From: [redacted]
Sent: 03 November 2026 09:07
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0702

Categories: Comments Received

Dear Sirs,

The planning officer has recently required the applicant to lodge the drawings it should have lodged in the first place, however the "Latest Drawings" of 11th October '26 do not illustrate what the applicant intends to build and
the applicant is still fundamentally misleading the planning officer and the public of what the proposals to alter the entrance to the Steyning Centre are.

These drawings show the new outer aluminium sliding doors, but instead of also showing the new aluminium swing inner doors which are to replace the original swing timber doors, they incorrectly show the original timber doors still in situ.

For all the reasons given in my original objection of 11th August '26, the unnecessary replacement of these timber doors with aluminium is what I fundamentally object to.

It's not acceptable that the applicant continues to mislead by not showing any drawings of the new inner swing doors which will be visible through the new outer sliding ones.

Replacing the original timber doors will fundamentally change the visually most important part of the building and yet the applicant has not shown any illustration of what this will look like after the work is done but instead just showing something very different to what is actually intended.

The application form of 29th April '26 states in a very unclear manner that the applicant intends to replace the original existing timber doors to the building with aluminium SWING doors as well as installing new aluminium SLIDING outer doors beneath the existing canopy.

The drawing uploaded on 11th October '26 P Clay 2362-3 Oct 2026 also states above the illustration of the swing doors "New Doors". And yet his drawing number 2362-4 "Elevation Plans as Proposed" wrongly shows the existing timber doors, not the intended replacement aluminium doors.

I have also noticed another misleading statement by the applicant in the 29th April '26 application form. It claims that the existing timber doors are "painted". They are not, they are stained/varnished so that the natural beauty of the hard wood and its grain are exposed to view.

All my substantive original objections of 11th August '26 also remain relevant and I copy below for ease of reference.

"Planning application DC/26/0702 submitted by Steyning Town Council should be deemed invalid until such times as the following details have been submitted. And in the case this proposal does go

to the planning committee for discussion and decision without my observations being dealt with as listed below, can you please take this communication as my objection.

1/ The applicant has misdescribed the proposal, meaning the Planning Notice is incorrect. The public and planning officer are misled as to what is proposed.

An accurate description is
1/ Construct new enclosed porch externally to the existing building to include sliding doors; and to Replace existing timber and glass swing doors with aluminium and glass swing doors"
not as the Planning Notice says
"Replacement of existing entrance automatic swing doors with external automatic sliding doors."

2/ There are no plan drawings of existing and proposed. And there are no elevation drawings of existing and proposed. It is impossible to tell from the application what the applicant intends to construct concerning the porch. [*Misleading drawings have now been uploaded on 11th October '26]*

3/ The replacement of the existing harmonious mostly hardwood bespoke entrance doors with off the shelf shop entrance aluminium and glass is unnecessary, unsympathetic and incongruous and is not appropriate for the dominant feature of a fine well-designed and architecturally intact public building in the Steyning Conservation Area.

4/ The proposal is contrary to the applicant's own policy as set out in the Steyning Conservation Area Character Assessment endorsed by HDC. "The alteration of windows and doors involving a new design or change of
material. Steyning Parish Council has a preference for windows and doors to be replaced with original materials, but will consider modern materials where they achieve the desired appearance ..." The new appearance with off the peg aluminium shop doors should not be the desired appearance when the existing bespoke timber doors are an important original feature which, having been sheltered from the elements, have no reason to be replaced.

5/ The applicant also implicitly recognised the potentially detrimental effect of porch design when it said in the Steyning Conservation Area Character Assessment that it wanted HDC to consider an Article 4 direction so that HDC could look critically at "Erection of porches to front entrances of properties and the enclosure of existing open porches".

And yet on its own very prominent public building in the conservation area it gives almost no information about what it intends. Not even stating anywhere that its intention is to create a new enclosed porch.

6/ The Heritage statement, item 4, made by Steyning Town Council is incorrect when it states "There would be no change to the use of the building and no substantial alteration to its overall scale, form or appearance".

Of course there will be - the whole front entrance which is the most important element of the building will be substantially changed by replacing the bespoke hardwood entrance doors which are a dominant and key aspect of the
original design with off the peg shop doors and a new enclosed porch for which no drawings have been produced.

Can you please acknowledge my communication? Thank you

[redacted], 7 Fairsfield, Steyning, BN44 3BU