

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 01 October 2026 22:40
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1652

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 01/10/2026 10:39 PM.

Application Summary

Address: 3-5 West Street Storrington West Sussex RH20 4DY

Proposal: Shopfront alterations to Nos. 3 and 5 West Street, installation/retention of replacement kitchen extraction duct and associated extract equipment to the rear of No. 3 West Street, fenestration alterations to the rear of the building and external enclosure, and change of use of No. 5 to a waiting and food preparation area (part retrospective).

Case Officer: Robert Hermitage

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Oboe Cottage, 1 Church Street Storrington Pulborough

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: Objection to Amended Application DC/25/1652 - Flame Grill, 3-5 West Street, Storrington Michael Yeoman Oboe Cottage, 1 Church Street, Storrington, West Sussex RH20 4LA michael.yeoman@saventsolar.com
1 October 2026
Development Management, Horsham District Council (submitted via the Council's Public Access planning portal)
Re: Further objection to amended Planning Application DC/25/1652 - 3-5 West Street, Storrington, RH20 4DY ("Flame Grill"), amended submission dated 14 September 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write as the owner and occupier of Oboe Cottage, 1 Church Street, a listed building in the Storrington Conservation Area directly affected by Flame Grill. I maintain my objection of 18 August 2026 in full and object to the amended scheme for the further reasons below. I ask that the application be refused.

The amended description now seeks permission for retention of the extraction duct and equipment, a new external enclosure, and the change of use of No. 5 to a customer waiting and food preparation area. In practice this roughly doubles the floor area of the business, while relying on an oversized extraction system the Council has already ordered to be removed, and which is not even connected at present.

1. The amended submission is an unfinished draft and cannot be determined

The applicant's own supporting statement (Merve Tay Architecture and Design, document 266-EX-ST01, Revision D01, 14 September 2026) is marked "Status: Draft for technical review". It states plainly that it "does not certify the completed installation or confirm that the revised system achieves the acoustic predictions in the existing assessment".

Its Appendix B lists seven categories of information still required to complete the submission (C01-C07). These include the design airflow, the carbon filter selection, the final duct height, the enclosure construction, a revised noise assessment and revised drawings. In other words, the applicant's own consultant confirms that the key evidence on noise and odour does not yet exist. The Council cannot properly conclude that the scheme would avoid harm to neighbouring amenity on the basis of a document that says it cannot yet show this.

Much of the amended submission is a bundle of generic manufacturer catalogue sheets for fans, filters, carbon cells, silencers, mounts and speed controllers. The statement itself confirms that none of these is a confirmed selection, and that they do not establish the installed quantity or operating condition. Product brochures assembled after the event are not a design, and they are no substitute for a properly engineered and independently assessed system. They should be given no weight.

The statement and the noise assessment it relies on also refer throughout to application DC/25/1478, not DC/25/1652. I ask the Council to confirm which application this material relates to and that it has been correctly consulted on.

This matters because Enforcement Notice EN/26/0003 requires the extraction equipment to be dismantled and permanently removed by 27 November 2026, less than two months away. The notice was not appealed. An incomplete amendment submitted weeks before the compliance date should not be allowed to delay compliance, and I ask the Council to confirm that the deadline stands regardless of this application.

2. The change of use of No. 5 intensifies the business and reverses earlier assurances
Drawing P-C01 shows No. 5 becoming a 16.5 sqm food preparation area and a 17.5 sqm customer waiting area, alongside the 19 sqm cooking and sales area at No. 3. The business would occupy roughly twice its current floor area, with all cooking still served by the same single extraction system.

More preparation space and more customer space exist to serve more orders. More orders mean longer and heavier cooking through the same extract, more customers and delivery drivers on West Street and Church Street, and more noise and odour for neighbours. The application provides no assessment of this increased throughput. The noise and odour material is based on the existing operation only.

The extraction stack is double the size of the flue that served the former Trawlers fish and chip shop, which is still shown on drawing P-C02. That oversized system is the very equipment the Enforcement Notice requires to be removed. At present it is not even connected: cooking fumes are being released without a working stack, leaving a haze of fumes over the rear of West Street and Church Street. A stack of this size is not acceptable on a building surrounded by homes. The only proportionate outcome is a return to an extraction arrangement no larger than the one that served the previous fish and chip shop.

The hours of operation have also changed dramatically. The fish and chip shop ran its extraction for around five hours a day. Residents now live with extraction noise and fumes for around twelve hours a day, from about 11:00 until after 23:00, seven days a week. The increased footfall from a doubled waiting and preparation area would add further customer noise, more vehicle movements and fumes, and more pressure on parking in streets that cannot absorb it.

Residents also want a clear assurance that fried chicken will not be added to Flame Grill's offering. The business already cooks doner kebabs, burgers and charred shish kebab

skewers, and the fascia on drawing P-C03 already advertises "Chicken". The carbon supplier's own data, based on DEFRA guidance, places fried chicken in the "Very High Odour" category, above kebab cooking. Adding fried chicken, with the grease, fumes and longer frying times it brings, on top of the existing menu would make the odour problem worse still. Any permission should be conditioned to exclude it.

This also directly contradicts the applicant's earlier Heritage Statement for this application, which stated that No. 5 would remain in ancillary storage use only, with no cooking, customer ordering or hot food takeaway activity. That assurance has now been withdrawn. Given that, I ask the Council to give no weight to the new statement that no cooking will take place in No. 5 unless it is secured by an enforceable condition.

Storrington & Sullington Parish Council has already objected to any change of use from Class E to Sui Generis that has not been granted. The amalgamation would extend the hot food takeaway use into a second unit and remove a Class E unit from the village centre.

3. Noise: the proposed attenuator falls well short of the applicant's own requirement. The DAA Group Noise Impact Assessment predicted a rating level of 27 dB against a 28 dB criterion, a margin of just 1 dB. That prediction depends on a discharge-side attenuator equivalent to the Acoustica R02-5-1800. The only attenuator data now supplied is for the Acoustica CP03-C-0500 range, and the supporting statement itself confirms it has lower insertion losses and "has not been selected or accepted as an equivalent".

Insertion loss (dB)

63 Hz

125 Hz

250 Hz

500 Hz

1 kHz

2 kHz

4 kHz

8 kHz

Required by NIA (R02-5-1800)

8

13

25

44

50

50

37

24

Best CP03 option supplied (C*P-0500-2D)

4

10

16

26

29

29

29

20

Shortfall

4

3

9

18

21

21

8

4

The shortfall is around 20 dB in the mid frequencies where fan noise is most audible. Against a predicted margin of 1 dB, the only product put forward cannot deliver the result the assessment relies on.

The noise case is weak in other ways the statement itself admits:

- The fan was described as "centrifugal" on the drawings but is now identified as a two-stage axial MaXfan 2. The statement says the fan sound data used in the assessment needs to be

verified, and that the assessment's claim that octave data was unavailable conflicts with its own appendix.

- No fan speed controller has been selected, and the fan data warns that electronic speed control can add motor noise at reduced speed.
- The acoustic jacket the NIA required around the fan is now to be replaced by a timber enclosure whose construction and acoustic performance are not defined and remain "subject to DAA's review".
- The assessment assumed operation from 07:00 to 23:00, based on unmanned monitoring on 22-23 December 2025, a quiet period that does not represent normal trading, let alone the intensified operation now proposed.

The Council's own Enforcement Notice found that this equipment causes unacceptable noise harm contrary to Policy 33. Nothing in the amended submission demonstrates that it would not continue to do so. Nor does it address the late-night noise from customers and delivery drivers set out in Section 6, which a doubled customer area would increase.

4. Odour: no carbon filtration is specified or shown to be installed

The supporting statement records that the Environmental Health Officer found no activated carbon installed at his inspection. The amended scheme still does not specify how much carbon will be fitted. It supplies a single product sheet and confirms the quantities are "not a confirmed project selection".

The figures supplied show how far short this is. The fan selection is 2.51 m³/s (9,036 m³/h). One Sitesafe PA240824 module is rated at 1,200 m³/h and a three-module bank at 3,600 m³/h. Handling the fan's duty would need several banks of carbon, with matching housing and fan pressure, none of which is shown on the drawings.

The carbon supplier's own data, based on DEFRA's guidance on commercial kitchen exhaust systems, classes kebab cooking as "High Odour" and fried chicken and burgers as "Very High Odour", needing the longest carbon contact times. The shop fascia on drawing P-C03 advertises "Kebabs - Burgers - Chicken - Doner". The applicant's earlier odour assessment also rated the site "High" risk. This is a very high odour operation that the amended scheme proposes to expand.

The statement confirms the photographs supplied "do not verify that the carbon cells, pleated panels and extended outlet have been completed". It also notes the Environmental Health Officer suggested electrostatic precipitation, which has not been included. The stack is currently not connected at all. For the past two months, cooking fumes have been discharging at ground level into neighbouring gardens and windows. This leaves a haze of fumes over the rear of West Street and Church Street. Residents, including the sheltered housing behind the White Horse, have had to keep windows closed.

5. The discharge height and drawings are unresolved

Drawing P-C03 notes that the duct will terminate at least 1,500 mm above the roof ridge "subject to final confirmation". The supporting statement admits the drawn outlet does not match that note and that no numerical height has been established. The duct diameter, exit velocity and distances to neighbouring windows are all listed as still to be provided.

The drawings submitted on 14 September 2026 still carry the date 12 August 2025, with no revision letter. They still describe the fan as "centrifugal", and the statement itself sets out a list of corrections needed before the drawings can be relied on. The roof penetration detail states that it "does not fix the duct diameter, kerb height, annular clearance or fire rating".

The height and position of the outlet decide whether fumes clear neighbouring homes or fall into their gardens. The Council is being asked to approve a scheme without knowing where the fumes will be released.

6. The rear enclosure, heritage and highways

The photographs in the supporting statement, dated 8 September 2026, show a timber-framed enclosure and new roofing already under construction at the rear. This is further development carried out before permission, while an enforcement notice is in force over the same equipment. Its construction, height relative to upper-floor windows, materials and acoustic performance are all undefined. It also adds to the bulk of development to the rear of buildings within the Conservation Area, beside the listed buildings at 1 and 3 Church Street.

The Council's Enforcement Notice already found the extraction equipment to be an incongruous feature that neither preserves nor enhances the Conservation Area, contrary to Policies 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Policy 14 of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan. An enclosure and a taller flue

would add to that harm, not reduce it. No public benefit has been put forward to outweigh it. Illegal parking linked to the business is already severe. A regular Just Eat delivery driver uses the double yellow lines in Church Street, outside Carters, as a personal parking space. Delivery and customer vehicles park illegally along Church Street and West Street, and across Bax Court and the footways, obstructing traffic at the Church Street junction and pedestrians on narrow pavements. Doubling the customer and preparation space will increase deliveries and collections and make this worse. The application makes no provision for servicing, delivery or customer parking.

The disturbance does not stop at parking. Delivery drivers and customers slam car doors and play car stereos outside the premises until after 23:00, night after night, in a residential street. This late-night noise is unacceptable in a residential area, and a doubled customer area would only increase it.

7. Procedure and conclusion

Residents have now lived with this intolerable situation since June 2025 - sixteen months, and two full summers - without any resolution from Flame Grill. Throughout that time the noise and fumes have continued daily, an enforcement notice has been issued, and the operator has offered a series of incomplete submissions instead of fixing the problem. Further delay is not acceptable.

The amended description adds the enclosure and the change of use of No. 5, which are material changes. I ask the Council to carry out full re-consultation, including site notices and letters to neighbouring residents and the sheltered housing behind the White Horse. Earlier proposals for this site only came to residents' attention by chance.

I also ask the Council to obtain direct advice from its own Environmental Health team on the amended scheme, rather than relying on reports commissioned by the applicant that its own consultant describes as incomplete.

For these reasons, and those in my letter of 18 August 2026, I ask that the application be refused and that Enforcement Notice EN/26/0003 be enforced on 27 November 2026 as required. Any future extraction at this site should be no larger than the arrangement that served the former fish and chip shop.

If the Council is nonetheless minded to grant permission, it should only do so once the missing information is supplied and independently checked, and subject to conditions requiring:

1. An independent noise assessment to BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 of the final installation and the intensified operation, with post-installation verification measurements.
2. An attenuator achieving at least the insertion losses specified in the DAA assessment.
3. An independently designed odour control scheme, with carbon sized to the actual fan duty and a very high odour cooking category, verified before use.
4. A fixed discharge height and position, approved before installation, with the extraction system no larger than the arrangement that served the former fish and chip shop.
5. No cooking, frying or extraction equipment in No. 5, and no fried chicken or additional deep-fat frying at the premises.
6. Restricted hours of operation for the extraction plant and for the business, ending well before 23:00.
7. A delivery and customer management plan preventing parking on the double yellow lines in Church Street and West Street, with deliveries and collections restricted in the late evening.
8. A maintenance and filter replacement schedule, with records available to the Council on request.

Please confirm receipt of this objection and register it against the application referenced above.

Yours faithfully,

 Oboe Cottage, 1 Church Street, Storrington, West Sussex RH20 4LA

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton