

Katherine Williams

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 August 2026 21:34
To: Katherine Williams
Subject: Purposed external lighting.

[REDACTED]
Dear Ms Williams,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed external lighting scheme put forward by Macar Developers for the 30-dwelling development at Hamsland, Horsted Keynes (site SA29, land south of St Stephen's Church).

I am extremely concerned that this lighting scheme is now being proposed when it was **not included in the original planning permission** for the development. The introduction of additional external lighting at this stage raises serious concerns about the impact on local residents, the character of the area and, importantly, the unacceptable increase in light pollution.

I wish to make a **strong and formal objection** to this proposal on the following grounds:

1. Conflict with the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan – Policy HK13 (Light Pollution)

Policy HK13 is there for a reason. It requires development proposing external lighting to demonstrate that the lighting is necessary, appropriately designed and will not cause unacceptable harm through light pollution.

I am seriously concerned that this proposal does not adequately address these requirements. The fact that external lighting was not part of the original scheme makes its introduction now particularly concerning.

Horsted Keynes is a rural village with an important dark-sky character. It is completely unreasonable for residents to be expected to accept additional artificial lighting simply because a developer has subsequently decided that it would be desirable or convenient.

This should not be treated as a minor or insignificant amendment. Additional lighting can have a permanent impact on neighbouring properties, wildlife, the appearance of the development and the wider rural environment.

2. Unacceptable impact on the village and surrounding area

The development is already a significant change to the character of the area. Adding further external lighting risks making the site far more visually intrusive, particularly during the evening and night.

Residents should not have to put up with increased glare, light spill, illuminated buildings and the loss of the existing darkness simply to accommodate a developer's revised proposal.

3. Impact on neighbouring residents

Any lighting that spills beyond the boundaries of the development has the potential to affect nearby homes and residents, particularly during late evening and night-time hours.

The planning system should not allow neighbouring residents to suffer unnecessary disturbance because adequate consideration was not given to lighting at the outset.

4. Environmental and wildlife concerns

The surrounding area is rural and supports wildlife that depends upon naturally dark conditions. Artificial lighting can have a significant detrimental effect on bats, birds, insects and other nocturnal wildlife.

These impacts should not be dismissed simply because the proposal involves lighting rather than physical construction.

Conclusion

I strongly urge the Council to **refuse the proposed external lighting scheme** unless the applicant can provide compelling evidence that every aspect of the lighting is genuinely necessary, fully compliant with Policy HK13 and will have no unacceptable impact on residents, wildlife or the rural character of Horsted Keynes.

The community should not be expected to accept **incremental changes to an already significant development**, particularly where those changes introduce additional light pollution that was not part of the original planning proposal.

I therefore ask that this objection is fully considered when determining the application and that the proposed lighting is **rejected**



Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)