

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 April 2026 13:15:06 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0540

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/04/2026 1:15 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	5 Orchard Close Scaynes Hill Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 7PQ
Proposal:	Change of Use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to children's residential care home (Use Class C2) for up to (2/3) children. No external alterations proposed. (additional information received 30.03.2026 and 07.04.2026)
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 2 Orchard Close Scaynes Hill Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to submit a further formal objection to the proposed Change of Use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a C2 children's residential care home at 5 Orchard Close as whilst the applicant has provided additional operational detail, the proposal remains fundamentally incompatible with the character, amenity, and transport conditions of this residential area. This objection is made with reference to relevant policies of the

Mid Sussex District Plan, including DP26 (Character & Design), DP29 (Noise, Air & Light Pollution), and DP21 (Transport).

1. The intensity of staffing and vehicle movements conflicts with DP26 and DP29

The applicant's own submission confirms:

- Three rotating daytime staff
- A waking night staff member arriving late at night and leaving at 8am
- A registered manager attending weekdays
- Daily staff handovers
- Up to 10 staff-related vehicle movements per weekday

This level of activity is far beyond that of a typical C3 family home. A normal dwelling does not generate daily shift changes, late-night staff arrivals, or a regular flow of employees.

This represents a material intensification of use, resulting in noise and disturbance at times when a residential street is ordinarily quiet. This is contrary to DP29, which requires development to protect neighbouring residents from unacceptable noise and disturbance.

The proposal also conflicts with DP26, as the operational pattern is not in keeping with the established residential character of the area.

2. Introduction of a commercial staffing operation is incompatible with the residential character (DP26)

Despite the applicant's attempt to describe the home as "family-like", the operational model clearly reflects a commercially staffed care facility, including:

- Multiple employees on shift
- Formal handover periods
- A registered manager working on site
- Regular professional oversight (Reg 44, social workers, Ofsted, LA QA visits)

This is not characteristic of a C3 dwelling and would fundamentally alter the residential character of the road. The introduction of a workplace-style staffing pattern is inconsistent with DP26, which requires development to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

3. Parking assumptions are unrealistic and conflict with DP21 (Transport)

The applicant claims that the property can accommodate six vehicles and that any overflow can use the public car park across the road. This is not a valid planning justification.

Concerns include:

- Staff shift changes often overlap, increasing parking demand
- Professional visits, family contact, and school transport add further unpredictable parking pressure
- Public parking at the park is not for private operational use and cannot be relied upon

This reliance on public parking demonstrates that the proposal

does not provide adequate on-site parking for the level of activity proposed, contrary to DP21, which requires safe and suitable access and parking provision.

4. The applicant downplays the cumulative impact of professional and regulatory visits

For three children, the following apply:

- Social worker visits every six weeks per child
- Statutory reviews every six months per child
- Annual health assessments per child
- Monthly Regulation 44 visits
- Ofsted inspections
- Family contact visits (not quantified)
- School transport and medical appointments

These visits, when combined, create regular, ongoing professional traffic far exceeding that of a normal household. The applicant has not provided a realistic assessment of cumulative impact, contrary to DP29, which requires development to avoid unacceptable disturbance.

5. Lack of information on behaviour-related impacts and out-of-hours management (DP29)

This objection is not about the children themselves, but about the operational implications of running a care facility.

The application provides no detail on:

- How noise or disturbance will be managed
- How out-of-hours incidents will be handled
- Whether emergency call-outs are anticipated
- How neighbours will be protected from disruption
- Any safeguarding-related activity that may require additional visits or interventions

Given the nature of C2 use, these are essential considerations.

The absence of a robust management plan means the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with DP29, which requires protection of residential amenity.

6. The proposal represents a material change in character and intensity, not a "modest" alteration

The applicant repeatedly claims the use is "modest" and "comparable to a family home". This is contradicted by their own operational details. The proposal introduces:

- A rotating workforce
- Institutional oversight
- Regular professional traffic
- Night-time staff movements
- A structured staffing model

This is a material change of use with clear and demonstrable impacts on the surrounding residential environment, contrary to DP26 and DP29.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed change of use

would:

- Result in a significant intensification of activity
- Introduce institutional operations incompatible with a residential street
- Create parking pressures and potential highway safety issues
- Generate noise and disturbance beyond what is reasonable in a C3 setting
- Fail to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents
- Conflict with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP21, DP26, and DP29

I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuse this application.

Kind regards