

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 02 August 2026 09:50
To: DC Admin
Subject: Urgent - OBJECTION Re 2026/62/91547/W Change of Use from Residential Dwelling (Class C3) to Children's Home (Class C2) and external alterations to form additional parking area

Importance: High

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

Good morning,

I have posted a 500 word summary on the online form with regards my objection for planning application 2026/62/91547/W (Change of use of residential dwelling (Use Class C3) to childrens care home for up to two children (Use Class C2) and external alterations to form additional parking area) but I wanted to submit a longer, comprehensive objection here given the word limit online.

I do not want my name publishing online.

Many thanks

URGENT: FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Application Reference: 2026/62/91547/W

Proposal: Change of Use from Residential Dwelling (Class C3) to Children's Home (Class C2) and external alterations to form additional parking area

Site Address: 28 Sylvan Ridge, Huddersfield, HD2 1ZH

Dear Case Officer,

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the above planning application. As the immediately adjoining resident sharing an open-plan driveway and an adjoined garage with the application site, I am directly affected by this proposal.

The application represents an unsustainable and incompatible physical arrangement that will cause permanent harm to residential amenity, highway safety, and neighbourhood security. Additionally, it would not meet the needs of the care users themselves. I urge the Council to refuse planning permission based on the following material considerations:

1. Direct policy conflict and binding planning precedents

The proposal directly conflicts with **Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan** and **Chapters 8 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, which mandate that developments must protect residential amenity, ensure safe environments, and respect local character. Furthermore, this application mirrors identical concerns that have already been tested and decisively rejected:

- **The 2 Robin Hood Road Precedent (Application 2024/91803 / Appeal APP/Z4718/W/24/3356783):** Kirklees Council refused, and the Planning Inspectorate subsequently dismissed, a similar C2 children's care application on an adjoined plot with shared drive and adjoined garage, which is located close to the property in question. The Inspectorate explicitly confirmed that layouts with shared, un-demarcated boundary spaces present unacceptable risks to residential amenity and severe safeguarding vulnerabilities. There was also objection from West Yorkshire Police given existing crime and safeguarding risks.
- **The Sylvan Ridge empirical evidence:** Past foster care placements on Sylvan Ridge resulted in frequent police attendance, local disruption, and acute distress to neighbours. This localised history proves this setting cannot absorb the volatile demands of institutional care structures.

2. Physical unsuitability, omission of care plans and safeguarding Risks

The application covers a wide 10-year demographic (7 to 17 years) for children in care who frequently present with significant emotional, behavioural, or therapeutic needs.

- **Complete omission of operational care plans:** The application is materially deficient. It fails to provide any safeguarding plan, risk assessment, or therapeutic care framework explaining how the children's complex needs will be safely managed on-site.
- **Open-plan boundary failures:** Because the front driveway and garage are adjoined with no physical barrier, it is structurally impossible to establish a secure boundary. This creates an unacceptable safeguarding risk for vulnerable children who cannot be contained within the site, while simultaneously posing a security and privacy threat to my private property.

3. Inaccurate application documentation

The submitted block plan doesn't demonstrate clearly that the garage and driveway are adjoined to my property. The Council cannot reliably assess noise transmission, structural vibration, or boundary encroachment using documentation that omits the true physical layout and open plan nature.

4. High intensity of use, loss of privacy and 24-hour residential reality

The 24-hour operational footprint of a Class C2 institutional care facility cannot be compared to a standard Class C3 family home:

- **Contradictory and hidden shift patterns:** The applicant states working hours are between 12:00 and 23:59 when it is going to be a 24 hour care facility.
- **Late-night acoustic disruption:** Shift-change overs, emergency call outs to a care environment cause noise. Car doors slamming, engines idling, and staff conversing on an un-demarcated shared driveway during these sensitive hours will cause severe sleep disruption, violating **Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP52**.
- **Right to quiet enjoyment:** Noise from change overs and increased footfall/traffic during the day could impact on quiet enjoyment.
- **Lack of proprietary care:** Shift-working, non-resident staff lack the long-term neighbourly investment of a permanent family unit as the care home is their workplace. Without physical boundaries, rotating staff, inspectors, and multi-agency visitors will impact on ability to enjoy one's home.

5. Highway safety, character degradation, and loss of recreational space

To accommodate increased traffic, the applicant proposes to expand the parking area by removing the front garden's mature hedging and garden area:

- **Eradication of amenity space:** This expansion strips the occupants of functional, open-air recreational space in the front garden, failing to meet the basic environmental needs of vulnerable youth.
- **Streetscene degradation:** Under **Policy LP24**, replacing natural green infrastructure with an expansive concrete forecourt commercialises a traditional street which is easily visible.
- **Increased traffic:** The fact that an application has been made to increase parking provision clearly indicates that there will be a significant increase in traffic to the quiet, narrow street with its associated difficulties.

6. Overconcentration and cumulative impact on infrastructure

The locality already accommodates multiple children's care facilities. Introducing another Class C2 facility tilts the demographic away from a balanced residential community, fracturing social cohesion. Furthermore, the cumulative burden of multiple care operations places an unsustainable strain on localised infrastructure which is already under significant strain—including GP surgeries, social services, and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)—while multiplying the frequency of disruptive blue-light emergency responses across local sites. Indeed, it is noted that Kirklees Children's Commissioning team does not support the application given the overprovision of children's home placements.

Conclusion and requests

For the reasons detailed above, this property is fundamentally incapable of safely supporting a Class C2 institutional use without causing permanent, irreversible harm to the adjoining household, the neighbourhood as a whole and is inappropriate to meet the needs of the care users themselves.

I therefore strongly oppose the plans and respectfully request that the application is refused.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration of these material objections.