustainable location for a development of this scale, taking into account the existing character of Thakeham, the limitations of the road network and public transport, the lack of local facilities, the landscape setting and the potential cumulative impact of further development.

For these reasons, I object to application DC/26/0266 and ask that planning permission be refused.

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