

## Peter Davies

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2025 17:53  
**To:** planninginfo  
**Subject:** Fwd: letter

[REDACTED]  
Dear Sir/ Madam

As I have received an out of office from Hamish Evans until 8/12/25 I am forwarding our letting of objection to your department, we understand the original deadline was extended due to technical difficulties in submitting email objections.

Regards  
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----  
[REDACTED]

Date: Thu, Dec 4, 2025 at 5:46 PM  
Subject: Fwd: letter  
To: <[hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk)>

---

## OBJECTION LETTER

[REDACTED]  
59 Balcombe Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1PE

**Date: 4/12/25**

**To: Hamish Evans / The Planning Department**  
Mid Sussex District Council

**Re: Planning/Change of Use Application DM/25/2830 – Change of Use at 65 Balcombe Road, Haywards Heath**

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to register our **strong objection** to the proposed Change of Use at 65 Balcombe Road. Having reviewed the application and its supporting statements, we believe the proposal represents a **material and harmful departure** from the established residential character of this area. The applicant's description of the operation as "similar to a family home" is fundamentally inaccurate and does not reflect the realities of the staffing model, intensity of use, or operational requirements described.

Our objections are set out below.

---

## **1. The proposed use is clearly institutional, not residential**

Based on the information provided, the operation requires **continuous staffing**, shift-based workers, and waking-night supervision. This level of activity is wholly inconsistent with that of a typical dwelling and constitutes a **material change of use**. The presence of rotating care staff, external agency visits, and operational protocols (including night alarms and monitoring systems) would give the property an unmistakably **commercial and institutional nature**, not a domestic one.

The installation of enhanced fire systems, signage and other internal alterations would further reinforce this non-residential identity.

---

## **2. Traffic generation and parking demand are significantly understated**

The driveway at 65 Balcombe Road is **not capable of safely accommodating** the staff, shift-change vehicles, management visits, and professional services associated with the proposed use. Shift overlaps alone could easily result in 6 or more vehicles on site at once. Because cars cannot turn within the driveway, drivers would be forced to **reverse onto Balcombe Road**, which is already recognised as hazardous due to limited visibility and existing traffic-calming features installed after previous incidents.

The application's comparison to an ordinary family home is misleading. A standard household does not generate multiple staggered arrivals and departures by unrelated adults throughout the day and night.

---

## **3. Inadequate on-street parking options and obstruction risks**

The suggestion that overflow vehicles could use on-street parking is simply incorrect. Balcombe Road has **no viable parking availability**, and Penland Road's restrictions are entirely incompatible with the needs of shift-based workers or visiting professionals. Additional vehicles would obstruct the highway and could impede emergency access, which is particularly concerning given the frequency with which emergency vehicles use this route.

---

## **4. Safety concerns for the children and the wider community**

We are deeply concerned for the welfare of the children who may be placed at this location. The property sits on a **busy road with incomplete pavements**, requiring pedestrians—including vulnerable young people—to cross the road at points with **poor sightlines**. Increased traffic from the Hanlye Lane developments has already exacerbated these risks.

Furthermore, the property has suffered **two burglaries this year**, which raises serious safeguarding concerns.

---

## **5. Noise, disturbance and intensified activity**

The frequency of staff movements, external professionals, and visitors would result in a **significant increase in noise and general disruption** within what is currently a quiet residential setting. Homes in this area are

occupied by families who expect a peaceful environment. The scale and regularity of activity associated with the proposed operation are incompatible with this expectation.

---

## **6. Lack of clarity regarding residents' needs and staff capability**

The application provides **little detail** about the specific needs of the children. However, the requirement for 1:1 staffing and waking-night supervision implies **complex or challenging behaviours**. Combined with the anticipated turnover of staff and frequent professional visits, the proposal risks creating an unsuitable and unstable environment for the young people involved.

Additionally, the operator is not Ofsted registered, and no evidence has been provided of experience in running children's services.

---

## **7. Unsuitable location for young people with limited supporting facilities**

There are **no age-appropriate amenities** nearby for older children. A lack of accessible local activities can place pressure on local communities and may inadvertently contribute to anti-social behaviour through boredom or lack of structure.

---

## **8. Failure to protect the Townscape Protection Area**

The property sits within a designated **Townscape Protection Area**, where preserving the character and appearance of the neighbourhood is paramount. The increase in vehicles, refuse, staff activity, and general operational intensity conflicts directly with the aims of this designation.

---

## **9. Existing problems with refuse and anticipated increase**

The property already suffers from **refuse-management issues**, with bins frequently obstructing pavements. Under the proposed use, waste volumes would rise significantly, almost certainly worsening this issue for pedestrians and neighbours alike.

---

## **10. Lack of evidence of freeholder consent**

The applicant is a **lessee**, yet there is no evidence that the freeholder is aware of or has consented to this application. This raises questions about the legitimacy of the proposal and its future deliverability.

---

## **11. Additional concerns (added for strengthening)**

- **No demonstrated local need:** The applicant has not shown that this type of provision is required in this specific location, or that it aligns with local authority commissioning strategies.
- **Cumulative impact on residents:** The introduction of an institutional operation on this stretch of Balcombe Road would create a precedent for further applications of this nature, potentially altering the character of the area.

- **Insufficient management oversight:** No clear information has been provided on senior supervision, escalation procedures or how community concerns would be addressed.
- **Emergency access:** Given the high turnover of vehicles and the hazardous driveway layout, emergency response could be compromised.

---

## Conclusion

For all the reasons listed above, we strongly believe this application represents an **inappropriate and harmful change of use** that would adversely affect local residents, the safety of the children, and the character of the area. We therefore respectfully request that the Council **refuse** this application and, given the level of public concern, that it be considered by **Planning Committee** rather than approved under delegated powers.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
59 Balcombe Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1PE

---