
Report of the Head of Planning and Development**DISTRICT-WIDE PLANNING COMMITTEE****Date: 09-Oct-2025****Subject: Planning Application 2025/92103 Change of use from dwelling (C3) to a children's home (C2) 17, Far View Crescent, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD5 8ER****APPLICANT**Jonathan Haigh,
Lighthouse Care
Residential**DATE VALID**

25-Jul-2025

TARGET DATE

19-Sep-2025

EXTENSION EXPIRY DATE

16-Oct-2025

Please click the following link for guidance notes on public speaking at planning committees, including how to pre-register your intention to speak.

[Public speaking at committee link](#)

LOCATION PLAN

Map not to scale – for identification purposes only

Electoral wards affected: Almondbury

Ward Councillors consulted: Yes

Public or private: Public

RECOMMENDATION:

DELEGATE approval of the application and the issuing of the decision notice to the Head of Planning and Development in order to complete the list of conditions including those contained within this report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application is brought to committee at the request of Councillor Alison Munro and due to the significant number of representations received contrary to officer recommendation. 43 representations have been received, 36 in objection, 4 in support and 3 general comments. The representations will be discussed further in section 7 of this report.

1.2 Councillor Alison Munro has requested that this application be referred to planning committee for the following reason:

“There will be a greater level of disruption from noise and pollution from vehicles with a big increase in traffic movements caused by these plans to this quiet residential area, impacting on neighbouring residents.

This is a residential area and a business with all its associated visitors, including multi agency staff does not fit with the established character of this quiet back water.

On site parking provision has been overstated by the applicant and will result in vehicles parking on the Far view estate where the roads are narrow and were not built to accommodate a business.

The Bank End/ Far View junction has poor visibility with parked vehicles making it difficult. These plans as stated will result in a big increase in vehicle movements, impacting safety at the junction.

I understand that there is almost universal objection to these plans by the residents of Far View Crescent and overall so far more than 50% of households living on the combined Far View Bank and Far View Crescent have raised objections.”

1.3 The Chair of the Sub-Committee has confirmed that the reasons for the referral to the committee by Councillor Alison Munro are valid having regard to the Councillor's Protocol for Planning Committees

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site relates to a detached, two storey dwelling located on Far View Crescent, a residential cul-de-sac in Almondbury. The dwelling is a flat roofed structure finished in stone and cladding which serves 6 bedrooms and associated living area. There is a driveway to the front and a garden to the rear.
- 2.2 The land is unallocated within the Kirklees Local Plan but the site does abut a woodland which is allocated as Urban Green Space (UG6 – Almondbury Bank) to the rear.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application is seeking planning permission for the change of use from a dwelling (C3) to a children's home (C2).
- 3.2 The proposed use as a children's home would serve up to three children, aged between 7 and 18, with a manager and up to three carers, two of whom would sleep overnight, working on a rota basis.
- 3.3 There will be no external changes made to the property.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2024/93381 - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed use as residential children's home - Withdrawn

2025/90229 Certificate of lawfulness for proposed change of use from dwelling (use class C3) to residential care home (use class C2) – Refused

2025/90962 Certificate of lawfulness for proposed change of use of dwelling to children's home – Refused

The applications for Lawful Development Certificates (LDC) under applications 2025/20229 and 2025/90962 were refused as officers considered the proposed change of use would change the character of the property, and it was recommended a planning application for full consideration of all "planning" matters should be submitted and fully assessed, hence the submission of this application. Whilst the planning history should be given weight, applications 2025/90229 and 2025/90962 were not assessed against current planning policy and legislation for full planning applications, only against the criteria of the General Permitted Development Order.

5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS

- 5.1 It was brought to officers' attention that there were discrepancies in the submitted information and details. Officers sought a revised Management Plan and Design and Access Statement of which consistently referred to the correct number of proposed children/staff. This was submitted whilst the comment period was open as such the public had the ability to comment on the changes.

- 5.2 The proposed plan initially showed an alteration to the front of the dwelling. Clarity was sought from the applicant regarding whether any changes are proposed and amended plans were submitted showing no changes. This was not readvertised as it would not cause any additional harm to any of the interested parties.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY:

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory Development Plan for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019).

Kirklees Local Plan (2019):

- **LP1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP2** – Place shaping
- **LP3** – Location of new development
- **LP7** – Efficient and effective use of land and buildings
- **LP11** – Housing Mix and Affordable Housing
- **LP21** – Highways and access
- **LP22** – Parking
- **LP24** – Design
- **LP30** – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- **LP51** – Protection and improvement of local air quality
- **LP52** – Protection and improvement of environmental quality
- **LP53** – Contaminated and unstable land

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:

- 6.2 Kirklees Council has adopted (as of 29th June 2021) supplementary planning documents for guidance on house building, house extensions and alterations and open space, to be used alongside existing SPDs previously adopted. They are now being considered in the assessment of planning applications, with full weight attached. This guidance indicates how the Council will usually interpret its policies regarding such built development, although the general thrust of the advice is aligned with both the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), requiring development to be considerate in terms of the character of the host property and the wider street scene. As such, it is anticipated that these SPDs will assist with ensuring enhanced consistency in both approach and outcomes relating to development. In this case the follow SPDs are applicable:

- Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Advice Note
- Highways Design Guide SPD
- Housebuilders Design Guide SPD

National Planning Guidance:

- 6.3 National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 12th December 2024, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance.
- 6.4 The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications.
- Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
 - Chapter 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
 - Chapter 11 – Making efficient use of land
 - Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

- 7.1 The application was advertised by site notice and on the council website. In total, over the course of the application 43 representations have been received, 36 in objection, 4 in support and 3 general comments.
- 7.2 One representation was submitted by Councillor David Longstaff on behalf of a constituent. This has been included in the above figures as an objection.
- 7.3 Below is a summary of all the comments raised by representation which have been grouped into themes. These will be addressed by officers in sections 10.31-10.37:
- 7.4 Objections

Planning History and Procedural:

- Three previous applications, two of which were refused – this application does not overcome reasons for refusal.
- Discrepancies in the submitted information.
- A covenant should be applied to prevent further planning applications.
- House was built without planning permission. Should be knocked down or re-built as a family house.
- Not long enough to comment on application.
- Property is still on the rental market.
- Lack of engagement with the community.
- Conduct of the applicant.
- Planning documents and submitted information would be ignored once permission is implemented.
- No specific need for another private children's home.
- Strange that supporting comments are now being submitted.

- Fails to meet Ofsted, Department of Health and Building Regulations.
- Questioned whether officers had undertaken a site visit

Suitability for children

- Unclear how many children or how old.
- Refurb is cheap and would be low quality housing for the children.
- Maintenance of the property/garden.
- No sizeable garden area.
- Limited activities for young people to do nearby.
- Lack of recreational space.

Community Impact

- Street is mainly elderly residents.
- What checks and balances are in place to maintain the resident's current quality of life.
- House prices reducing.

Environmental Impact

- Additional noise from vehicles and use would impact wildlife in adjacent woodland.
- Children playing in woodland would impact on ecology and biodiversity.
- Loss of garden habitat.
- The property forms part of a wider network of private gardens in Far View Crescent, which collectively function as a corridor for local biodiversity. Intensifying use of one site for institutional purposes risks undermining this network.
- No ecological survey or biodiversity net gain assessment has been provided with the application.

Safety

- Unsafe for children.
- First-floor balcony is a safety risk.
- Concerns regarding the structural stability of the building.
- Increased crime and anti-social behaviour.
- No restrictions if a child escapes to the front – not safe to play out on street.
- If a child climbed the fence, it's a steep drop into the woods.
- If a child was to start a fire in the woods it would have catastrophic consequences.
- Cladding to the front of building is a clear danger – asbestos.

- There is animosity created by Lighthouse Care and all individual residents which could be seen as a safeguarding issue for any under 18 year old services users due to the negative relations created by the care company and this should not be deemed a suitable situation in which to be caring for vulnerable children

Visual and residential impact

- Would change the character of the residential area.
- Occupants enjoy a quiet lifestyle.
- Additional noise, odour and disturbances.
- Vulnerable neighbours.
- No public engagement with residents.
- Causing stress and anxiety.
- Will change the character of the building and neighbourhood.
- Separation distance to neighbour is too small.

Highways

- Increase in traffic due to visitors to the property.
- Parking would be on the highway.
- Have officers ever opened the garage door to see if two cars would fit.
- Residents already have to park on the pavement.
- Would result in more traffic than a normal residential home.
- Staff policy is to park on nearby roads.
- Restrictions to emergency parking due to on street parking.
- Blocking of neighbouring driveways.
- More congestion at handover time – 48hr shift changes.
- Car sharing mentioned in parking policy – how will this be monitored.
- Accidents at junction with Bank End Lane.
- Estimated 166 weekly vehicle movement.
- Parking interferes with access to garage.
- Garage showing as reduced in scale.
- Highways officers haven't responded to objectors' comments directly
- Highway consultation response doesn't account for minor accidents which have taken place.
- Far View Crescent is only 4.9 metres wide, which is barely sufficient for two vehicles to pass
- Any reversing manoeuvres from the site will obstruct the carriageway

- Due to the intensity of vehicle movements associated with the operation of a children's home this presents an unacceptable impact on highway safety
- No swept paths provided for parking
- Visibility splays/sightlines to the left/right at the entry/exit points are inadequate and do not meet Kirklees standards
- The proposed parking layout does not allow vehicles to manoeuvre safely within the site and no alternative internal manoeuvring space is provided – the spaces block other spaces
- The positioning of vehicle 1 in the garage does not permit the driver to exit the vehicle and the garage does not meet the minimum internal dimensions set out in the Kirklees Highway Design Guide
- There is no segregated pedestrian access within the site
- No disabled vehicle access is provided
- If there is sufficient on-site parking for staff why has the applicant set a parking policy which directs staff not to park outside the property itself but to use nearby roads instead?

7.5 *Supporting Comments*

- Complies with planning guidance and statutory requirements for approval.
- Addresses previous concerns.
- Minimal physical impact – no significant material changes to building.
- Children will be under 24/7 supervision which reduced likelihood of any antisocial behaviour.
- Gives vulnerable children the best chance at a normal life. Integrating such homes into residential areas promotes inclusion, stability, and a sense of belonging—values that benefit not only the children but the wider community.
- Shocking that the most vulnerable of society, young innocent children, escaping abusive or inadequate parenting are shown such prejudices by others.
- These homes have a huge oversight from government so will be operated properly.
- Highly unlikely the children would bother any neighbours or be out causing trouble.
- It's time we supported the next generation and moved with the times, children's homes need to go somewhere... safer on a quiet cul de sac than a main road.
- Home will be managed by someone with two 'outstanding' Ofsted inspection results

- All of us owe these children a duty of care. A responsibility to enable them to grow and heal with safety and security surrounded by compassionate professionals.
- All the comments that focus on Far View Crescent being a quiet, pleasant, family orientated locality are actually arguments that support this application.
- Concerns are all resolvable through partnership between Lighthouse Care and the local community and residents.

7.6 *General Comments*

- Other areas with care facilities in residential areas which have been successful.
- Why shouldn't the vulnerable children get a chance to live in a decent area, go to decent schools, and get given a chance in life. They simply need a home and will no doubt be well supervised.
- Comments submitted from the general public who have zero affiliation with Far View Crescent – not relevant.
- It does not affect anyone outside the Far View area.
- Disappointment that certain parties are trying to subvert the fair and impartial planning process by submitting statements of support that are quite clearly from the same source as the application.

8.0 **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

8.1 KC Highways Development Management (HDM) – No objection.

8.2 KC Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO) – no objection.

9.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

- Principle of development
- Impact on visual amenity
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on highway safety
- Other matters
- Representations
- Conclusion

10.0 **APPRAISAL**

Principle of development

10.1 NPPF paragraph 12 and Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan outlines a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the dimensions of sustainable development as economic, social and

environmental (which includes design considerations). It states that these facets are mutually dependent and should not be undertaken in isolation.

- 10.2 The dimensions of sustainable development will be considered throughout the proposal. Paragraph 11 concludes that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted. This too will be explored.
- 10.3 The principle of the proposal upholds the aims of the NPPF in terms of addressing the needs of groups with specific housing requirements. Locally, the Kirklees Local Plan (adopted 2019) supports the delivery of a range of housing types to meet identified needs. Whilst the Local Plan has no policies specifically relating to care homes, Policy LP1 promotes sustainable development that improves the economic, social, and environmental conditions of the district. LP7 supports meeting housing needs by promoting the efficient reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land, helping deliver sustainable development while preserving local character and minimizing land consumption and Policy LP11 encourages a mix of housing to meet the needs of all groups, including those requiring care. Therefore, there is no presumption against such a use.
- 10.4 In terms of changing the use of the building, Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan is relevant in conjunction with Chapters 8 and 12 of the NPPF taking into account the character of the area, the amenities of neighbouring properties, highway safety and ensuring the safe operation of the home and community cohesion.
- 10.5 Therefore, in this case, the principle of the use of the building is considered acceptable and the development shall be considered against all other material considerations including the character of the area, residential amenity and highway safety.

Impact on visual amenity

- 10.6 The NPPF offers guidance relating to design in Chapter 12 (achieving well designed places) whereby 131 provides a principal consideration concerning design which states:
- “The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.”.
- 10.7 Kirklees Local Plan policies LP1, LP2 and significantly LP24 all also seek to achieve good quality, visually attractive, sustainable design to correspond with the scale of development in the local area, thus retaining a sense of local identity.
- 10.8 LP24 states that proposals should promote good design by ensuring “the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, heritage assets and landscape...”

- 10.9 Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
- 10.10 The proposed development would not include any external alterations and therefore would not cause harm to the visual amenity of the host building or wider street scene.
- 10.11 Having taken the above into account, as there would be no significant changes to the exterior of the building, no harm is considered to be caused to visual amenity. The scheme is therefore in accordance with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (a) in terms of the form, scale and layout, and the aims of chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

- 10.12 Section C of LP24 states that alterations to existing buildings should “minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.” Further to this, Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 10.13 The proposed development would not include any extensions or changes to openings so no significant additional overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing harm is considered to be caused over and above the existing arrangements on site.
- 10.14 Principle 16 of the Housebuilders Design Guide SPD states that:
“All new build dwellings should have sufficient internal floor space to meet basic lifestyle needs and provide high standards of amenity for future occupiers. Although the government has set out Nationally Described Space Standards, these are not currently adopted in the Kirklees Local Plan.”
- 10.15 Further to of the site layout and seek to maximise direct sunlight this, Principle 17 of the Kirklees Housebuilders Design Guide SPD outlines that “All new houses should have adequate access to private outdoor space that is functional and proportionate to the size of the dwelling and the character and context of the site. The provision of outdoor space should be considered in the context received in outdoor spaces.”
- 10.16 The development far exceeds the minimum internal floor area outlined within the NDSS for a potential six-bedroom dwelling and there is considered to be sufficient outlook and natural light for future occupants.
- 10.17 Taking the above into consideration. It is considered that the proposed dwelling, would not cause any significant harm to residential amenity of the neighbouring or future occupants. The proposal would therefore comply with LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and the aims of Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Highway issues

10.18 Local Plan Policy LP21 states that '*All proposals shall:*

- a. ensure the safe and efficient flow of traffic within the development and on the surrounding highway network...
- e. Take into account the features of surrounding roads and footpaths and provide adequate layout and visibility to allow the development to be accessed safely;'

10.19 This is supported by Chapters 9 and 12 of the NPPF and guidance within the Highways Design Guide SPDs. KC Highways Development Management (KC HDM) have also been consulted as part of this application. It is noted that highway concerns have been raised in a number of representations as well as by Cllr Munro in her committee request.

10.20 It is noted that two applications for a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for a similar scheme were refused recently under applications 2025/20229 and 2025/90962. The scheme under consideration through these applications did however propose 4 children and 4 carers during the day as well as 2 carers working at night. It was determined that the use of the building as a residential institute, in particular the traffic movements relating to that residential institute use, was considered to be a material change of use from the current lawful use as a single dwellinghouse. It must be noted that LDC applications are assessed against alternative planning legislation and policy to that utilised in the assessment of an application for planning permission.

10.21 The change of use was considered to change the character of the property, and the certificates were refused. It was recommended a planning application for full consideration of all "planning" matters be submitted. Hence the submission of this application. It should be noted that KC HDM were not consulted on either LDC.

10.22 On this basis, this application must be assessed fully against all planning considerations. KC HDM have been consulted on this application and their comments are summarised as follows:

10.23 Far View Crescent is a typical residential road consisting of detached residential properties. Access is taken via Far Bank Lane and Bank End Lane. No injury accidents have been recorded at the junction of Bank End Lane with Far Bank Lane.

10.24 Whilst there will be some additional trips associated with the use as a children's home, there is no evidence that the use will give rise to a greater level of disturbance than could be expected to be generated by a large (6 bedroom) family home.

10.25 It is considered that the additional vehicle movements and parking requirements are of a sufficiently low level so as to remain within the parameters of what could be usually expected of a large family home. Sufficient parking is proposed for at least 4 vehicles which is considered appropriate, particularly given the children themselves will be too young to drive.

- 10.26 The provision of waste collection will remain as existing and is unaffected by the proposals.
- 10.27 Based on the above assessment, KC HDM have no objections to the proposal. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not cause any significant additional harm to efficiency or safety of the highway network, over and above the existing arrangements as a large family home. The proposal therefore complies with LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

Other Matters

Land Contamination

- 10.28 No ground works are proposed and therefore no further assessment is necessary.

Ecology

- 10.29 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10% for developments is a mandatory requirement in England under the Environment Act 2021, subject to some limited exceptions. Unless exempt, every planning permission granted pursuant to an application submitted after 12 February 2024 is deemed to have been granted subject to a pre-commencement condition requiring a Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the development.
- 10.30 The applicant has stated in their application form that the development falls under the de minimis exemption. As there is no ground works proposed, Officers have no reason to disagree with this statement and therefore the application would be exempt from providing BNG. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

- 10.31 The fear of crime is a material planning consideration. Chapters 8 and 12 of the NPPF state that decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which are safe and accessible so that crime and disorder and the fear of crime to not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion. In addition, and under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1988, the Council acting as Local Planning Authority has an obligation to have due regard to the likely impact upon and to do all it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder.
- 10.32 Chapter 8 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which are accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion. This is further reiterated under Chapter 12 of the NPPF which goes on further to state that planning decision should create spaces that are safe, inclusive and accessible which promote health and wellbeing, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder and the fear of crime to not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

- 10.33 Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan forms a provision for development which do not have specific policies to ensure that permission can be granted unless there are material considerations including adverse impacts, which the potential for crime and disorder would be a significant factor, where the adverse impact would outweigh the benefits. It is noted that fear of crime has been raised as a concern by representation.
- 10.34 Fear of crime is a material consideration where it is based on legitimate evidence. However, in this case, the agent has supplied a management plan with the application which seeks to demonstrate the home would be well managed, including appropriate security measures with protocols in place such as staff supervision. In the event that planning permission be approved, it is recommended that the decision include a condition requiring the home be operated in accordance with the submitted management plan.
- 10.35 The care facility is considered be similar to a family unit in term of its operation. In terms of the character of the area, the area is residential, close to transport links, schools and green spaces. It is not considered to be an unsuitable location for childcare.
- 10.36 KC Designing Out Crime Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has not raised any objections.
- 10.37 It is therefore considered that the use of the buildings as a care facility would not cause concerning levels of crime and anti-social behaviour or be an unsuitable location for a care home.

10.38 Representations

In total, over the course of the application 43 representations have been received, 36 in objection, 4 in support and 3 general comments. The comments have been summarised, and officers have responded below:

10.39 *Objections:*

Planning History and Procedural:

- Three previous applications, two of which were refused – this application does not overcome reasons for refusal

Officer response: Officers are aware of the planning history and have addressed this in section 4.3 of this report.

- Discrepancies in the submitted information

Officer response: Officers are aware of the discrepancies in the submitted information when the application was initially submitted. Amended plans/details were submitted as addressed in section 5 of this report.

- A covenant should be applied to prevent further planning applications

Officer response: Covenants are not a material planning consideration. The planning system cannot apply covenants, this would be through a regulatory function outside the planning system.

- House was built without planning permission. Should be knocked down or re-built as a family house.

Officer response: The dwellinghouse has been erected for at least 10 years and is therefore considered to be exempt from enforcement action.

- Not long enough to comment on application

Officer response: As detailed in section 7 of this report, the statutory publicity requirements for this application have been met.

- This property is being advertised for rent

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration and therefore no further comment will be made.

- Lack of engagement with the community

Officer response: Whilst it is encouraged, community engagement by the applicant is not a requirement.

- Conduct of the applicant

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration and therefore no further comment will be made.

- Planning documents and submitted information would be ignored once permission is implemented

Officer response: In the event that planning permission be approved, any decision notice would condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the plans and submitted information. In the event that the development was being carried out contrary to the plans and supporting documentation, the applicant could be liable for enforcement actions.

- No specific need for another private children's home

Officer response: Current public provision for children's homes only meets 35% of residential care needs and the number of children's homes required is predicted to increase.

- Strange that supporting comments are now being submitted

Officer response: The supporting comment can be submitted any time before the application is determined. The principle of these being submitted are not a material planning consideration and therefore no further comment will be made.

- Fails to meet Ofsted, Department of Health and Building Regulations

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration. Ofsted and building regulations covered by other regulatory functions outside the planning system.

- Questioned whether officers had undertaken a site visit

Officer response: Officers have undertaken a site visit.

Suitability for children

- Unclear how many children or how old

Officer response: This information is contained within submitted information. In the event that planning permission be approved, this would be secured by condition.

- Refurb is cheap and would be low quality housing for the children

Officer response: There is no evidence to demonstrate that the building is of low quality and not suitable for habitable use.

- Maintenance of the property/garden

Officer response: This is a private matter, not a material planning consideration and therefore no further comment will be made.

- No sizeable garden area

Officer response: The garden is considered an appropriate size to provide amenity space for 1-3 children and is not dissimilar to the gardens within properties in the street.

- Limited activities for young people to do nearby

Officer response: This is a residential area in close proximity to schools and services and therefore is considered an appropriate location.

Community Impact

- Street is mainly elderly residents

Officer response: The individual characteristics of the neighbouring occupants is not a material planning consideration. As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area.

- What checks and balancing are in place to maintain the resident's current quality of life.

Officer response: An assessment of the impact on residential amenity has been carried out in section 10.12-10.17.

- House prices reducing

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration so not further comment will be made.

Environmental Impact

- Additional noise from vehicles and use would impact wildlife in adjacent woodland

Officer response: The proposed use is considered to be similar to that of a residential dwelling and therefore no additional harm over and above the existing use is considered to be created.

- Children playing in woodland would impact on ecology and biodiversity

Officer response: The proposed use is considered to be similar to that of a residential dwelling and therefore no additional harm over and above the existing use is considered to be created.

- Loss of garden habitat

Officer response: There are no external alterations to the existing building, as such there would be no loss of habitat as a result of the proposal.

- The property forms part of a wider network of private gardens in Far View Crescent, which collectively function as a corridor for local biodiversity. Intensifying use of one site for institutional purposes risks undermining this network

Officer response: The proposed use is considered to be similar to that of a residential dwelling and therefore no additional harm over and above the existing use is considered to be created.

- No ecological survey or biodiversity net gain assessment has been provided with the application

Officer response: As discussed in section 10.29 and 10.30, there are no external changes proposed and therefore no additional measure regarding ecology or biodiversity are required.

Safety

- Unsafe for children

Officer response: The proposed use is considered to be similar to that of a residential dwelling and therefore no additional harm over and above the existing use is considered to be created. The children's safety will be controlled under regulatory functions outside the planning system.

- First-floor balcony is a safety risk

Officer response: The applicant confirmed in an email to the Designing Out Crime Officer that the balcony will be inaccessible to staff and residents.

- Concerns regarding the structural stability of the building

Officer response: There is no evidence to demonstrate that the building is of low quality and not suitable for habitable use.

- Increased crime and anti-social behaviour

Officer response: The impact on crime and anti-social has been carefully assessed in section 10.31-10.36 of this report.

- No restrictions if a child escapes to the front – not safe to play out on street

Officer response: The children would be supervised at all times.

- If a child climbed the fence, it's a steep drop into the woods

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration so no further comment will be made.

- If a child was to start a fire in the woods it would have catastrophic consequences

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration so no further comment will be made.

- Cladding to the front of building is a clear danger – asbestos

Officer response: This is not a material planning permission however there is no evidence to demonstrate that the building is of low quality and not suitable for habitable use.

- There is animosity created by the company and all individual residents which could be seen as a safe guarding issue for any under 18 year old services users due to the negative relations created by the care company and this should not be deemed a suitable situation in which to be caring for vulnerable children

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration so no further comment will be made.

Visual and residential impact

- Would change the character of the residential area

Officer response: As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area.

- Occupants enjoy a quiet lifestyle

Officer response: As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area.

- Additional noise, odour and disturbances

Officer response: As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area therefore no further comments can be made

- Vulnerable neighbours

Officer response: As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area.

- Causing stress and anxiety

Officer response: As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area.

- Occupants enjoy a quiet lifestyle

Officer response: As the property would be the primary residence of the children, the use is considered to be appropriate within a residential area.

- Separation distance to neighbour is too small

Officer response: As discussed in sections 10.12-10.17, no external changes are proposed to the building. Therefore, no additional harm over and above the

existing arrangements on site are considered to be caused to residential amenity.

Highways

- Increase in traffic due to visitors to the property
- Would result in more traffic than a normal residential home
- Estimated 166 weekly vehicle movement
- Lots of external visitors which would increase vehicles

Officer response: As outlined in sections 10.18-10.27 of this report, officers consider that the proposed use would not significantly intensify vehicle movements, over and above that of a large family home.

- Accidents at junction with Bank End Lane Restrictions to emergency parking due to on street parking

Officer response: No injury accidents have been recorded at the junction of Bank End Lane with Far Bank Lane.

- More congestion at handover time – 48hr shift changes

Officer response: there would only be one additional vehicle at change over time. As outlined in sections 10.18-10.27 of this report, the vehicle use would not be dissimilar from that of a large family home.

- Blocking of resident's driveways
- Residents already have to park on the pavement

Officer response: As outlined in sections 10.18-10.27 of this report, the proposed use would not significantly intensify vehicle movements, over and above that of a large family home. Off-street parking is also provided for 4 vehicle, therefore the proposal would not significantly impact on existing on-street parking.

- Parking would be on the highway

Officer response: The scheme proposed 4 off-street parking spaces.

- Have officers ever opened the garage door to see if two cars would fit

Officer response: Only one vehicle is proposed to be parked in the garage so officer will not make any further comment.

- Staff policy is to park on nearby roads
- Car sharing mentioned in parking policy – how will this be monitored.

Officer response: Officer will not comment on the internal policies for the management company.

- Parking interferes with access to garage

Officer response: The parking is considered sufficient for the proposed use.

- Garage showing as reduced in scale

Officer response: As outlined in sections 10.18-10.27 of this report, no changes are proposed to the garage as a result of the proposal.

- Highways officers haven't responded to objectors' comments directly

Officer response: The representations have been reviewed by officers and highway consultees prior to their comments being written. Consultees do not have the capacity to respond individually to each representation.

- Highway consultation response doesn't account for minor accidents which have taken place.

Officer response: No injury accidents have been recorded at the junction of Bank End Lane with Far Bank Lane.

- Far View Crescent is only 4.9 metres wide, which is barely sufficient for two vehicles to pass
- Any reversing manoeuvres from the site will obstruct the carriageway
- Due to the intensity of vehicle movements associated with the operation of a children's home this presents an unacceptable impact on highway safety
- No swept paths provided for parking
- Visibility splays/sightlines to the left/right at the entry/exit points are inadequate and do not meet Kirklees standards
- The proposed parking layout does not allow vehicles to manoeuvre safely within the site and no alternative internal manoeuvring space is provided – the spaces block other spaces

Officer response: As outlined in sections 10.18-10.27, the proposed change of use would not significantly intensify vehicle use, over and above that of the existing large family home so it is considered there would be no additional harm to highway safety over and above the existing arrangement on

- The positioning of vehicle 1 in the garage does not permit the driver to exit the vehicle and the garage does not meet the minimum internal dimensions set out in the Kirklees Highway Design Guide

Officer response: The garage is wider (3.6m) than the recommended width for a single garage (3m) and therefore officers are satisfied it is a sufficient width.

- No disabled vehicle access is provided
- There is no segregated pedestrian access within the site

Officer response: the proposed use would operate similarly to a large family home and therefore a separate pedestrian and disabled access are not considered necessary. A ramp could easily be provided to the front or rear of the property if disabled access is required.

- If there is sufficient on-site parking for staff why has the applicant set a parking policy which directs staff not to park outside the property itself but to use nearby roads instead?

Officer response: Officer will not comment on the internal policies for the management company.

10.40 *Supporting Comments*

- Complies with planning guidance and statutory requirements for approval
- Addresses previous concerns
- Minimal physical impact – no significant material changes to building
- Children will be under 24/7 supervision which reduces the likelihood of any antisocial behaviour
- Gives vulnerable children the best chance at a normal life. Integrating such homes into residential areas promotes inclusion, stability, and a sense of belonging—values that benefit not only the children but the wider community
- Shocking that the most vulnerable of society, young innocent children, escaping abusive or inadequate parenting are shown such prejudices by others
- These homes have a huge oversight from government so will be operated properly.
- Highly unlikely the children would bother any neighbours or be out causing trouble
- It's time we supported the next generation and moved with the times, children's homes need to go somewhere... safer on a quiet cul de sac than a main road.
- Home will be managed by someone with two 'outstanding' Ofsted inspection results
- All of us owe these children a duty of care. A responsibility to enable them to grow and heal with safety and security surrounded by compassionate professionals.
- All the comments that focus on Far View Crescent being a quiet, pleasant, family orientated locality are actually arguments that support this application
- Concerns are all resolvable through partnership between Lighthouse Care and the local community and residents

Officer response: These comments are noted and align with officer recommendation.

10.41 *General Comments*

- Other areas with care facilities in residential areas which have been successful
- Why shouldn't the vulnerable children get a chance to live in a decent area, go to decent schools, and get given a chance in life. They simply need a home and will no doubt be well supervised.

Officer response: These comments align with officer recommendation and therefore no further comments are necessary

- Comments submitted from the general public who have zero affiliation with Far View Crescent – not relevant
- It does not affect anyone outside the Far View area
- Disappointment that certain parties are trying to subvert the fair and impartial planning process by submitting statements of support that are quite clearly from the same source as the application

Officer response: All representations received are considered during the assessment of a planning application regardless of if they do not align with other representation.

11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.
- 11.2 This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the proposed development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

12.0 CONDITIONS

- Standard conditions regarding time scale
- In full accordance with plans
- Restrict maximum number of children
- In accordance with management plan

Background Papers:

Application and history files.

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2025/92103>

Certificate of Ownership – Certificate B signed.