

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 July 2026 09:58:13 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Clarke" <andrew.clarke@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1498

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/07/2026 9:58 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	21 Victoria Gardens Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 9NB
Proposal:	Amended description: Variation of Condition 2 pursuant to planning permission DM/25/3134 relating to hours of use to allow deliveries and collections between the hours of 4am - 7am, and 7pm -10pm, with a restriction to a maximum vehicle size of 3.5 tonnes during these times.
Case Officer:	Andrew Clarke

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	21 Victoria Close Burgess hill
----------	--------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Planning Officer, I wish to formally object to planning application DM/25/3134, seeking permission to extend the operating hours of EBISS UK Ltd from 07:00-19:00 to 04:00-22:00, seven days a week.  My property directly adjoins the application site, with my rear

fence forming the boundary of the warehouse yard. My family and I are therefore among the residents who will experience the greatest impact should this application be approved.

The proposal represents a significant intensification of industrial activity immediately adjacent to long-established family homes. Whilst the applicant describes this as simply allowing vehicles to leave earlier and return later, the practical effect is that industrial activity would take place from 4:00am until 10:00pm, seven days a week.

Impact on my family

My children sleep in bedrooms overlooking our rear garden, directly facing the warehouse yard. Vehicle engines starting at 4:00am, doors closing, vehicle manoeuvring and headlights shining towards our property would inevitably disturb their sleep and have a detrimental effect on their wellbeing.

I am also a shift worker and rely on uninterrupted sleep when I am not working nights. The current operating hours at least provide a period during which neighbouring residents can reasonably expect peace and quiet. Extending operations into the early morning and late evening would significantly reduce that respite and would directly affect my health, wellbeing and ability to recover between shifts.

Existing homes should be protected

Our homes were established before this industrial unit existed. Residents should not be expected to accept an increasing level of industrial activity over time simply because the business wishes to operate more flexibly.

The planning system exists to protect existing residential amenity. In this case, approval would fundamentally change the relationship between this industrial site and the neighbouring homes.

The Noise Assessment relies on assumptions rather than reality

While I appreciate that a professional Noise Assessment has been submitted, I do not believe it adequately reflects the reality of living immediately beside the site.

The assessment assumes that:

- no loading or unloading will occur outside 07:00-19:00;
- drivers will simply enter vehicles and leave;
- reversing alarms will be switched off;
- vehicle movements will remain very limited. [OBJ]

These are assumptions rather than guarantees. Once permission

is granted, neighbouring residents have no practical way of ensuring these operating practices are consistently followed over the lifetime of the permission.

Planning permission should consider what is capable of occurring, not simply what is intended at the time of the application.

The assessment only considers a limited snapshot

The background noise survey was undertaken over one week in March 2026. [OBJ]

This provides only a snapshot of background conditions and does not demonstrate how the site may operate during busier periods, different seasons or over many years if the permission is granted.

The report focuses on average noise rather than sleep disturbance

The assessment repeatedly concludes that vehicle movements are acceptable because the calculated Rating Level is at or below the measured background sound level. [OBJ]

However, average noise calculations do not reflect how people experience disturbance at night.

A single diesel engine starting, vehicle doors slamming or vehicles manoeuvring immediately behind residential gardens at 4:00am can wake sleeping residents even if the average measured sound level appears relatively low.

The report also makes significant reductions to the calculated noise levels by assuming that the noise event occupies only a very small proportion of the assessment period. While that may reduce the mathematical average, it does not reduce the likelihood of residents being woken by a sudden industrial noise during the quietest hours of the morning.

The assessment overlooks other impacts

The report concentrates almost entirely on noise.

It gives little consideration to the impact of:

- vehicle headlights shining towards neighbouring homes;
- security and yard lighting;
- visual disturbance from vehicle movements before dawn and after dark;
- the cumulative effect of repeated early morning and late evening activity immediately behind residential gardens.

These factors all contribute to a loss of residential amenity.

Previous planning concerns

This proposal should also be considered alongside previous planning concerns associated with this site. Residents have already experienced issues relating to development and industrial activity adjacent to our homes. Extending operating hours further would only increase the impact on neighbouring properties and further reduce confidence that residents' amenity is being properly protected.

Conclusion

The National Planning Policy Framework requires planning decisions to avoid unacceptable noise impacts and to protect the health and quality of life of existing residents. [08]

For the reasons set out above, I do not believe this proposal strikes an appropriate balance between the operational needs of the business and the rights of neighbouring residents to enjoy their homes without unreasonable disturbance.

I therefore respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuses planning application DM/25/3134.

Helen Bradford

Kind regards