

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 September 2026 14:57:49 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0927
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 17/09/2026 2:57 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Lock House Lock Partridge Green West Sussex RH13 8EG
Proposal:	Erection of a car port, leisure suite and padel court. Conversion of the tank room into a holiday let. (Full Application).
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 1 Gatehouse Cottage Lock Partridge Green Horsham West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	The below comments in objection are made in respect of planning applications DC26/0927 and DC/26/0928. The below identifies the principal noise issues arising from the applicant's supporting Noise statement and explains why the assessment should consider not only objecting residential neighbours, but also other noise-sensitive receptors and users of the countryside, including, but not limited to the nearby public right of way (PROW), existing consented residential property formerly

garage block and flat above, and proposed conversion of 'tank room' to a holiday let.

1. Summary

The applicant's statement provides useful information about distance, court orientation and screening, but it does not appear to provide a full receptor-specific assessment of the distinctive intermittent and impulsive nature of padel noise. The principal issue is not simply whether an average noise level falls below a numerical benchmark. Padel produces repeated, attention-grabbing impact sounds. The planning assessment should therefore consider the acoustic character of the receiving environment, maximum/impact noise, frequency of events, hours of use and the effect on external amenity and publicly accessible areas.

A nearby frequently used PROW (2368) at approximately 10m from the proposed court is potentially an important additional receptor. As are the consented garage conversion and proposed 'tank room' holiday let. These receptors should also be considered, particularly because they will experience the court noise at a distance dramatically closer than the nearest objecting dwelling.

2. The applicant's own Noise Statement

The statement identifies the nearest objecting neighbour as approximately 160m away and a second neighbour (our property) at approximately 400m, and says the court is screened by an existing hedge. It also says the site is rural. The statement acknowledges that BS 8233 is a relatively blunt tool for padel's intermittent impact noise.

The statement gives a maximum sound level of 73 dB at 20m in the direction of the nearest neighbour and then uses simple geometric spreading to illustrate approximately 55 dB at 140m and 42 dB at 400m. These figures are presented as an order-of-magnitude illustration, not site-specific acoustic modelling. A key question for the LPA is therefore what the predicted LAeq and LMax actually are at each relevant receptor, how frequently the impact events occur, and whether the assessment models the court in its proposed orientation and operating conditions.

3. The 30m LTA point should not be treated as a safe-distance threshold

The applicant repeatedly emphasises that 160m is more than five times the LTA's 30m figure. That is not the correct interpretation of the guidance. The LTA guidance says that where a residential property is within 30m, sound attenuation could be required; newer SAPCA/LTA guidance says that within 30-50m a formal

specialist assessment is often considered essential. These distances are triggers for assessment/mitigation, not evidence that noise beyond them cannot be harmful or intrusive.

4. Rural tranquillity and acoustic character

Government planning guidance says noise should be considered in the context of the acoustic environment and specifically recognises the importance of tranquil areas that have remained relatively undisturbed by human noise and are valued for recreational and amenity reasons.

The Planning Inspectorate's comments in the April 2026 Stone Hall case (see reference below) is particularly relevant. The Inspector found that the rural area was characterised in part by relative tranquillity and expressly recognised that the sound of a padel ball against the glass and rackets would be inconsistent with the overtly rural qualities of the area. Although that private single-court proposal was not found to cause sufficient wider harm in its particular circumstances, the decision demonstrates that padel's distinctive noise can be relevant to rural tranquillity considerations.

Whilst appeal decisions are fact-specific, the Inspector in the Stone Hall case recognised that the distinctive sound of padel ball impacts against rackets and glass panels was capable of affecting the perceived tranquillity and rural character of the surrounding area.

The relevance of that decision is not the outcome itself, but the Inspector's acceptance that the acoustic character of padel differs from many other recreational activities and may require assessment beyond simple consideration of average sound levels and separation distances.

5. PROW, existing consented residential conversion of garage / flat above & proposed tank room conversion all within 10m of Padel Court

The Noise Statement identifies the two objecting residential properties, but the planning assessment should not be confined to those people who have submitted objections. Government planning guidance says decision-making should consider the acoustic environment, including external amenity spaces and the wider characteristics, likely users and surroundings of the development. A frequently used PROW is a publicly accessible amenity/recreational route.

Users of that route may pass within circa 10m from the proposed court - vastly closer than the 160m residential receptor used as the principal noise case. Residents at the consented garage conversion and proposed tank room conversion would arguably be even closer than users of the PROW.

Any noise assessment should therefore establish the noise experienced by users of the PROW and residents of the garage conversion and proposed tank room conversion. It is particularly

relevant whether repeated ball/racket/glass impacts would materially alter the quiet rural experience of walkers, runners, equestrian and others users of the PROW, and those residents of the consented garage conversion and users of the proposed holiday let, particularly during the summer months. This is not dependent on those users having private property rights or submitting individual objections.

The absence of such assessments within the Noise Statement is a particular concern and appears to form part of a broader pattern of selective reporting within supporting documentation submitted in connection with the applicant's numerous planning applications.

6. Existing noise comparisons

The statement refers to tractors/heavy machinery, our dogs, the existing tennis court and pheasant shooting as evidence that the neighbours already experience intermittent or high-level noise. These comparisons should be treated with caution as source-level decibels are of course not the same as noise received at a receptor. More importantly, the existence of occasional loud noise does not necessarily demonstrate that a new, repetitive and distinctive impact noise is acceptable.

The relevant planning question is the change to the acoustic environment and amenity caused by the proposed development.

The applicant also states that padel noise should be judged in the context of the existing noise character. That principle cuts both ways: a rural environment that would typically be quiet and peaceful can make a new distinctive repetitive impact source much more noticeable.

7. Accuracy of Statements

The Noise Statement makes repeated reference to an objecting property having "two dogs that bark continually" and relies upon this as part of its description of the existing acoustic environment. This is our property, and for the avoidance of doubt, the description is factually incorrect. There are three dogs, not two, at the property and all three are rescue dogs from Holbrook Animal Rescue, a registered animal rescue charity in Horsham. Each dog has had behavioural difficulties for much of its life, which is part of the reason they came into rescue.

It is also inappropriate to characterise their behaviour simply as "continually" barking without knowledge of the circumstances in which they do so. Their barking therefore cannot reasonably be presented, without qualification, as an independent or constant background noise characteristic of the local environment, and is therefore not relevant to this matter.

I appreciate that the existing acoustic environment is a legitimate consideration in a noise assessment. However, where the applicant chooses to rely upon the behaviour of neighbouring animals as part of the evidential basis for concluding that the proposed padel court would have no adverse noise impact, it is important that the factual information presented is accurate and properly understood.

This is another example of information within many of the applicant's planning submissions that is either factually inaccurate or presented without the necessary context. I therefore respectfully ask the LPA to exercise appropriate caution when relying upon assertions in the submitted Noise Statement and other submissions from the applicant that are not supported by objective evidence or accurate factual information.

This point is raised because the applicant has specifically relied upon their alleged behaviour of our dogs as part of the justification for introducing a new and distinctive source of noise into the surrounding rural environment.

It is also worth noting that the driven pheasant shoot referenced by the applicant as being a source of high level noise is also incorrect as the shoot no longer operates on the Lock Estate and hasn't done so for a few years.

9. Evidence and sources

GOV.UK - Noise planning guidance: planning decisions should consider the acoustic environment, external amenity spaces and tranquillity.

LTA/SAPCA Code of Practice for Padel Courts: specialist noise assessment/mitigation may be required where residential properties are within 30-50m.

Planning Inspectorate Appeal APP/R3650/W/25/3376989 (Stone Hall, 2026): rural tranquillity and the distinctive sound of padel were expressly considered.

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