

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 July 2025 21:23:32 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1394

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 29/07/2025 9:23 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	North End School North End London Road East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 1QQ
Proposal:	Proposed single storey extension and porch. (amended plans received 24.07.25)
Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Gorse Cottage East Grinstead
----------	------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Dear Ms Catherine Cardin,
I am writing to formally object to planning application DM/25/1394 concerning the proposed porch extension and associated developments at the former childcare setting.
While the application is presented as a minor alteration-specifically a porch extension-it raises several inconsistencies and concerns that warrant closer scrutiny.

1. Misleading Statement on Childcare Capacity

The application claims there will be no increase in childcare places as a result of the development. However, it simultaneously refers to the demand generated by the Government's 30 hours free childcare entitlement. This contradiction implies an intention to increase childcare capacity, yet the applicant appears to downplay this in order to ease the application process.

The former registered childcare capacity for the premises was 57 places, yet the plans now refer to 60 places. This represents an increase, albeit small, that will undoubtedly have an impact on traffic and local infrastructure. If the facility has been unable to operate at full capacity for some time, one must question how it now intends to manage not only a full intake but a potential expansion. The plans indicate three toilets on the upper floor and four on the lower floor, which suggests an intended capacity of up to 70 children, based on the guideline of one toilet per 10 children. This is not highlighted in this current planning application of their potential intentions to increase capacity overall !

2. Traffic and Parking Concerns

Parking provision is wholly inadequate. The previous planning applications claims there are 11 parking spaces, yet:

- Only 9 spaces are visible on recent satellite imagery.
- The existing site plan shows only 7 marked spaces To accommodate an increase of up to 60 parents during drop-offs and pick-ups, as indicated in the planning application, has consideration also been given to staff parking requirements?
- Realistically, fitting even 9 cars into the space would be challenging due to layout constraints and the single entry/exit point onto a busy main road.

This entrance presents significant safety and congestion concerns during peak drop-off and pick-up hours, especially given current traffic conditions. Has the Highway Authorities been consulted on the potential increased congestion and cars reversing out onto a main road as there is no mention of this in the application?

3. Unapproved or Misleading Site Descriptions

There are discrepancies between the submitted plans and the current site. Specifically, the "existing plans" show two canopies which do not exist, nor are they visible in satellite imagery as far back as 2021. Including these features in existing drawings is misleading and undermines the integrity of the application.

This raises concerns about what else may be inaccurately represented or intentionally omitted. The planning process depends on trust in accurate documentation; any ambiguity should be clarified before consideration can proceed.

4. Heritage and Character of the Building

The building in question dates to circa 1885 and possesses considerable local character and historical interest. While the proposed works may appear limited, incremental changes can gradually erode heritage features if not properly managed. Any development on such a site should demonstrate high sensitivity to

its architectural integrity and historical context.

Kind regards