

Planning Comment submission on application 2025/1147 at 09/11/2025 17:44:54

Thank you for your comments on application 2025/1147, which have been received.

Please note that we do not send a separate acknowledgement.

CommentatorName	Phoebe Lin
Telephone No	
EMail Address	
Address	2 Eaton Place, Caterham, CR3 5GT
Planning App No	2025/1147
Comment Reason	Object to this application
Comment	

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing as a resident of No. 2 Eaton Place, directly adjoining the property proposed for conversion into a children's home. I wish to object to this application on the grounds of residential amenity, suitability of location, safeguarding, and noise disturbance.

1. Requirement for a Quiet Living Environment

I am a trainee pharmacist, commuting daily over 3 hours to and from work. My role in healthcare demands a high level of focus, responsibility, and mental alertness. I also have ongoing exams that require quiet time for study and rest. The peace and stability of my home environment are therefore essential.

The proposed 24-hour operation of a children's home—with rotating staff, shift changes, and professional visitors—would inevitably create disturbance in what is currently a calm, family-based cul-de-sac. As the adjoining property in a terraced row, any increase in activity, voices, or vehicle noise will directly affect my ability to rest and concentrate.

2. Noise and Disturbance from Staffing Patterns

The Planning Statement claims that staffing will "replicate a family home" and that "activity levels remain within residential norms." However, a home staffed 24/7 by shift workers is very different from a private household. Based on the applicant's rota, there will be at least two adults on-site at any given time, plus shift handovers, managers, social workers, and possibly emergency visits.

Even with daytime shift changes, the additional comings and goings, car doors, and conversations in a narrow terrace will be intrusive. As someone who often studies early or late due to shift work, this would have a serious impact on my wellbeing and professional performance.

3. Safeguarding and Child Welfare Concerns

As a healthcare professional, I am acutely aware of safeguarding standards and the complexities of caring for vulnerable young people. Having spoken with colleagues who work in residential care, I understand that such homes often accommodate children with emotional or behavioural difficulties whose parents are unable to manage them safely.

While I support the principle of providing safe care, the physical setting of Eaton Place—small terraced homes with minimal separation and simple garden fences—is not suited to this type of care environment. The rear gardens are easily accessible via low fences and normal gates, offering limited security for both the residents and neighbours. If children are not allowed outside unsupervised, this raises questions about how outdoor time and safety will be managed without impacting neighbouring gardens and privacy.

4. Potential Impact on Property and Vehicles

In the unfortunate event that behavioural incidents occur (as sometimes happens in care settings), there is a risk of noise, property damage, or disturbance to vehicles parked nearby. Our driveways and frontages are very close together, and even minor damage could have personal and financial implications. The Planning Statement gives no reassurance on how the operator would prevent or handle such incidents.

5. Unsuitable Location and Inaccurate Information

The statement refers to "excellent transport links" and claims that Caterham Station is within a 10-minute walk. This is inaccurate; it is at least a 30–40 minute walk from this location, uphill. In reality, staff will drive, increasing parking demand on a street already restricted for emergency access.

Eaton Place is not a suitable site for a commercial care facility. It was designed for quiet residential occupation, and there are no provisions for frequent vehicle turnover, visitor management, or secure outdoor areas.

6. Amenity and Character

Policies DP7 (General Policy for New Development) and CCW1 (Character of Development) require protection of neighbour amenity and the preservation of residential character. The proposed change fails on both counts. It would introduce a business operation into a small, peaceful row of homes, causing sustained disruption to the daily lives of adjoining residents.

I fully support the need for high-quality care for vulnerable children, but 3 Eaton Place is not the right setting. The proposal would negatively affect neighbour amenity, create safeguarding and security risks, and compromise the peace and privacy that residents rely upon.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council refuse planning permission for the proposed change of use from Class C3 to Class C2 at 3 Eaton Place.

Yours faithfully,

Phoebe Lin

No. 2 Eaton Place, Caterham

UPRN 10007915952