

About the application

Application number: 2026/92192	
What is the application for?:	Change of use of residential dwelling (Use Class C3) to children's home accommod
Address of the site or building:	57, Adelphi Road, Marsh, Huddersfield, HD3 4BB
Postcode:	HD3 4BB

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
I am writing to formally object to the above planning application. I live at 25 Wellfield Road, in the immediate vicinity of the application site, and am directly affected by the matters set out below. I understand this is a resubmission of application 2025/93550, which the Council refused on 16 March 2026 on safeguarding grounds, and whose subsequent appeal (PINS ref 6007912) was dismissed on 21 July 2026. My objection sets out both why the concerns that led to that refusal and dismissal remain unresolved, and additional local, first-hand concerns regarding the proposed security measures, parking, pedestrian safety and drainage that I do not believe have been properly addressed. 1. The locational safeguarding concern that led to refusal and dismissal of the appeal has not been addressed The Council's decision notice for application 2025/93550 refused permission on the basis that the proposed use, 'by reason of safeguarding issues identified in the immediate vicinity of the site, represents a significant risk to the safety of vulnerable residents from crime and disorder,' contrary to Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan and paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF. West Yorkshire Police objected to that application on the same basis, following checks of police databases and consultation with internal safeguarding partners, and requested refusal. The subsequent appeal was dismissed. The Inspector was explicit that the applicant's proposed staffing and operational arrangements were not disputed and were considered adequate, but that this did not change the finding on the suitability of the location: 'the management and operation of the proposed use do not alter the findings in respect of the suitability of its location and associated risk from this to the safety of vulnerable residents' (paragraph 8), and concluded that 'the location of the proposed development would fail to provide a safe and suitable environment for the occupants of the proposed use, with particular regard to safeguarding' (paragraph 10). The current application adds a Design and Safeguarding Report, a Crime Prevention Statement, and a document titled 'Response to Previous Appeal'. Having reviewed these, every change offered is an operational or physical security measure, increased	

these, every change offered is an operational or physical security measure: increased staffing (a minimum of two trained staff on duty 24 hours a day), PAS24-certified doors and windows, external CCTV, a monitored intruder alarm, controlled visitor access, and formal liaison procedures with the police, Ofsted and the Council. None of these documents identify any change to the site's surroundings, nor do they explain what, if anything, has altered the safeguarding risk in the immediate vicinity that the Inspector found determinative. On the Inspector's own reasoning, these are exactly the type of measures already found not to remedy a locational safeguarding objection. I would ask the Council to reconsider West Yorkshire Police and to confirm whether their original objection, on which the refusal and the appeal decision both turned, still stands.

2. The proposed security measures are inconsistent with the application's own characterisation of the site, and do not match its current condition

The Design and Safeguarding Report submitted with this application states that a 'fundamental principle of the proposal is that the property will remain, both in appearance and operation, a HOME rather than an INSTITUTION,' and that there will be 'no institutional features' distinguishing it from neighbouring homes. This sits uneasily alongside the same document's proposed security specification, which includes PAS24-certified entrance doors and windows, high-security locking systems, external CCTV covering all access points, a video door entry system, a monitored intruder alarm, external security lighting, and secure boundary fencing and gates. This is a materially higher specification of physical security than any ordinary dwelling on this street. As a resident with my own family living in the immediate vicinity, I have a legitimate interest in understanding why a level of physical security well beyond that of a normal home is considered necessary here, and would ask the Council to require the applicant to explain the basis for it, rather than accept it as a neutral description of 'a home, not an institution.'

I would also ask the Council to satisfy itself that the security measures described are coherent and genuinely deliverable, rather than being asserted in supporting text alone. The submitted Proposed Site/Block Layout drawing labels the rear yard, which is also shown as providing three car parking bays, as a 'secured rear garden' with a 'timber fence around the property to provide security.' This is a description of what the applicant proposes to install, not of the property's current condition: based on my own first-hand knowledge of the site, no such perimeter fencing or rear security currently exists. I supply photographic evidence of the site's current condition separately in support of this objection. As the safeguarding case for this application appears to rely in part on this proposed security package, I would ask the Council to require the applicant to confirm precisely what boundary treatment and access control is to be installed, when, and how it would be reconciled with regular vehicle movements in and out of the parking area, and, if planning permission were to be granted, to secure this by way of a pre-occupation planning condition rather than accept it as already in place.

Separately, I would ask the Council to consider the data protection implications of the proposed CCTV system for neighbouring residents. Once this property operates as a registered care business rather than a private dwelling, CCTV covering its entrances, parking area and external boundary is likely to fall under full UK GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 obligations as a data controller. Given the site's position and the shared rear lane,