

Stefan Galyas

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 October 2025 12:40
To: Stefan Galyas
Subject: Application DM/25/1968

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE : Application No: DM/25/1968

1 Lucas Way, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 1JR

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the further information regarding this application.

There are material concerns about this application. It is clearly the development of a commercial operation and cannot reasonably be considered “a modest change of use”.

Slightly more detail has emerged about the proposed shift pattern...now involving four carers (for whom there would be insufficient car parking space), but any understanding of 24/7 shift patterns would suggest more than four individuals will be needed to cover sickness, holidays, staff turnover. This (a) undermines assertions this is not a commercial endeavour and (b) adds to the discontinuities of adult presence in a residential property.

Disparaging remarks from the applicant’s legal representative about ‘a freezing frenzy of opposition’ are designed to divert Councillors’ attention from the basic facts: this is not a well-chosen location for this commercial operation. It isn’t ‘just’ a conservation area: it is a small cul de sac environment with restricted access and an environment of family homes. Interaction between neighbours on property maintenance (hedges, interconnected drainage, etc), facilitating access along the narrow road (no walkways), is key to continued success as a residential environment. Turning one property into a commercial business offers no continuity of occupation - adult or child – and is a material difference from homeowner residence.

It is disingenuous of the legal representative to seek to commit Councillors to approve, based on initial non-specific correspondence with Council representatives, or assertions that expenditures have been incurred as a result, and/or that individual children will be denied opportunities. One wonders if the legal representative has ever visited the location. No-one is seeking to penalise children in need. Had the homeowner offered to live in his home in a foster parent relationship, for example, there would have been no cause to comment. But this is the creation of a business environment...in a poorly chosen location for the purpose. Others have commented on the logistics of the inevitable comings and goings of traffic. We comment here on the inevitable discontinuity in relations between shift workers and residents.

Others have referred to the Applicants’ case history elsewhere, including OFSTED commentaries and, while not simply repeating those points here, it seems important Councillors take these into careful consideration, please. It seems unlikely the Applicants will divulge the nature of their proposal in terms of short break or long term, open or secure children’s home, the extent of support/facilities needed for vulnerable adolescents or children with complex SEND...or indeed any real detail of what their intentions are for this operation.

In summary, we submit there are too many concerns in the application for it to merit approval, regardless of any claims applicants make about having already sunk costs into physical adaptations of the house.