

FAO: Nina Sayer,
Planning Department,
Kirklees Council,
Huddersfield.

Correspondence Address:
9 Hazel Croft,
Shipley,
BD18 2DY.

Re: Change of Use Application N°. 2025/G2/52/103/W
Site: 17 Far View Crescent, Almondbury.

18 August 2025

Dear Nina Sayer,

I am writing concerning the above application, although I note that the notice is no longer displayed. I am part-owner of N°.8 opposite and have been associated with it since 1964. My concerns concern both the nature of the property itself and the proposed usage.

1. The building. Building was commenced in the mid 1960s on behalf of the site's owners who lived at N°. 15. The whole thing was done "on the cheap" by sub-contractors who frequently had to take issue with the owner in order to obtain payment. The principal structural members were the two side walls which were badly affected by freezing conditions when part built due to them being left exposed during the worst of winter. As a consequence they were only partly demolished and then rebuilt leaving some of the frosted masonry in the lower courses. In order to scrape through the planning requirements it was described as a bungalow and to that end had the bedrooms on the ground floor with the services and communal area on the first floor. So far as I am aware it was never actually inhabited and consequently deteriorated to the extent that enquirers after it remarked on the general internal dampness and bad smell. Despite being comprehensively repaired and refitted in the last 2-3 years it remains essentially the same structurally with a flat roof supported on flimsy wooden rafters and a cladding of unknown substance and safety specification. I would not have thought therefore that it was at all suitable, let alone safe enough for any institutional use.

2. The proposed use. This is essentially a 3 bedroom bungalow and allowing for staff residential space and service spaces and requirements will have scant space for any resident "children" unless the proposal is to pack them in like prisoner sardines in a way which would be both unhygienic and immoral. Furthermore there would be no space for any necessary recreational areas within the building without taking up even more residential space. Externally the space is wholly inadequate for any outdoor activities. The building is not capable of being extended without breaching planning limits and there is insufficient parking space for staff, tradespeople and visitors. Lastly, the area itself is entirely unsuitable for institutionalised children, there being no recreational or leisure facilities anywhere nearby. It is not social policy to foist bored and activityless children on a small community.

Yours faithfully,

