From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 August 2025 19:35:46 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1203
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 26/08/2025 7:35 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Anchor Inn 46 High Street Storrington West Sussex RH20 4DU
Proposal:	Erection of free-standing timber lighting posts to rear of premises. Erection of 5No new garden pod seating booths, new low picket fencing, conversion of existing garage into a small bar serving area. Installation of bi-fold doors in enlarged window opening to rear elevation.
Case Officer:	Shazia Penne

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	6 Eastbrook Court Cottages Manleys Hill Storrington

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

I wish to declare my objections to the planning application by the Anchor Pub. However, before I do I want you to consider the following arguments:

First the concept of asymmetry of choice: whereas one party (the pub's patrons) can opt in to or out of a pub derived experience, the other party (nearby residents) have no such option and will involuntarily be subjected to it.

Put simply if the pubs application is granted in full then we the nearby surrounding residents will suffer noise and light pollution, and other impediments to the enjoyment of our homes.

Here are some specific arguments against the planning application, building on this idea of involuntary negative externalities:

Our arguments against the pubs planning application:

* Car Parking: The vehicle parking situation in the Anchor is problematic. There's no clear demarcation between the parked vehicle areas and the patrons. The problem here is that the patrons often visit the pub with their young children, and we have often seen children running between where their parents are seated and parked cars. This is clearly a danger to the children.

* Fire risks: A large proportion of the patrons smoke conventional cigarettes
While those that are seated have ash trays available those that will be standing if outside events are allowed will be likely to flick their cigarette butts into the grassed areas near the trees. Given how dry foliage is these days this could be a significant fire risk.

* Light Pollution: The pub may propose new exterior lighting, signs, or security lights to enhance the customer experience and safety. However, the residents living nearby do not benefit from this lighting. Instead, they are forced to deal with increased light pollution, which can disrupt sleep patterns and diminish the enjoyment of their own gardens and living spaces, particularly at night.

* Noise Pollution: The intent by the Anchor to have live music events in its car parking area will be a huge source of noise pollution. The claim by the pubs management that some how they can musically entertain their patrons in their car park on these occasions and keep everything acceptably quiet for their neighbours is unrealistic. Also the pubs patrons have a tendency to shout to each other, we have experience of this now. This occurs when patrons seated on the decking at the rear of the pub shout to others seated inside. We are convinced that this practice will be continued outside. With patrons seated on the decking

shouting to those along the picket fencing and those seated at the pods.

* Chemical pollution: We have noticed that patron seating has been placed very close to car parking bays parallel to the picket fence, with cars mostly parking with their backs toward the picket fence and tables. It should be appreciated that combustion engine based vehicles produce high levels of noxious chemical pollution during the first approximately 10 minutes when started from cold; this period accounts for the warmup for the exhaust based catalytic converters to reach working temperature. Those seated adjacent to these parking bays will be frequently exposed to this pollution.

* Loss of Character and Amenity: A quiet, residential village's character is a public good that everyone enjoys. Introducing a new, noisy, and busy element like frequent outdoor live events changes this character for everyone. The pub's patrons choose to visit for the atmosphere, but the residents lose the quiet enjoyment of their homes and the local environment, a choice that will have been taken away from them.

* Proximity to our Terrace: From the measurements given in the plan it is clear that the fifth pod would be very close to our terrace. We have experience of how high the volume of noise the patrons routinely make at present is. Even at 25 metres away from our terrace on the pubs rear decking. Consequently we would suggest two pods not five.

* Visual Privacy Threat:
There is essentially an inclined line from near where the last pod will be placed to our terrace and our spare bedroom that would allow patrons see directly in to our property, this would not be acceptable to us. We would suggest that a 7ft fence be placed around the last pod from the new bar area; where the garage is at present. Our terrace adjoins our kitchen and is our main source of privacy and enjoyment in or home.
There is also the problem of the grassed area between where this fence could be put and the walls of our house. The problem here is two fold, we have seen this area used as a toilet; for dogs and humans. We are also concerned that being a pathway to the river that some of the smoking patrons will flick their cigarette buts in the direction of the river, this would present a fire hazard. We would prefer to see the area blocked off.

In conclusion these arguments are all centred on the idea that the proposed pub activities create negative externalities-costs imposed on third parties who are not involved in the transaction; i.e. those living nearby who choose not to visit the pub but are nevertheless effected by it.
We also bring your attention to the fact that the pub has no signage advising their patrons to keep their noise down in the

area of decking that is outside and partly In the car park area at present. The offer to install such signage as part of planning application is granted suggests that the concern over noise pollution is not genuine. If it were genuine then why are there none of these signs now?

Live bands can already be clearly heard, despite being inside the pub. Live bands outside the pub will be even more noise polluting.

I dearly hope that pragmatism will reign supreme when considering this planning application. E.g. the pub is a dog friendly pub which will increase the problem of dog fouling, which is something we have experienced near our terrace in the past and especially unpleasant in the summer.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council