

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 March 2026 15:46:55 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 18/03/2026 3:46 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, open space and infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 9 PENN STONE WAY Thakeham, PULBOROUGH

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	My family has been living in Thakeham for over 300 years, so have more right than most to object vehemently to this excessive violation of our hamlet. Please can we stop further developments NOW, and save our rural hamlet from overdevelopment by greedy

developers who couldn't care less about us.

Infrastructure around the site is totally insufficient to support the proposals. The site would be served only by the B2139, a tiny road incapable of being 'upsized' to cope with what will be a large increase in traffic flow. There have already have problems with medium to large vehicles causing passing problems and blocking. The proposed number of homes will result in at least another 200 cars and will generate many more vehicular movements with delivery vehicles etc., increasing pollution in the area which, particularly in Storrington centre, is one of the worst in the country. Thakeham has virtually no public transport with buses running once a day so it will inevitably mean even more traffic movements. The proposed entrance to the site is in a short space between two very sharp bends with no visibility. It will inevitably lead to 'rear-ending' traffic accidents.

There have been two fatal accidents on the B2139 in the last few years. Does the council want to be responsible for more?

The development would require many hundreds of lorries and other vehicles to access the site to take away the demolished buildings and associated existing debris, then to bring groundworker equipment for clearance, followed by building materials. Given the road system, this is not feasible, particularly for the several years such a development would take.

The local area does not have the facilities to be able to cope with such an expansion of population. Local schools are already full to capacity as are doctor's surgeries etc.

General - This development will add to the existing planned growth in the village, estimated at some 400 units between those built and committed to. This is some 50% of an increase in houses from 2016 and proportionately the highest in West Sussex.

The whole site is much larger than that part which is the subject of this application and will have unallocated spare land that could accommodate hundreds more houses. Should this application be granted consent, it will serve as a precedent to further development on the remainder of the site. A prime example and proof is the increase in the number of dwellings by Bellway at Abingworth Fields phase 3 which went from 25 to 75 units.

The land has been designated as agricultural in the TPC Neighbourhood Plan and it MUST remain that way.

There are currently at least two barn owl nests in the older buildings on the western part of the site. These would be lost along with the surrounding area on the site which is used by many birds, including endangered nightingales, in the breeding season. Bellway had problems selling properties in its Abingworth fields site. So how can they possibly justify the need for more houses in the hamlet.

It would make much more sense for this are to be taken over by the council (public donations to help with the purchase?) and turn it into a country park similar to Southwater.

There is neither the need or call for ANY more houses in

Thakeham.

The village should have a complete ban on blocks of flats: totally inappropriate for a small rural hamlet.

Bellways reputation and past performance shows it doesn't deliver on its promises and what its agreed re Abingworth Fields. There are no benefits to this Application for Thakeham. The village needs to maintain its rural environment and Small Village Designation.

When Bellway took over phase 3 of the Abingworth development they made a substantial increase from the original approved plan of 147 houses on the Abingworth development to well over 200: enough is enough.

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 E aton