

## **Objection to Planning Application – 65 Balcombe Road, Haywards Heath, RH16 1PE**

Dear Mr Evans,

I am writing to object to the planning application for the proposed change of use from C3 (residential dwelling) to C2 (residential institution) at 65 Balcombe Road, Haywards Heath, RH16 1PE.

While I fully support the need for appropriate services for vulnerable and at-risk children, it is essential that the correct planning process is followed and that issues of safety, amenity, and accuracy are properly assessed.

### **1. Material Change of Use Requiring Full Planning Application**

Type to enter text

The proposed change from C3 to C2 constitutes a material change of use and should therefore be subject to a full planning application. This would allow the Council and consultees to properly assess the likely impacts, including those relating to traffic, access, parking, and residential amenity.

### **2. Highway Safety and Access Concerns**

The existing access onto Balcombe Road already presents significant safety concerns, with limited visibility and minimal vision splays. The proposed C2 use would substantially increase vehicular movements, heightening the risk to pedestrians and other road users.

Balcombe Road is a main access route into Haywards Heath, carrying fast-moving traffic throughout the day. There is no safe on-street parking directly outside the property, and only extremely limited and unsafe street parking available on the immediate surrounding roads. Any additional vehicle movements or on-street parking associated with the proposed use would therefore pose a serious highway safety risk and impede the free flow of traffic.



Unless substantial improvements are made to the driveway access and visibility splays, the current arrangement cannot be considered safe or suitable for the proposed intensity of use.

### **3. Inaccurate and Insufficient Parking Provision**

The parking representations within the planning statement are inaccurate and misleading. The site cannot accommodate the six vehicles claimed while still allowing safe manoeuvring within the site boundaries. In reality, space appears to be available for only four vehicles at most (please see attached photo). This underestimation of parking demand, combined with the lack of safe on-street alternatives, creates an unacceptable highway and amenity impact.

### **4. Biased and Inaccurate Traffic Movement Calculations**

The traffic analysis within the planning statement appears biased and methodologically flawed. It assumes that:

- (a) all movements from a standard family home involve vehicles;
- (b) these movements are independent (e.g., a school drop-off and daily commute counted as separate trips rather than combined journeys); and
- (c) midweek social visits, tradespeople, or delivery movements have been excluded from the care home estimates.

These assumptions do not present a fair or realistic comparison. A C2 use would likely experience at least the same level of domestic-related movements as a family dwelling, plus additional vehicular movements linked to staff shift changes, visitors, and external support services.

It is my contention that these shift-change movements would be additional to any trips associated with a typical family home, resulting in an overall increase in vehicle movements compared to a standard C3 dwelling and this would present a material change.

### **5. Misuse of Statistical Data**

The planning statement also appears to selectively use ONS data to support its claim that traffic levels would not increase. While referencing large family households, ONS data show that the average UK household size is 2.36 persons, and that only 15% of households contain three or more children. Comparing the property to a household with two adults and five children represents an unusually large and unrepresentative example, which further compounds the inaccuracies in the applicant's traffic assessment.

### **6. Need**

The planning statement makes much of the need in the area and quotes a number of West Sussex statistics, however I can find no evidence that the applicant company actually holds a contract for this kind of care in West Sussex, or is Ofsted registered. If this care home facility is not in fact to address this local need as stated then the supporting statement is at



best misleading and calls into question the accuracy and honesty displayed throughout the application. If this application is actually to provide care to children not currently in mid sussex than actually this application would increase the need in the area. Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and related planning regulations, all planning applications must include accurate and truthful information. Providing false or misleading details can make the application invalid.

## **6. Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity**

The proposed change of use, with the accompanying increase in staff and visitor movements, has the potential to cause adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, within this Townscape Protection area, including increased noise, disturbance, and vehicle activity within a quiet residential setting. This would alter the established character and enjoyment of the surrounding area.

Additionally the applicant is a lessee and there is no evidence that they have permission from the freeholder, or that the freeholder is aware of this application.

## **7. Conditions if Approved**

Should the Council be minded to approve the application, I would request that a strict limit be imposed on the number of residents within the property to ensure the scale of use remains compatible with the residential surroundings and existing highway conditions.

I wish to emphasise that I am not opposed to the principle of providing care or services for children in need within West Sussex. My concern lies in ensuring that this proposal is considered through the appropriate full planning process, with road safety, accuracy, and local amenity properly safeguarded.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the objector.

110 Penland Road