

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 10 September 2025 19:34
To: DC Admin
Subject: Opposition to planning application

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Following my email to your colleague Laura Yeadon this morning, in which I explained our predicament regarding opposing a planning application while we are on holiday and while your system was down, please find our objections below .

Our names:
Address:

Planning application number: 2025 / CLD / 92297 / W
Change of use of 102 Redwood Drive and 1 Grantley Place from residential use to care homes.

We strongly object to the proposed changes which are in direct contravention of the Deed of Covenant signed by all homeowners on buying a home at Woodland Glade, namely that owners must not

1. Carry out any trade or business at the property or from the dwelling or in or from a dwelling erected there on

It is clear from the applicants proposal and website that he or his family will no longer reside in either property. Moreover, there will be a daily turnover of staff on a rotating basis, likely including new staff on a regular basis. Therefore neither address can be seen as a family home but rather as a business.

This is in direct contravention of the above deed and thus planning permission cannot be approved.

2. To ensure that nothing shall at any time be done on the property or part of the estate that shall become a nuisance or annoyance or injury to any part of the estate or its occupiers.

As a secondary school teacher with pastoral responsibilities for more than 30 years, and with friends and family in children's services, I cannot accept that this deed can be fulfilled if one or both houses are converted to children's homes.

Namely:

- multiple additional cars on the estate (each child has a social worker with at least weekly visits, school pick up and drop off, key workers likely to arrive by car - 4 extra cars parked at shift change - and have line managers/social workers visiting and likely family visits . This all increases the risk to drivers, pedestrians, children and pets - creating nuisance and annoyance and, potentially, injury both from more cars at peak times and increased number of parked cars.

- the fact that children in homes have already , sadly, been in the care system for some years and are both vulnerable and volatile. This multiplies the risk of annoyance and nuisance and potential injury, for example

- neighbouring homes experiencing bad language on a regular basis with increased risk of arguments between children and children and staff, causing anxiety to residents and especially parents / grandparents of young children . High risk of drug taking and discarded materials - then a risk to others, especially young people, pets and wildlife.

- young people leaving the home(s), perhaps without permission, at all times of day and night and hanging around the surrounding area, or at the sports facilities. This increases the risk of illegal behaviour from the young person, eg casual theft or vandalism of property or inviting in friends , causing possible increase in police presence - an annoyance, nuisance and potential cause of injury to all parties. Potential for conflict.

- likelihood of some drug taking and potential for dealers hanging about, putting vulnerable residents and the young people at risk

- likelihood of multiple visits by emergency services, especially police, at all times of day and of night, eg for behavioural issues, child missing, unwanted visitors - eg groomers, threatening behaviour from young people to another /staff or visitors. Caused annoyance, nuisance and anxiety for locals.

- to my knowledge there are foster carers on site (home owners) - of both young children in a family setting, babies and mothers. Successful fostering situations could be jeopardised by unwanted interactions as outlined above. This is a risk (physical and mental) to vulnerable groups other than those placed in the possible children home, as well as the carers themselves.

Finally, and significantly, I suggest that the application for change of use itself shows that the applicant has a lack of understanding of safeguarding in publishing the address of both properties on his website (TemplarHive) and that this should cause great alarm within Social Services and OFSTED. By publishing this information the young people are at significantly heightened risk of threat from groomers, dealers and those involved in trafficking and county lines operations - and likely more - arriving at the houses and this cannot be tolerated in any circumstance.

It goes beyond 'nuisance' and annoyance' . It puts the physical and mental wellbeing of the young people, staff and local residents in obvious danger. It raises serious questions about the experience and knowledge of the applicant and future management.

For these reasons, and others I am happy to discuss with you in person, and I strongly object to the application.