

From:

Sent: 27 January 2026 21:44

To: ann.biggs@midsussex.gov.uk <ann.biggs@midsussex.gov.uk>; Jessica Szollosi <jessica.szollosi@midsussex.gov.uk>; planninginfo <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: BENNETT, Alison (MP) <alison.bennett.mp@parliament.uk>; Steve.Ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk <steve.ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Final Representation regarding Case Number: DM/25/2945

Dear Planning Team,

*****REDACTED*****

The **front shed has already been erected without planning permission**. As such, the impacts described below are **not hypothetical or future concerns**, but issues that are already occurring on site and affecting access, safety, and wellbeing.

*****REDACTED*****

The unauthorised front shed occupies part of the area previously used for parking by No.14. **Prior to the erection of the shed, vehicles associated with No.14 were parked on the grass in this location. Since the shed has been constructed, this is no longer possible. As a direct result, vehicles are now being parked along the shared drive.**

*****REDACTED*****

Parking by No.14 along the shared drive has **obstructed both entry and exit**, with vehicles parked over the access route, preventing safe manoeuvring, wheelchair transfer, and emergency access. These obstructions have arisen **only since the shed was erected**.

*****REDACTED*****

Because the shed is already constructed and has already displaced parking into the shared drive, any suggestion that planning conditions could retrospectively control behaviour does not address the **existing and ongoing harm**. The development has formalised activity in a constrained access area where obstruction has already occurred, thereby increasing risk.

In these circumstances, **any obstruction, delay, or encroachment onto access space — even on a single occasion — could have serious consequences.**

***** access constraints are not a matter of convenience but of **safety, dignity, and medical necessity.**

While conditions relating to parking, noise, or storage use have been proposed (by the Burgess Hill Town Council Planning committee), such measures are **not fail-safe.** Planning conditions rely on voluntary compliance and retrospective enforcement. A single breach — even once — could obstruct emergency or wheelchair access at the precise moment it is required. *****

Given that the shed has been erected without permission and has already resulted in the loss of parking, the displacement of vehicles on***** , mitigation through conditions is insufficient. The development presents an **ongoing and immediate risk** that cannot be adequately controlled. The only way to **eliminate**, rather than attempt to manage, this risk is for the shed to be **removed from the site as soon as possible.**

Planning policy requires development to avoid unacceptable impacts on:

- highway and access safety,
- emergency service access,
- and the health and safety of neighbouring occupiers, particularly disabled persons.

*****REDACTED*****

Yours sincerely,