

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 August 2026 11:35:57 UTC+01:00
To: "Deborah Lynn" <deborah.lynn@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1633

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/08/2026 11:35 AM.

Application Summary

Address: Land NE Of Park Parade South Road Haywards Heath West
Sussex RH16 4LX

Proposal: The construction of a new 1 bed detached dwelling house.

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 102 Langley Way, Watford

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I strongly object to the plans on the following grounds:
1. The proposed residential building is totally out of keeping with the surroundings and will cause significant detriment to the residents of the existing flats nos 1a - 6a.
2. Any resident of the flats - especially nos 1a-4a who sit on the area outside the front doors to their flats will be overlooked by the residents of the proposed building - not to mention the rear windows of the flats 1a-4a themselves will be overlooked from a very close range. It is evident that the proposed residential building will "cause significant harm to the amenities of existing

nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings", and it will have a significant overbearing impact, and will result in a loss of outlook.

3. The proposed residential building completely alters the residential building line, it is considerably higher than the existing buildings on Park Parade and could be used as a precedent for the other garages to be demolished and residential buildings constructed in their stead.

4. In particular, in the event of this application being approved, if the landlord of no 3 wishes to construct a building where the bins for the residences and shops are currently stored, it would be difficult to reject, and there is no alternative location for the bins to be stored. [Having said that, it will be remembered from the correspondence relating to DM/20/4718, that this space is actually required to be left free to operate as a turning circle for vehicles - and not a bin store]. Either way, it is vital that the Council uses its powers to stop this erosion of obligations (restrictive covenants / easements) placed on the freeholders which are for the good of all residents, shop owners and tenants. It is noted in correspondence relating to planning application DM/20/4718, that the Council stated that it has no interest in restrictive covenants and easements and did not see enforcing them as its role. However, I believe this is unacceptable and unfair and the Council needs to defend the legitimate rights of its residents who of course are tax payers to the Council.

5. The previous application DM/20/4718 approved by the council stated that the parking space being lost by the construction of the extension to the rear of the shop at no 1 Park Parade, would actually result in an increase in parking spaces. It was stated that: "The proposal would result in the removal of the existing garage to the rear of the property and the erection of an extension over part of the area to the rear of the building. There would however be sufficient space for 2 No. vehicles to the rear of the building including one space whether the garage is currently located. It is therefore considered that the proposal would maintain the existing parking spaces on the site".

Of course, there have never been 2 practical spaces, and the tenant of the shop has never parked its car in this space and has simply parked, as per the picture (photograph 02072026) submitted in planning application no DM/26/1633, extending significantly in front of the remaining garage and encroaching on the already limited space adding further pressure to parking and commercial delivery space at the rear. It has become considerably harder to park and manoeuvre in the reduced space behind the shops since the building in application DM/20/4718 was constructed, and our commercial tenants have suffered as a result due to deliveries being frustrated. This new proposal would make matters even worse.

6. Any future occupier of the proposed 3-storey dwelling is going to want to have vehicular access to drop off shopping, take deliveries etc, even if not to park, and there will be yet a greater fetter to access for all, including for any emergency services. Also,

If the building is sold on a freehold basis there will be no practical mechanisms for stopping the freeholder from parking in the yard. Currently the tenants of the flats above the shops can be restricted from parking in the service yard by virtue of their tenancy agreements.

7. Construction of the proposed dwelling will require significant access via the service yard for a considerable period of time for lorries and builders, and this will

a. Impede the legitimate parking needs and delivery needs of the tenants of the shops,

b. Completely disrupt the operation of the businesses being carried on in the shops - including specifically no 4, 5 & 6 which have materials stored in the garages which are needed for their trade and which require immediate access to the garages throughout the working week, and it is evident that the business tenants in all of the shops will suffer losses, and

c. Impede access to any emergency services.

8. The proposed wall next to the steps from the service yard to the path at the rear of no 1 will cause the access to be unreasonably narrowed at the entrance to the steps and will impede use of the steps, which is unfair and unreasonable for all residents

9. The proposed construction will extend in front of the garage behind no 2. This is totally unreasonable and sets a very dangerous precedent in the event that other freeholders wish to construct on the land in the service yard which they own. Would it be reasonable for any other of the landlords to build on the land owned by them in the service yard, but over which others have rights of passage and access? If not, why would it be reasonable here? It would certainly not be reasonable.

10. I am concerned that the planning application is extending over land which is potentially owned by others (council, unregistered, others). Is the demarcation of the land between the existing retaining wall and the footpath (which it is noted is unregistered land) clearly understood? In the absence of an owner of the footpath, how are the interests of the public who rely on use of this path to be protected? This is a classic situation where in the absence of an owner, boundaries are hard to pin down but when the dust has finally settled, the interests of the unregistered party has not been protected and the public has lost out. I note that there is width of 1.5m annotated on the plan. Who has agreed this measurement and is it clear between which 2 points this is a measurement? I doubt that the applicant has clear proof of ownership and, if not, it is another reason why I believe the Council should not approve this application.

11. The existing garages are fragile but are functional and dry. If this proposed building is approved (in the face of all these very reasonable objections), all landlords and businesses will reasonably require an undertaking by the contractor conducting the works that it will make good any damage to these garages and compensate the landlords and businesses for any losses they suffer.

Kind regards