

Peter Davies

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 May 2025 08:13
To: planninginfo
Subject: Attention Katherine Williams: DM/25/1057 and DM/25/1058

[REDACTED]

Planning Department
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
RH16 1SS

Date: 14 May 2025

Formal Objection to Planning Applications DM/25/1057 & DM/25/1058 – Burgess Hill School Proposed LED Lighting and Extended Use of Sports Courts Adjacent to Conservation Area

To: Planning Department
Mid Sussex District Council

Dear Ms Williams,

I wish to formally object to the planning application for the installation of LED floodlighting and extended operational hours of the courts which are situated adjacent to the Ferndale Road Conservation Area.

In short, I am aware that the School only just got extension for 1 hour, and are now going for longer hours permanently. The generous spirit of neighbours' and their reasonability, is now, in my opinion, being trodden. I like other neighbours are generally in support of the School, however balance is crucial to good relationships and neighbourliness.

In a nutshell:

Lights are on for longer on some occasions; and people are also there well beyond Permitted Hours.

Residents nearby and this application will impact further upon them and their quality of life.

Conservation Area is opposite and impact upon 'Dark Skies'.

Traffic will increase and peacefulness changed.

Noise will increase.

Light will interrupt nature and impact upon the bats and owls nesting locally.

My objection is based on material planning grounds under the **Mid Sussex District Plan, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, and other relevant environmental and heritage considerations.

I now expand on this:

1. Harm to the Setting of the Conservation Area

Under **Policy DP35 (Conservation Areas)**, development proposals must preserve or enhance the character, appearance, and setting of Conservation Areas. The proposed LED lighting and extended activity hours would **undermine the tranquil character** of the adjacent Conservation Area, introducing **visual intrusion, night-time glare, and noise pollution** incompatible with its historic and aesthetic value.

The **NPPF (paragraph 199–200)** also requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, including their setting. This application fails to respect that principle.

2. Unacceptable Impact on Residential Amenity – Noise and Light Pollution

The proposal directly conflicts with **Policy DP29 (Noise, Air and Light Pollution)**. Extending evening use of the courts will **generate increased noise**—from ball impact, shouting, and social activity—well into the night, disturbing residents nearby. Combined with **intense LED floodlighting**, this represents an unacceptable loss of residential amenity.

Policy DP26 (Character and Design) further requires that development should not cause significant harm to the privacy, outlook, or amenity of adjoining occupiers. This scheme risks precisely that.

3. Light Pollution in a Sensitive Location

The introduction of LED floodlighting near a Conservation Area and in a generally dark-skied locality is inappropriate. The **proposed lighting fails to demonstrate effective mitigation** measures such as:

- Directional shielding,
- Low-intensity (warm-white) spectrum LEDs,
- Timing controls or curfews,
- Compliance with **Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance GN01:2021**.

As such, the proposal contravenes **DP29** and **NPPF paragraph 185**, which seeks to limit the impact of artificial light on local amenity and the natural environment.

4. Biodiversity and Ecological Impacts

The site's proximity to green space and mature vegetation raises concerns over **bats, owls, and other nocturnal wildlife**. The absence of an ecological assessment or biodiversity mitigation strategy suggests a failure to comply with **Policy DP38 (Biodiversity)** and the Council's responsibilities under the **Environment Act 2021**. Lighting can fragment habitats and disrupt feeding or breeding behaviour of sensitive species.

5. Intensification of Use and Lack of Justification

The proposal constitutes a material intensification of site use without evidence of need or public benefit that would outweigh the harms. No assessment of the **cumulative impact of extended use**—traffic, noise, parking, safety—has been provided. This fails to satisfy **DP21 (Transport)** and **DP18 (Neighbourhood Plans and Community Infrastructure)** where applicable.

Conclusion

In light of the above, I respectfully urge the Council to **refuse** this application on the grounds that it:

- Conflicts with **Policies DP26, DP29, DP35, and DP38** of the Mid Sussex District Plan;
- Fails to preserve the setting of a Conservation Area under the **Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**;
- Would cause demonstrable harm to residential amenity and local biodiversity;

- Lacks necessary mitigation, justification, and technical assessments.

Thank you for considering this objection. Please notify me of any further consultation opportunities or decision notices related to this application.

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.