

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 August 2025 15:28:57 UTC+01:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <stefan.galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1968

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/08/2025 3:28 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	1 Lucas Way Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 1JR
Proposal:	Use of a (C3) dwelling as a children's home for a maximum of 3 children with up to three carers, two sleeping overnight working on a rota basis.
Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	23 Lucastes Road 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 formally object to the application for a Lawful Development Certificate S192 of the Planning Act for the use of a (C3) dwelling as a children's home for a maximum of 3 children with up to three carers, two sleeping overnight working on a rota basis at 1, Lucas Way, Haywards Heath, R H 1 6 1 J R. I consider the proposed change is a material change of use within planning law. The applicant states that the key issue here is whether the proposed use versus the existing use is materially different. Would

the number of people at the property, activities and traffic movements be materially different? They have sought to argue that it would not and have used other cases where applications to change residential homes into children's homes have been successful. I aim to show why I believe it would be materially different.

1. The examples given of successful applications are all from long busy through roads with at least 72 houses on. One of the four examples is the Old Shoreham Road which is 2 miles long. The impact of the change of use in a road like this is clearly statistically very different from a tiny cul de sac of 6 houses.

2. Even for a cul de sac, Lucas Way is very quiet. The road leading to the houses is narrow, without any pavement and there is not room for a proper turning circle at the end. We can assume that there could be emergency vehicles needing access to the property on a more regular basis than one would normally expect for a family home. The size of the cul de sac will mean that this will be very impactful on the residents of Lucas Way.

3. Whilst the applicant sought to show that the number of adults and children was not a material change, this is a high ratio of adult to child and one can assume from that that the children may have emotional or behavioural needs. Rather than focusing purely on the overall number of comings and goings, we should consider the specific nature of those comings and goings and the materiality of movements to and from the property being from a wider range of people than typically expected in a single household dwelling. Indeed this is amongst the conclusions in the following appeal cases which were rejected:

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/X/22/3301638
144Deyes Lane, Sefton, Maghull L31 6DW

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/X/23/3332264
93 Hurst Grove, Bedford MK40 4DW

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/X/23/3330329
24 Marsh Lane, Milton Ernest, Bedford MK44 1RB

4. Lucas Way is in a conservation area. The reasons for it being a conservation area is that it is largely residential homes, the absence of on street parking and low traffic flow. With shift workers, social workers, possibly emergency service workers, friends and family visiting etc will inevitably lead to more on street parking and higher traffic flow. There is nothing saying that the children will be related, so each child could have multiple agencies and family and friends visiting.

5. I also believe that the proposed use would change the building use from a C3 to C2. The North Devon case is a precedent for this. Crucially, the Judge found that the children could not be regarded as constituting a household by themselves. The

question also arose as to whether carers who do not live on the premises but who, between them, provide 24 hour care can be regarded as living together as part of the household. The court held that the concept of living together as a household means that a proper functioning household must exist and thus, for the use to fall within Class C3(b), the children and carers must reside in the premises. Otherwise, the use falls within Class C2.

In addition to the above planning points, I do not have confidence that the applicant's client will run this children's home well. Ofsted records show Cranmead was only registered as a children's home provider on 27 June 2024. Ofsted records also show only one Social Care Common Inspection Framework report for Cranmead (Ref 2797976), recording a "requires Improvement to be good" rating, placing that children's home in the bottom fifth of UK children's home providers. I have also found ex employee comments online which cause concern. "dreadful houses for the YP's to live in, even worse for the UASK. high turn over of staff which has a knock on effect to the YP's the most disorganised organisation poor training poor support from management. Mostly lip service with no action to back it up a director who is cliquy, moody, unprofessional It's all about the money"

"Managers not in sites regularly. High staff turnover. Once my two weeks training finished, that's it. You're left to get on with it. Lots of managers have left in the last year. Same reason, senior managers poor, little training. It's all about making a profit, not caring for the kids. Staff pressurised to make up key working hours to keep the local authority happy. But it's fake."

"Lack of support from area manager, never around. '

"Blame culture, passes the buck little support. Management not truthful and will throw you under a bus to save themselves."

In conclusion, I do not feel that the applicant has considered the actual nature of the close and the surrounding area, as evidenced by using such contrasting examples. Therefore their arguments that the proposed use is not materially different from the existing use are faulty. I also believe that the nature of the conservation area could be materially damaged by changing the use from a residential home.

In light of the above, I respectfully request that the Council refuse this application. The proposal is incompatible with both national and local planning policies and would result in harm to the conservation area, residential amenity, and local infrastructure. Thank you for considering my objection.

Kind regards

