

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 08 August 2026 14:34
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0946

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 08/08/2026 2:34 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Steyning Cricket Club Charlton Street Steyning West Sussex BN44 3LE
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing club house and changing building and the construction of a new single storey pavilion and part 1.5 storey changing facility with associated landscaping and storage areas
Case Officer:	Shazia Penne

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	3, The gardens Charlton Street Styening

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Re: Proposed Redevelopment of Steyning Cricket Club Pavilion, Charlton Street, Steyning Reason for comment: Design / Loss of General Amenity / Over Development / Privacy Light & Noise Dear Planning Officer, I write to object to the above planning application. Whilst I support investment in

community facilities in principle, I do not consider that the submitted application has adequately demonstrated that the proposed development can be accommodated without causing unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity. Furthermore, a number of aspects of the proposal appear insufficiently justified or lack the technical information necessary for the Local Planning Authority to properly assess their impacts.

My objections are set out below:

1. Failure to Protect Neighbouring Residential Amenity

The application proposes a significant increase in facilities including an enlarged pavilion, bar/lounge and event space. The applicant has failed to provide a Noise Impact Assessment demonstrating that neighbouring residential amenity will not be adversely affected. Residents living adjacent to the cricket ground already experience significant disturbance arising from the existing use of the site. Consequently, any proposal that is likely to intensify activity should be supported by robust evidence demonstrating that neighbouring residential amenity will not be adversely affected.

The application contains no detailed assessment of the likely increase in noise associated with:

- increased numbers of users.
- evening functions or community events.
- external congregation of patrons.
- opening and closing of external doors; or
- general operational activity associated with the enlarged pavilion.

Without such evidence, the Local Planning Authority cannot reasonably conclude that the proposal would safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. National planning policy requires development to create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on neighbouring occupiers. In my opinion, the application has failed to demonstrate compliance with these principles.

2. Insufficient Information Regarding Mechanical Plant, Heat Pumps

The application does not appear to provide sufficient information regarding the location, specification or acoustic performance of any proposed heat pumps, air source heat pumps,

condensers, ventilation equipment or air conditioning plant associated with the development. Mechanical plant is capable of generating continuous background humming and low-frequency noise which can have a significant effect upon nearby residential properties, particularly during evenings and overnight periods when background noise levels are considerably lower. Given the close proximity of neighbouring dwellings, it is essential that the application demonstrates that plant noise will not adversely affect residential amenity. No acoustic assessment or plant noise assessment appears to have been submitted demonstrating:

- the type of equipment proposed.
- its sound power levels.
- its precise location.
- predicted operational noise levels.

or

- compliance with recognised acoustic assessment standards.

In the absence of this information, it is impossible to conclude that the development would not result in unacceptable noise impacts.

3. Excessive Height and Unjustified Roof Form

Although described as predominantly single storey with a modest one-and-a-half storey element, the proposed building incorporates a pitched roof form which appears considerably higher than is reasonably necessary for the accommodation it serves. The submitted sections indicate that the principal ridge reaches approximately 6.4m metres above finished floor level, with an eaves level of approximately 4.1m.

The Design and Access Statement does not adequately explain why such a substantial roof form is required for the predominantly single-storey block containing the main bar and ancillary club facilities. The proposed ridge height appears disproportionate to the

accommodation it serves, and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate why a lower roof profile could not achieve the operational requirements of the building whilst reducing its visual impact on neighbouring properties. In the absence of this justification, it is difficult to understand whether the roof form has been oversized to provide flexibility for future adaptation or whether alternative, less visually intrusive design options have been properly considered.

A lower roof profile would appear capable of accommodating the proposed use whilst reducing:

- visual prominence.
- perceived scale and massing.
- impact upon neighbouring residential properties; and
- the overall dominance of the building when viewed from surrounding dwellings.

The application therefore fails to demonstrate that the proposed scale has been minimised or that the development represents the least harmful design solution.

4. Poor Relationship Between External Doors and Adjacent Residential Boundary

I have particular concerns regarding the proposed double doors located immediately adjacent to the shared residential boundary. Whilst the drawings identify these as providing access to the rear external area, the application provides no assessment of how these doors will operate during normal use of the building or during larger cricket matches, club events or social functions. Given their location immediately adjacent to neighbouring gardens, there is a clear potential for:

- internal noise escaping directly towards neighbouring properties.
- doors being left open for prolonged periods during events.
- food and cooking odours being discharged into neighbouring gardens; and
- increased disturbance resulting from movement between internal and external spaces.

These concerns are entirely foreseeable given the nature of the proposed use.

The application contains no management strategy, operational controls or mitigation measures demonstrating how these impacts would be prevented. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded approving the development, I respectfully request that careful consideration be given to relocating these doors, introducing acoustic mitigation or imposing operational controls to minimise impacts upon neighbouring residents.

5. Inappropriate Architectural Features and Design Quality

Whilst design is inevitably subjective, planning policy nevertheless requires development to respond positively to its context and to demonstrate high-quality design. In this respect I am concerned by the introduction of the proposed clock tower. The tower appears visually unrelated to the otherwise modest pavilion buildings within the Memorial Playing Fields and introduces a prominent vertical feature which is not reflected within the surrounding townscape.

The application provides no convincing architectural or functional justification explaining why this feature is necessary. Rather than contributing positively to the character of the site, the tower appears visually discordant and risks becoming an unnecessarily dominant feature within an otherwise simple recreational setting. A simpler and more restrained design would, in my view, better respect the character of the area whilst still achieving the operational objectives of the development.

Conclusion

I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority gives careful consideration to the matters raised above. My concerns are not directed towards the principle of improving the cricket club. Rather, they relate to whether this particular proposal has been sufficiently justified and whether it has adequately demonstrated that neighbouring residential amenity will be protected.

In summary, I consider that the application:

- fails to demonstrate that increased activity associated with the enlarged pavilion will not adversely affect neighbouring residents.
- provides insufficient information regarding the noise impacts of proposed mechanical

plant.

- fails to justify the scale and height of the proposed roof design.
- inadequately addresses the relationship between external activity areas and adjoining residential properties; and
- includes architectural features that are insufficiently justified and fail to respond appropriately to the local character.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused unless these concerns can be satisfactorily addressed through amended proposals and the submission of further supporting technical information.

Where did you
hear about this
application?

Not specified

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



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