

21 September 2026



John Ainsworth

E: john.ainsworth@savills.com

DL: +44 (0) 7977 942 974

M: +44 (0) 7977 942 974

Runway East - York and Elder

50 New England Street

Brighton BN1 4AW

savills.com

Dear Sam,

**Re: DC/26/0266 - Thakeham Mushrooms, Storrington Road,
Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 3DY
Response to Enterprise Horsham Consultation Response**

We write further to the objection submitted by Enterprising Horsham (Economic Development) dated 24 August 2026.

It is noted that the Economic Development Team has maintained its objection from the previous application on the site (DC/24/0021).

The updated consultation response confirms that the marketing exercise undertaken as part of the previous application adequately demonstrated that there is no realistic prospect of the continued commercial occupation of the existing buildings. Notwithstanding this conclusion, Enterprise Horsham has expressed disappointment that the proposed development does not include an employment-generating element or measures to offset the loss of commercial floorspace.

In response to this objection, we refer to the Planning Officers Report for application DC/24/0021;

"The HDC Economic Development Team have raised no objection to the marketing undertaken. However, the Team has commented that it is felt that the redevelopment should include additional workspace for small businesses. The Economic Development Team further commented that the proposal is a predominantly residential scheme involving the loss of commercial/agricultural buildings, with no commitment to providing replacement commercial floorspace, other than a minimal amount of Class E retail floorspace."

"Notwithstanding the comments from the Economic Development Team, it is considered that the marketing undertaken is acceptable and has demonstrated that the site is not viable for policy-compliant uses, given its condition and location. As such, the scheme has met the requirements of Policy 9 of the HDPF."

The Planning Officers Report therefore confirms that the scheme meets the requirements of Policy 9 of the HDF and that the site is not viable for policy-compliant employment uses, having regard to both its condition and location. Consequently, the principle of redeveloping the site for alternative non employment use has already been accepted, and the absence of replacement employment floorspace did not form a reason for the previous refusal.

Yours sincerely

John Ainsworth

John Ainsworth MRTPI MTCP
Associate

