

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/03/2026 11:52 AM from Mr Christopher White.

Application Summary

Address:	Linfield Care Home 18 - 22 Wykeham Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 4JD
Proposal:	Alterations and extensions to existing care home to provide additional bed spaces, including construction of single storey glazed link extension to southwest elevation, three storey extension to southeast elevation and installation of solar panels to existing flat roof and south west roofslopes.
Case Officer:	Rebekah Hincke

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Christopher White
Email:	
Address:	19 Graydon Avenue Chichester

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment
Comments:	I wish to register my objection to this application. My concern is not with the principle of improving care provision, but with the significant and unavoidable impact these proposals would have on the people already living in the home. Many residents are extremely vulnerable and rely on a calm, predictable environment. Any major construction project in an occupied dementia and nursing home must be assessed with great care, and I do not believe this application has done so. The documents submitted with the application confirm that the home is currently fully occupied. This means that all construction activity would take place around residents who cannot remove themselves from noise, vibration, dust, or disruption. Even routine maintenance can be unsettling for people with cognitive impairment. A project of this scale, directly adjoining bedrooms and communal areas, would inevitably cause distress, confusion and behavioural changes. These are not minor impacts. They are material considerations affecting residential amenity. The proposal also removes or encloses existing communal and garden spaces that residents and families rely on for quiet visits and calmer moments away from the busier parts of the home. Reducing the number and quality of these quieter areas limits the ability of residents to find suitable, low-stimulus spaces when they need them. Reducing natural light, outlook, and access to outdoor space will diminish the quality of life for those already living there. When considered alongside the related application AWDM/1544/25, the combined effect is a much larger overall change to the site than the applicant suggests. The

building would feel more enclosed, and the internal layout would become tighter and more constrained. This is not a small or simple alteration. It changes the balance between the building and the spaces residents use every day, and it reduces the sense of openness that helps people feel settled and secure.

It is also concerning that no meaningful or independent resident impact assessment has been provided. Given the vulnerability of the residents, the application should have included a clear evaluation of:

- the psychological and behavioural impact of prolonged construction noise
- the risks associated with unfamiliar contractors moving through secure areas
- the effect of losing familiar communal spaces
- the operational strain placed on staff during construction

These are not peripheral issues. They go to the heart of whether the development is appropriate in this location and in this setting. Without this information, the application does not demonstrate that the wellbeing of current residents can be protected.

The application suggests that disruption can be "managed", but provides no detail on how this would be achieved in a fully occupied dementia care environment.

There is no phasing plan, no noise or vibration modelling, and no explanation of how residents' routines and safety will be maintained. The impact on staff capacity during construction is also not addressed.

I am not opposed to investment in care provision. However, this proposal represents overdevelopment of the site, loss of valued amenity space, and a level of disruption that cannot be reconciled with the needs of the current residents.

The planning system has a duty to protect residential amenity, particularly for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application be refused.
