

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 July 2026 16:41:26 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2087
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 08/07/2026 4:41 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Thakeham Tiles Ltd Rock Road Storrington West Sussex RH20 3AD
Proposal:	Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings, and the re-development of the site for up to 108no. dwellings (including a mix of private and affordable housing units), with associated infrastructure including vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access, parking, landscaping, open space and play provision, and sustainable drainage with all matters reserved except access.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Greenwood, Bracken Lane Storrington

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I note that the Thakeham Tiles outline development application has received a number of updates documents , that require further

comment.

In addition to my original objections, I have concerns regarding the accuracy of the foundational material used to justify the location and density of housing. This is typified by the poor and inaccurate positioning of the site boundary on numerous plots and maps (Phase 1 Desk Study Report 37212-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1000 P05 Part 4), which variously show the site boundary running through our drive or crossing our garden. This calls into question the accuracy of any surveys carried out in support of the application and recommendations made therein. Similarly assertions that local shops are within a 10 to 15 minute walk from the southern side of the site are a fantasy, particularly when faced with a return trip up hill towards the site from Storrington when laden down with shopping. Having made the walk myself, it is a 20 to 25 minute walk and predicates the more likely use of private vehicles to reach Storrington, adding to road congestion and pollution in the town.

The Landscape Design Strategy document (2.18) asserts that Heath Common, Sullington Local Wildlife Site is located some 50m to the south of the site at its closest point. Perhaps you could highlight on one of the maps where this close proximity exists , as 50m puts you on my property and behind my property is my neighbours property which extends for another 100m or so before you reach any open woodland. You might also like to re-measure the distance from the site to the working pit at Sandgate Park. These inaccuracies again call into question the reliability of the applicants data.

The Proposed Drainage Strategy Plan is indicative that groundwater from the sites' southern central area will be routed/ channelled / directed towards the southern edge of the site , leading to an increased potential for erosion / undermining of the elevated slope to the south / south east.

The Response to Landscape Comments document notes the presence of rhododendron within the woodland area and for the removal of this, to be replaced by native species. There is no evaluation or even recognition of the potential damage the removal of rhododendrons from the southern slope/escarpment will do to the structural integrity of the southern slope, particularly when undertaken with additional tree removal. There is a complete lack of transparency as to what would remain of the existing southern / south eastern slope wooded area. I don't believe any of the trees in this area have been surveyed. The Landscape Design Strategy notes that the development proposed for the southern area of the site would include embankment features along the boundary, with some associated ground preparation. What are these features and preparations that they will not unduly impact the southern slope, my boundary and

property. The revised proposal documents also note that a timber post and rail fence will edge the woodland areas to prevent access. This seems highly unlikely to stop anyone climbing over the fence to gain access to the boundary woodland areas, thereby increasing again the potential for fauna damage and erosion, particularly of the embankment to the south. In fact I would suggest it would act as an invitation to use the wooded areas for unauthorised recreational purposes.

With respect to lighting having a detrimental impact on the night time wildlife , the use of mitigation such as downlighters is laudable. What measures will be in place to prevent further light pollution being created once any properties built are in private hands and subject to the whim of the homeowner to install additional building and garden lighting features?

In summary I urge the Council to decline this application. I would be in favour of seeing a full application within which we might see the actual plans for the site and make informed decisions based on the "to be" rather than the "may be this or could be that, or we don't want to say until it's too late in the planning process to object".

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 E aton