

[REDACTED]

Sent: 07 April 2026 14:56
To: Planning
Subject: DC/26/0322

Categories: Comments Received

Good afternoon,

I have tried several times to submit my comments on the HDC portal to no avail, please find my comments below which I hope are read.

Whilst the school undoubtedly needs investment, I am concerned and disappointed with the proximity of the proposed works to the boundaries of the dwellings on the North side of Coxham Lane,

Allowing buildings that are 13m high to overlook the private, secluded rear gardens of Coxham Lane is more in keeping with a city centre school and it clearly shows that this site is being overdeveloped for a capacity target and is not sympathetic to the typical Downs settlement that Steyning represents.

The access road to the school car park passes less than 10m to the rear of the gardens and provides a direct vehicle link to Shooting Field.

The car park has 164 spaces, or 328 vehicle movements per day. This can only increase the strain on the southern section of Horsham Rd where already vehicle have to mount the path when they meet.

- Measures should be introduced to prevent vehicles cutting through to avoid the High Street and the A283 junctions

The Leisure Centre car park is already used after hours and the sounds of wheel spin and engine revving are not uncommon, the service road to the car park will only exacerbate this.

There is then a further pedestrian path that passes immediately against our rear boundary. It should be noted there are currently no vehicle movements or pedestrian paths in this area.

- Gates should be positioned and controlled to protect the privacy of the gardens outside of school hours and terms

The title boundary is a chainlink fence and is in the established hedgerow, referenced as H5 in the Arb Report, that provides all-year screening and security to our gardens.

We are unable to improve this boundary on our side and would ask for

- a 2m high timber fence to be installed to prevent the public from looking through or entering into our garden and affecting our privacy.

The drive and path pass through an area of existing, established trees – some of which are acknowledged as not in the ownership of the school in the Arboricultural report.

Introducing a no-dig road is referred to on the drawings, but this will mean raising the height of the current ground levels (as they can't be dug in). This will further affect the privacy into our garden

- The proposed design of the driveway and the finished ground levels to the rear of our boundaries should be made available and subject to a planning condition so they are controlled

- Long term inspections and health checks of the trees and hedges should also be implemented and made publicly available so that trees don't deteriorate in the years that follow the project.

The External Lighting Design has, in my view, been miscalculated and should be an E2 (semi-rural) design, and not an E3 (urban). This is of particular importance given the proximity of Steyning to the SDNP and the Dark Skies area that the residents enjoy. I note this has already been commented on by the SDNP during their consultation and would hope their document *Towards a Dark Sky Standard* is conditioned through the planning decision.

The lighting to the Southwest MUGA appears to have been removed since the public consultation event. This is welcomed, however should be conditioned that any introduction of lighting in the future is made via a full planning application process and to the same or improved standard as the current scheme.

Kind regards