

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 October 2026 20:52:00 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 01/10/2026 8:51 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 - Other - 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 am not against new housing or development in principle. Thakeham has already accepted a considerable amount of new development in recent years. My objection is about the scale of this particular proposal, its location and whether our village and its infrastructure can realistically cope with it.

Thakeham is a small rural village and I simply don't believe another 150 homes on this site represents appropriate or sustainable development. This is particularly concerning when there remains the possibility of a further 85 homes on the western part of the site. For a village the size of Thakeham, the potential difference between 150 and ultimately 235 additional homes is enormous.

One of my biggest concerns is traffic. Anyone who actually lives here and regularly uses the roads around Thakeham will know what they are like. The routes into and out of the village are narrow, winding country roads. Large vehicles already regularly have to cross towards or onto the opposite side of the road to negotiate bends and narrow sections. These roads were simply never designed to carry the level of traffic that could result from development on this scale.

This isn't just my perception as somebody who lives here. The Planning Inspector considering the previous development specifically described the section of Storrington Road between the two parts of Thakeham as relatively narrow, with high banks on either side and no footway along the carriageway.

Public transport doesn't provide a realistic solution either. Our bus services are very limited. Thakeham simply doesn't have the range of facilities that would allow hundreds of additional residents to carry out their everyday lives within the village.

People will need to leave Thakeham to get to schools, larger supermarkets, work, medical appointments and many other everyday services. In reality, for many of those journeys people will use their cars.

This was one of the fundamental problems with the previous proposal for 247 homes. That application was refused and Bellway's subsequent appeal was dismissed. Horsham District Council specifically reported that the limited facilities in the village and distance from key services would leave residents highly reliant on cars for their everyday needs.

Reducing the proposal from 247 homes to 150 does not suddenly provide Thakeham with better roads, frequent buses, more schools, a supermarket or the other services that the village lacks. The fundamental problem with the location remains.

I am also concerned that the Mushroom Farm was not allocated

for housing through our adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The plan actually contains a specific policy for the site which sought continued agricultural or horticultural use and, if that could not be achieved, identified alternative lower-impact uses. It even refers to limiting things such as traffic movements in order to maintain the rural character of the area.

That is important to me. Residents participated in the Neighbourhood Plan process in good faith to help decide how Thakeham should develop. It is difficult to see the point of communities going through that process if a site dealt with in the plan can subsequently come forward for a very substantial housing development that was not envisaged by it.

There is also the cumulative impact of development to consider. Thakeham has already grown substantially. The Inspector dealing with the previous application specifically noted the material expansion of Thakeham/Abingworth in recent years, including around 200 dwellings at Abingworth Meadows.

At some point the question has to be asked not simply whether another individual development can physically be fitted onto a piece of land, but what the cumulative effect of all this development is doing to the village as a whole.

I am concerned about schools and healthcare for the same reason. Another 150 households will inevitably create additional demand for local services. If further development subsequently takes the overall number towards 235 homes, that pressure would be greater still. These things should be considered now rather than after the houses have been built.

The countryside surrounding Thakeham is also an important part of the character of the village. We are close to the South Downs National Park and live in a distinctly rural area. I appreciate that the application site itself is not within the National Park, but development should still respect Thakeham's rural setting and the wider landscape. I don't want to see the village gradually lose that character through successive large developments around its edges.

I am particularly concerned about the possibility of the remaining western land coming forward later. I appreciate that the Council must determine the application actually before it, but where there is a realistic prospect of further development, I believe the wider cumulative consequences for traffic, services and the character of Thakeham deserve serious consideration.

Perhaps most importantly, we have already been through this once. The previous application proposed 247 homes. Horsham District Council refused it and the Planning Inspector subsequently dismissed Bellway's appeal, agreeing that

development of that scale was not sustainably located.

I accept that 150 homes is fewer than 247. However, simply reducing the number of houses does not answer the underlying question: what has fundamentally changed about Thakeham to make this location sustainable now?

The roads haven't become wider or less winding. The bus service hasn't suddenly become comprehensive. The schools, supermarkets and other facilities people need haven't moved closer to the site. Thakeham hasn't stopped being a rural village.

For me, that is at the heart of this application.

I don't believe that 150 additional homes - with the possibility of considerably more development later - represents sustainable growth for Thakeham. I believe it would lead to more car journeys on unsuitable rural roads, place additional pressure on services and infrastructure and contribute to the gradual loss of the rural village character that makes Thakeham what it is.

I therefore strongly object to planning application DC/26/0266 and ask Horsham District Council to refuse planning permission

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