

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 30 May 2026 18:34
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0526

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 30/05/2026 6:34 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Thornhill Court Billingshurst Road Coolham West Sussex RH13 8QN
Proposal:	Variation of condition 4 of previously approved application reference DC/04/2569 (Change of use of poultry barns for storage of aircraft parts) to allow extension of business hours.
Case Officer:	Shazia Penne

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Five Oaks Cottage Five Oaks Billingshurst
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Dear Sir/Madam, I wish to object to the application seeking to vary the operating hours at Thornhill Court. I am the owner of the recently approved residential development known as Thornhill Barn, situated immediately adjacent and parallel to Thornhill Court. Planning permission for this substantial family dwelling was granted on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate, thereby establishing the principle of residential occupation on land directly adjoining the industrial estate. As the future occupier of Thornhill Barn, I have a direct and substantial interest in the impact that any extension of operating hours at Thornhill Court would have upon residential amenity. The existing operating hour restrictions at Thornhill Court have been in place for many years and formed an integral part of the planning balance when permission was originally granted. These restrictions were imposed for a clear planning purpose, namely the protection of

neighbouring residential amenity in what is predominantly a rural residential environment. The applicant has provided no compelling evidence that these restrictions have failed, become unnecessary, or are otherwise unreasonable.

The application is based largely upon the assertion that extended operating hours are required to improve occupancy levels within the estate. However, no substantive evidence has been submitted demonstrating that vacancies arise as a consequence of the current operating restrictions rather than other commercial factors. In my opinion, the applicant has failed to demonstrate any planning justification for removing long-established protections afforded to neighbouring residents.

Since the original permissions were granted, the planning context has evolved significantly. The Council and subsequently the Planning Inspector have accepted the principle of additional residential occupation immediately adjoining Thornhill Court through the grant of permission for Thornhill Barn. The protection of residential amenity therefore carries even greater weight than when the original operating restrictions were first imposed.

The proposal would inevitably increase the potential for noise, disturbance and vehicle movements over a longer period of the day and into more sensitive periods of the week, particularly on Sundays. Existing residents, together with the future occupiers of Thornhill Barn, would be adversely affected by the extension of commercial activities beyond the currently approved limits.

Particular concern should be given to the introduction of Sunday operations. Sunday has historically been the one day when nearby residents can enjoy a reasonable degree of peace from commercial traffic, deliveries, collections and industrial activity. The application provides no exceptional or compelling justification for removing that long-standing protection. The loss of this respite would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life and enjoyment of neighbouring residential properties.

The estate is accessed from the A272 via an access arrangement serving both commercial and residential properties. Any increase in operating hours inevitably increases the opportunity for vehicle movements over a longer period and during more sensitive times. This has the potential to increase disturbance, inconvenience and conflict between commercial and residential uses and should be carefully considered by the Local Planning Authority.

It is also noteworthy that during the determination of my own planning application, the owner of Thornhill Court raised concerns regarding potential disturbance arising from activities within the industrial estate. Those concerns implicitly recognised that activities on the estate have the potential to affect residential amenity. It is therefore difficult to reconcile that position with the current request to extend operating hours and introduce Sunday operations.

The operating restrictions currently in force were imposed for a clear planning reason and continue to serve an important purpose. The applicant has not demonstrated that circumstances have materially changed since those restrictions were imposed, nor that they are no longer necessary. To remove or significantly relax them without compelling evidence would undermine the planning justification upon which they were originally based.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate any exceptional circumstances that would justify the relaxation of long-standing operating restrictions which were imposed to protect neighbouring residents. The proposal would materially erode residential amenity, increase the potential for noise and vehicle activity during sensitive periods, and adversely affect both existing residents and the occupiers of the recently approved Thornhill Barn dwelling.

For all of the above reasons, I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,



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