

Anna Tidey

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2025 21:36
To: Anna Tidey
Subject: Comments about DM/25/1171....

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED]

Hi Anna,

I recently submitted comments about the planning application DM/25/1171 on your website.

My comments were slightly long and it did say that they had been truncated. I've included them below, just in case you didn't get them in full.

If this application goes to a public hearing, I'd be grateful for a notification of date and time. I don't think I have anything further to say, but I wouldn't mind hearing anything that others may say publicly on the matter.

My submitted comments are as follows (without spelling errors);

I'm not sure I would go as far as to say that I object outright, but the recently constructed garage structure does not seem to be a proper dwelling under the newly drawn arrangements. It appears to be more of a "guest accommodation". I wonder if this would strictly comply with building control, especially given that foul water services would have to be pumped uphill to the main property under the drawn arrangements. One is also caused to wonder about the arrangements for damp proofing given that part of the building is below ground level.

I have concerns about the occupant of such accommodation, given that many migrant families generally are finding themselves in substandard accommodation in Sussex and Surrey back gardens. I'm not happy about that, and it seems this accommodation would be consistent with that scenario.

Whilst the garage door on Jubilee Close would vanish, one is caused to wonder how long it would be before it became a new front door and a window. A new address for Jubilee Close. Possibly even with a second storey. Elsewhere in Jubilee Close there has been a recently added address. On the basis that they actually did build a proper new house to modern building standards, it seems relatively acceptable. That's not the case here, and it isn't the case that Jubilee Close is already a low population density.

Overall Jubilee close and Allen Road have a parking problem. Providing additional parking for new residents, would be problematic. My feeling is that the housing density in this area is already higher than it should be.

I'm not comfortable that this proposal is properly planned, given the arrangement of the area. 28, Allen Road had an internal garage and a nice garden. The garage was converted to a Kitchen. With a new found parking problem, part of the garden was used to restore the garage. Now the proposal is to convert the replacement garage into an additional dwelling. How many years will it be before that the whole property is demolished and flats are erected above a ground level car park? The occupants always seem to move on, leaving their improvements behind them. This is not the town centre. Is it really the case that Jubilee Close should become a shanty with poorly planned, incrementally developed, residential property on every conceivable free space?

The immediate changes, in principle, could be less impactful than now.

In practice I think there are likely to be issues with drainage, damp, population density and parking.

I wouldn't object outright on the basis that I wouldn't want to confront my neighbours directly. I do suspect it's a simple case for them to make money though a deterioration in the built environment before moving on from their created problem. It probably wouldn't affect me that badly, but I don't want to see the general area deteriorate in the way that I envisage it could through this change. I want to see better standards for everyone. I hope that the council will see sense and act appropriately.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

25, Jubilee Close

Haywards Heath

RH163PJ

[REDACTED]