

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 01 January 2026 23:36
To: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application No 2025/92913 – Change of Use from C3 (Residential) to F1 (Education/Community Hall) including erection of open sided structure to rear.

389 Bradford Road

Fartown

Huddersfield

HD2 2QY

01/01/2025

Kirklees Planning Department

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: 393 Bradford Road, Huddersfield, HD2 2QY

I am writing to formally object to the proposed change of use of two Victorian mid-terrace dwellings from Use Class C3 (Residential) to Use Class F1 (Education/Community Hall). This proposal conflicts with the Kirklees Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and raises serious concerns regarding housing supply, neighbourhood character, resident amenity, highway safety, property values, fire safety, and compliance with accessibility and equality standards.

1. Loss of Residential Accommodation

- Local Plan Policy LP11 requires retention of housing stock to meet identified needs. Removing two dwellings undermines housing supply targets and the Council's five-year housing land supply.
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 60 & 62 stress the need to boost housing supply and meet diverse housing needs.
- Local Context: HD2 2QY comprises only five residential properties, with an average house price of £263,553 (+58% over 10 years). Losing two homes here represents a 40% reduction in housing availability, exacerbating local housing pressure.

2. Historical Significance and Destruction of Terrace Character

- The terrace is part of a Victorian-era residential block, contributing to the historic and architectural character of Fartown.
- Converting two multi-level residential terraced homes into a high-traffic community facility fundamentally destroys the uniform residential nature and historic integrity of the terrace, contrary to LP1 and NPPF Paragraph 130, which require developments to respect local character and heritage.

3. Impact on Property Values

- Significant devaluation of nearby homes is highly likely due to increased noise, loss of amenity, and the stigma of living adjacent to a non-residential, high-traffic facility.

4. Amenity Issues for Neighbors

- LP24 and NPPF Paragraph 185 protect residential amenity.
- The building is already hosting over 100 attendees, with people spilling into rear gardens during events.
- Activities occur during unsociable hours, causing severe noise disturbance.
- The walls between properties are single-skin Victorian brickwork, meaning noise is heard above television volume in adjoining homes during evenings.

5. Parking and Traffic Concerns

- LP22 and NPPF Paragraph 111 require safe access and adequate parking provision.
- The application provides no dedicated parking spaces, despite high visitor numbers.
- Existing on-street parking is already under severe pressure due to an adjacent detached property converted to an HMO.
- Visitors will compete for limited spaces on narrow side streets, causing congestion and obstructing emergency access.
- Repeated blocking of private drives has already been reported, creating conflict and distress for residents.
- The terrace fronts onto a busy dual carriageway, making visitor drop-offs hazardous and increasing the risk of accidents.

6. Inadequate Facilities, Accessibility, and Equality Act 2010 Compliance

- The two properties are Victorian mid-terrace houses, which are not compliant with current Building Regulations or the Equality Act 2010.
- They lack disabled access, step-free entry, accessible toilets, and compliant circulation space. No lift to access multiple levels internally which also poses a serious fire risk.

7. Rear Structure and Environmental Hazards

- A structure at the rear of the property is being used for outdoor cooking, which presents a serious fire hazard given proximity to residential gardens and Victorian timber elements.
- Outdoor cooking and food waste have led to rat infestations, creating health risks and environmental nuisance for adjoining properties.

8. Fire Safety Risks and Emergency Access Issues

- High Occupancy in Non-Compliant Buildings: The proposed use introduces large gatherings into Victorian properties never designed for public assembly.
- Construction Vulnerabilities: Single-skin brick walls and timber floors allow rapid fire spread between rooms and adjoining properties. Shared roof voids and party walls mean a fire in one property can quickly engulf the entire terrace.
- Lack of Fire Safety Infrastructure: No evidence of compliant fire exits, emergency lighting, or fire suppression systems.
- Rear Structure Hazards: Outdoor cooking introduces open flames near combustible materials.
- No Rear Access for Fire Services: The mid-terrace properties have no rear access, meaning firefighters cannot approach from behind to contain a blaze.
- Emergency Access Issues: Severe parking congestion and blocked drives would delay fire service response times. The terrace fronts onto a busy dual carriageway, making appliance positioning and hose deployment extremely difficult.
- Regulatory Non-Compliance: Contravenes Building Regulations Part B (Fire Safety) and NPPF Paragraph 130.

9. Unclear proposed opening hours

- The proposed hours of operation on the planning statement and the application itself do not match. Neither reflect true events, as gatherings are known to carry on until the early hours of the morning, with large groups gathering in the street the whole time.

Conclusion

This proposal conflicts with Local Plan Policies LP11, LP22, LP24 and NPPF Paragraphs 60, 62, 93, 111, 130, 134, 185. The loss of housing, destruction of historic terrace character, harm to neighbourhood amenity, severe parking and traffic issues, property devaluation, fire and pest hazards, and complete lack of parking, disabled access, and Equality Act compliance strongly weigh against approval.

Recommendation: Refuse the application in line with the Local Plan and NPPF.

Thank you for considering this objection. Please confirm receipt and advise on the next steps.

Yours faithfully,