

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 May 2025 10:16:17 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1057

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12/05/2025 10:16 AM.

Application Summary

Address: Burgess Hill School For Girls Keymer Road Burgess Hill West
Sussex RH15 0EG

Proposal: Revision to floodlighting fittings and hours of operation.

Case Officer: Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 5 Ferndale Road Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: The rear of our property backs on to the school tennis courts that are subject to application DM/25/1057 and I object to the proposals for the following reasons:-

1) The Mid Sussex District Local Plan under DP35: Conservation Areas, states that "open spaces, gardens and boundary features are protected". It also goes on to say "development in a Conservation Area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and range of activities that

contribute to it". The proposal fails to meet the criteria laid out in this section.

2) Additionally, the Plan under DP29 Noise Air and Light Pollution, goes on to say "areas of nature conservation and the quality of peoples life will be protected from unacceptable levels of noise, air and light pollution"

Whilst modern floodlighting minimises "light overspill", at night the courts are currently lit up with a brilliant light backdrop to the dark woodland area which is offensive to the eye and also goes against the policy statement DP29 in the Local Plan. i.e. "The impact on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation areas of artificial lighting proposals (including floodlighting) is minimised, in terms of intensity and number of fittings".

3) The time extension to 2100 hours is well outside school working hours which only suggests the school intends to open the courts to members of the public with all the attendant noise and disruption this would bring to this neighbourhood. In contrast to the use of the courts by the school where pupils are supervised there would be no such controls at these late hours leading to excessive noise and disturbance.

4) In conclusion this is an inappropriate, unsympathetic and unwarranted proposal causing light pollution in a mature Conservation Area damaging the dark woodland environment. It also contravenes certain sections of the District Plan under DP29 and DP35. For these reasons I formally object to this application.

I see that a similar application has been submitted under DM/25/1058, for the Astro Turf courts where my comments and objections set out above would also apply.

Kind regards