

Hamish Evans

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 March 2026 14:10
To: Hamish Evans
Subject: Re: Planning Application DM/26/0540 – 5 Orchard Close, Scaynes Hill, RH17 7PQ

Dear Hamish,

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application. Please could you reply to confirm receipt of this e-mail.

Having reviewed the submitted documents, I note that the application contains **no supporting assessments** beyond the single-line proposal. For a change of use from C3 to C2, this level of information is wholly insufficient for the Council to determine the suitability, impact, or policy compliance of the proposed development. My objections are set out below, with reference to relevant Mid Sussex District Plan policies.

1. Absence of essential supporting information

The application provides no evidence to demonstrate that the proposal complies with the District Plan. Specifically, it lacks:

- Location Risk Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Parking/Traffic Statement
- Operational Management Plan
- Safeguarding or supervision details
- Staff numbers, shift patterns, or visiting professional information

Without these documents, the Council cannot properly assess the impact of the proposed C2 use. This is contrary to the evidential requirements of:

- DP26 (Character & Design)
- DP29 (Noise, Air & Light Pollution)
- DP21 (Transport).

2. Location suitability for vulnerable 16–18-year-olds not demonstrated

The applicant proposes a children's home for "2 or 3" young people aged 16–18. National guidance requires providers to demonstrate that the location is appropriate for vulnerable young people, including access to:

- education
- employment or training
- support services
- safe recreational opportunities
- reliable public transport

Scaynes Hill is a small rural village with very limited amenities, no secondary school, no youth services, no local employment opportunities, and an infrequent, unreliable bus service. The applicant has provided no evidence to show that this location can meet the needs of the intended residents.

This omission is contrary to DP26, which requires development to be appropriate for its context.

3. Intensification of use far beyond a typical family dwelling

Although the proposal states "2 or 3" children, the four-bedroom layout makes it likely that 3 children and at least 1 staff member will be present at all times. Children's homes typically involve:

- 24-hour staffing
- shift changes
- visits from social workers, therapists, and education professionals
- transport to school, college, medical appointments, and activities

This represents a materially more intensive use than a C3 dwelling. The applicant has provided no operational details to allow the Council to assess the scale of activity or its impact on neighbouring amenity.

4. Significant noise impact on the directly adjoining semi-detached property

Nos. 5 and 6 Orchard Close form a 1930s semi-detached pair with joists running side-to-side, increasing both horizontal and vertical noise transmission. Noise from No. 5 is already audible within No. 6, including TV noise, voices, laughter, and even sneezing.

A 24-hour staffed care home will inevitably generate significantly more noise than a family dwelling. The applicant has submitted no acoustic assessment, despite the known construction issues and the proposed intensity of use.

This is contrary to DP29, which requires development to protect neighbouring amenity from noise.

5. Impact on vulnerable household members in the adjoining property

My household includes a 16-year-old with significant mental health needs and suspected autism/ADD. Noise is a major stressor and has a disproportionate impact on his wellbeing. Increased noise from a 24-hour staffed home would materially harm our residential amenity.

This is directly relevant to DP26 and DP29, which require protection of neighbouring amenity, particularly where vulnerable residents may be affected.

6. Parking and traffic concerns (DP21)

No. 5 has four parking spaces, but the application provides no information on:

- staff numbers
- shift patterns
- visiting professionals
- transport arrangements for residents

Given the lack of local amenities, staff will need to drive residents to school, college, appointments, and activities. This will increase vehicle movements and parking demand.

Orchard Close is relatively narrow, and parking pressure already exists near the roundabout a short distance away. Without a parking/traffic statement, the Council cannot assess compliance with DP21.

7. Inadequate outdoor space and layout for the proposed use

The garden at No. 5 is small, fully overlooked by neighbouring properties, and contains no grassed area. Due to extensions, there is no rear or side access; all movement must occur through the front door or porch.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the outdoor space is suitable for vulnerable young people, contrary to DP26.

8. Impact on the character of Orchard Close (DP26)

Orchard Close is a quiet residential street, predominantly occupied by older residents and families. A 24-hour staffed care home represents a significant change in character and intensity. The application does not demonstrate how the proposal will integrate with the established residential environment.

This is contrary to DP26, which requires development to respect and enhance local character.

9. Unsuitability of a semi-detached property for a 24-hour care home

Semi-detached properties are inherently less suitable for intensive C2 uses due to shared walls and close proximity. The applicant has not demonstrated that the building can operate without harming neighbouring amenity.

This conflicts with DP26 and DP29.

Conclusion

The application provides insufficient information to assess the suitability, impact, or policy compliance of the proposed C2 use. The proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with DP21, DP26, and DP29, and raises significant concerns regarding noise, amenity, intensification of use, parking, and the suitability of the location for vulnerable young people.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council refuse planning application DM/26/0540.

Yours faithfully,



6 Orchard Close
Scaynes Hill
West Sussex