

10 October 2025

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: Formal Follow-Up Objection to Planning Application 25/01765/FP – Change of Use from Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) to Use Class C2 (Children’s Care Home) at Hayes Cottage, 1 West Lodge, Putteridge Park, Luton, LU2 8LA

We, the undersigned residents, submit this follow-up objection to the revised Operational Management Plan (OMP) dated 17 September 2025 and the Environmental Health (Noise and Other Nuisances) consultee comment dated 24 September 2025. This builds on our initial objection submitted on 4 September 2025, which identified multiple shortcomings in the application, including policy breaches, legal inconsistencies, and compliance failures. The revised OMP fails to address these concerns with site-specific evidence and introduces further contradictions, while the Environmental Health comment relies on the OMP without sufficient independent assessment. We request refusal of the application under sections 70 and 70A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as the proposal remains incompatible with the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023, and relevant statutory requirements, posing significant risks to both vulnerable children and the local community.

As residents of Putteridge Park and Stopsley, we value the area’s rural calm and have observed safety challenges daily, supporting the 29 objections on the planning portal with photographic evidence, and seek engagement to ensure welfare, undermined by inadequate prior notification (EG - Notice attached to lamppost away from Hayes Cottage covered by leaves).

This objection details issues including non-registration and safety risks. Please note that this is the second objection letter submitted noting issues in this manner:

1.

Page 1: Legal Compliance (Children’s Homes Regulations, Children’s Act, GDPR)

The OMP asserts that the home will be run in accordance with the Children’s Homes Regulations, the Children’s Act 1989 and 2004, and all applicable laws including GDPR, yet the admission of pending Ofsted registration contradicts this claim, as registration is a legal prerequisite for compliance with these regulations. This inconsistency breaches NPPF paragraph 39, which requires planning applications to be supported by clear evidence of compliance. Legally, it contravenes section 11 of the Care Standards Act 2000, which makes it a criminal offense to operate a children’s home without registration, potentially leading to enforcement action. The compliance gap is the absence of a GDPR policy or detailed compliance framework, leaving data protection and legal obligations unaddressed.

Page 1: Registered Manager’s Duties and Staff Hiring/Training

The OMP asserts that the Registered Manager will ensure “the most effective interventions”

and “exceptional Ofsted standards” to oversee the care and supervision of children and young people, yet it acknowledges that operational logs will only be “available to Ofsted when we are registered,” indicating no current registration with Ofsted. This contradiction undermines the application’s intent to establish a Use Class C2 children’s care home, as registration is a legal prerequisite under the Care Standards Act 2000 section 11, which prohibits operation without it. The absence of documented staff training programs, specific Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check results, or details of the induction process further questions the manager’s ability to safeguard children effectively, particularly in a rural setting with unique risks such as proximity to woodlands and unlit roads, as evidenced by our traffic photographs. This lack of evidence breaches the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 39, which requires planning applications to be supported by robust, evidence-based information. Legally, operating without registration could constitute a criminal offense under the Care Standards Act 2000, exposing the operator to prosecution. Additionally, the failure to provide proof of training or DBS checks contravenes the Children’s Homes Regulations 2015 Regulations 12 and 13, which mandate safeguarding through appropriately trained staff, and aligns with concerns raised in our original letter (section 5) about the operator’s unproven track record, such as the unregistered status of a similar facility at Mount Grace Road since its 2022 approval.

Page 3-4: Training and Zero-Tolerance Policies

The OMP claims that staff receive regular training, including anti-bullying practices, and maintain a zero-tolerance policy, but without Ofsted registration to validate these claims, the effectiveness of such training remains unproven, particularly in addressing diverse behavioural needs in a rural setting. This breaches NPPF paragraph 92-93, which requires planning to support healthy communities with adequate facilities. Legally, it contravenes the Equality Act 2010, which requires evidence of non-discriminatory practices. The compliance gap is the absence of training certificates or policy implementation records.

Page 16: Design & Compliance

The OMP states that the home will meet Ofsted standards upon registration, but the current lack of registration status conflicts with the requirement for compliance before operation, as the application anticipates immediate use. This breaches NPPF paragraph 39, which requires evidence of compliance. Legally, it contravenes section 11 of the Care Standards Act 2000, making operation without registration a criminal offense. The compliance gap is the absence of detailed design specifications or bathroom ratios.

2.

Page 1: Team Meetings, Shift Handovers, and Quality Care Standards

The OMP repeatedly states “protecting the safety of children” without providing specific details on how this will be achieved, suggesting a reliance on generic text rather than a tailored operational strategy, and it mentions “nine quality care standards” without listing or defining them. The OMP states that monthly team meetings and shift handovers will be held (Page 1) for up to 7 staff, as implied by the 5-7 parking spaces (Page 5), yet lacks a traffic management plan for these regular events. This contradicts the “normal home” claim (Page 7) and risks increased congestion, which could generate noise and increase traffic in the quiet

rural enclave of Putteridge Park and surrounding roads, as demonstrated by our submitted traffic photographs showing existing congestion. This lack of detail breaches Policy SP9 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031, which requires developments to protect existing amenity and avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment, and NPPF paragraph 130, which mandates a high standard of amenity for existing users. Legally, the absence of specific standards contravenes section 22C of the Children's Act 1989, which prioritises the welfare of children, as it fails to demonstrate how their safety will be ensured. The compliance gap is evident in the absence of protocols to mitigate noise or disturbance from handovers, particularly in a residential area unaccustomed to such activity.

3.

Page 1: Liaison with Teams and Commissioning Authorities

The OMP promises "constant communication" with internal and external multidisciplinary teams, as well as commissioning authorities, to ensure the care needs of children are met, yet it provides no evidence of consultations with local schools or the Crown Estate regarding land use implications, a concern we raised in our original letter. This lack of documented engagement breaches NPPF paragraph 40, which encourages best practice in engaging with the community and relevant stakeholders to inform decision-making. Legally, it contravenes Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which requires adequate consultation with affected parties, including educational institutions and land owners like the Crown Estate. The compliance gap lies in the absence of liaison logs or correspondence, leaving uncertainties about how rural-specific risks, such as woodland proximity, will be managed.

Environmental Health Comment Analysis

The Environmental Health comment acknowledges that the OMP "does not specifically relate to noise generation" yet raises no objection, conditioning approval on compliance with the plan, which lacks noise-specific measures. This approach is insufficient, as it fails to independently assess the impact of activities like fire drills on the rural tranquillity documented in our objection, thereby breaching NPPF paragraph 183, which requires controlling pollution including noise. Legally, it contravenes section 79 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, which obliges the authority to investigate statutory nuisances, a duty unmet without a site visit given the 29 objections. The recommendation of an electric vehicle charging point, while aligned with the North Herts Air Quality Planning Guidance, does not address noise or nuisance concerns, misapplying the guidance's focus and breaching the requirement for a reasoned decision under Article 35 of the Order 2015. The compliance gap is the absence of a site inspection or cumulative impact review, disregarding our evidence of existing traffic issues.

Conservation Team Comments Analysis

The Conservation Team's no-objection, dated 6th October 2025, is limited to heritage under Section 66(1) and Policy HE1, asserting no harm to the grade II Registered Park & Garden's significance based on 'no physical alterations.' However, the floor plans confirm the

applicant's intent to convert the garage into a staff office, potentially involving physical alterations, and the Hertfordshire Constabulary's recommendation for a security gate (points 19, 21), alongside security lighting and patrols (OMP Pages 10, 11, 12). These changes risk visual intrusion, a shift from residential to institutional/commercial character, and cumulative harm to the C18/C19 parkland setting designed by Lutyens and Jekyll, as evidenced by our hedge and traffic photographs. This breaches NPPF paragraphs 135(c) (local character), 207 (setting assessment), 212 (conservation weight), and 213 (justification), plus Policy HE1 and Section 66(1). The absence of a heritage impact assessment, issued post 29 objections and 41 consulted properties, fails to address these effects, weakening its validity and necessitating further review.

Lack of Consultee Comments and Resident Exclusion

Despite re-consultation of the Architectural Liaison Officer (Police) on 19 September 2025 and initial consultation of parties including The Crown Estate, The Gardens Trust, and Luton Borough Council since July 2025, no comments are visible online as of 10 October 2025, with the public consultation closing on 12 October 2025. This silence from these parties' breaches Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and NPPF paragraph 40, which mandate adequate and timely consultation. Many residents report not receiving council letters regarding the application, yet express a willingness to sign, highlighting a failure to notify an expanded catchment area. The potential for consultees to comment post-deadline, while resident input (including our objections) is finalised, is entirely unfair, denying residents a chance to respond, especially given the lack of due diligence in prior consultee comments—e.g., Environmental Health's failure to conduct a site visit and the Conservation Team's omission of operational impacts (point 26). This undermines the application's validity and risks judicial review under *R (Finch) v Surrey* [2024] UKSC 20, placing the onus on the council to address this procedural deficiency.

4.

Page 2: Admission Criteria and Matching Assessments

The OMP outlines a matching process that considers high-risk behaviours such as aggression, absconding, and substance misuse among children, yet it labels them as "low to medium risk" without detailing how these behaviours will be managed in a rural setting with woodlands and open farmland, as evidenced by our submitted images. This lack of site-specific adaptation breaches Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which requires the location to minimise risks to children based on their needs. Legally, it contravenes section 10 of the Children's Act 2004, which mandates cooperation to promote child welfare, as no evidence shows coordination with local authorities on these risks. The compliance gap is the absence of completed assessment templates tailored to the rural environment.

Page 7 and Page 11: Community Engagement vs. Security Measures

The OMP proposes community engagement by inviting residents to meet staff and children on Page 7 to foster positive relationships, yet on Page 11 it details 24/7 staff supervision, regular patrols, and security lighting, indicating a controlled environment more typical of an

institution. This contradiction raises serious doubts about the home's compatibility with the rural character of Putteridge Park and surrounding areas, especially given the 29 objections which reflect a clear community rejection. The two consultee comments which note no objections from the HCC and Environmental Health are entirely flawed as evidenced in the first objection letter and this objection letter. The reliance on security measures to manage admitted behavioural risks, such as absconding and aggression outlined on Page 2, conflicts with the friendly integration promised, breaching Policy SP9 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031, which requires developments to protect residential amenity and align with local character, and NPPF paragraph 130, which mandates inclusive places that consider community acceptance. The operator's persistence in pushing this plan despite overwhelming opposition, as evidenced by our traffic photographs highlighting road safety concerns, may contravene Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which mandates that the location minimise risks to children and the community. The absence of a coherent strategy to reconcile security with engagement further highlights a compliance gap, suggesting an imposition on residents without due regard for their views.

Page 7: Impact of Proposed Home

The OMP suggests that the home will foster "positive integration" into the community through structured supervision, but the admission of potential behavioural risks such as aggression contradicts this goal, particularly without evidence of community support following 29 objections. This breaches Policy SP1 of the Local Plan, which promotes vibrant and healthy communities. Legally, it contravenes the Equality Act 2010, which requires consideration of community impact. The compliance gap is the lack of a community engagement plan or consent.

Page 7: Lack of Response to Community Opposition

This failure to adapt the plan breaches NPPF paragraph 40, which encourages effective engagement with communities to shape development. Legally, if the council approves despite this opposition, it risks judicial review under the Civil Procedure Rules Part 54 for procedural unfairness, as case law like *R (Finch) v Surrey County Council* [2024] UKSC 20 supports overturning decisions that ignore material objections, potentially leading to reputational and financial costs for both the council and operator.

Page 7: Inadequate Liaison with Schools/Authorities

The OMP claims liaison with local authorities, schools, and police (Page 7), but we cannot see that any of the schools have been consulted, contradicting this engagement. This breaches NPPF paragraph 40 (community involvement) and Order 2015 Article 15 (consultation), as many residents were also excluded, undermining the operator's credibility.

5.

Page 10: Unsuitability of Location

The OMP argues that the property offers a "calm and settled environment" suitable for children who have faced challenges, yet the acknowledgment of behavioural issues such as absconding undermines this suitability for a tranquil rural setting. This breaches Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which requires the location to minimise risks. Legally, it contravenes section 10 of the Children's Act 2004, which mandates cooperation to

ensure suitable placements. The compliance gap is the lack of a comparative analysis with urban sites.

6.

Pages 10 and 13: Contradiction Between “Family-Style” and Institutional Features

The OMP describes the home as a “family-style” residence on Page 10, intended to provide a nurturing environment, but on Page 13 it outlines lockdown protocols and regular fire drills, features more characteristic of an institutional setting. This inconsistency undermines the suitability of the property for a residential area, as the institutional nature of these measures is likely to disrupt the tranquillity of Putteridge Park and surrounding areas. This breaches Policy SP9 of the Local Plan, which protects amenity, and Regulation 12 of the Children’s Homes Regulations 2015, which requires a location that supports a homely environment. Legally, if the welfare of children is compromised by this unsuitable setting, it could contravene section 22C of the Children’s Act 1989, which prioritises their best interests, potentially exposing the operator to legal scrutiny if implemented.

7.

Lack of Early OMP Sharing and Council Duty

The OMP’s late release in the process, which fails to address many of the breaches cited in the first objection letter, indicates poor engagement and breaches NPPF paragraph 40 (community involvement) and Order 2015 Article 15 (consultation). This neglects the council’s duty under section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to consider material objections, a gap not fully mitigated by subsequent revisions.

8.

Page 1: Paperwork, Logs, and Health/Safety Checks

The OMP claims that all required paperwork, logs, and health and safety checks will be “maintained to a high standard” and kept in constant communication with Placing Authorities, but it overlooks the implications of North Hertfordshire District Council’s recent switch to a 3-weekly bin collection cycle, effective from 4 August 2025, which could lead to waste overflows and attract vermin in this rural environment. This oversight breaches Policy NE1 of the Local Plan, which mandates the protection of habitats and requires developments to avoid significant harm to biodiversity, and NPPF paragraph 174, which emphasises achieving net gains in biodiversity. Legally, it contravenes section 2 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which imposes a duty on operators to ensure a safe environment, including waste management. The compliance gap is the absence of a waste management plan, which is critical given the ecological sensitivity of the area, as illustrated by our hedge photographs.

9.

Page 1: Environmental Risk Assessments and Fire Safety

The OMP states that “environmental risk assessments have been implemented” and that a qualified fire assessor conducts annual assessments, with regular fire drills to promote safe evacuation, yet this conflicts with the application form’s “No” response to the presence of

hedges on page 6, which our photographs clearly depict as a significant ecological feature. The lack of a noise impact assessment for fire drills in a tranquil rural area further undermines the plan's environmental consideration. This breaches Policy NE1 of the Local Plan, which requires the protection of landscapes and biodiversity, and NPPF paragraph 174, which mandates net biodiversity gains. Legally, it contravenes Schedule 7A of the Environment Act 2021, which requires environmental assessments for developments, and the absence of noise mitigation breaches SP9 (amenity). The compliance gap is the failure to provide these assessments or drill schedules, leaving residents' amenity unprotected.

10.

Page 2: Churn of Children and Operational Intensity

The OMP describes the home as an independent children's home for up to 5 children aged 6-18 with behavioural needs (Page 2), implying frequent inductions and drills due to churn, which contradicts the "normal home" operation (Page 7). This intensifies activity in a rural setting, breaching Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015 (location suitability) and SP9 (amenity) due to increased disturbance.

11.

Page 2-3: Planned Admission and School Attendance

The OMP indicates that all children will attend school between 8:30 AM and 3:00 PM to provide structure, but it provides no transport plan to address the safety concerns of unlit and narrow roads leading to Putteridge schools, a hazard illustrated in our traffic photographs. This breaches Policy T1 of the Local Plan, which requires safe and suitable access, and NPPF paragraph 110, which mandates developments to ensure safe transport links. Legally, it contravenes Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which stipulates that transport arrangements must support children's needs. The compliance gap is the absence of timetables or transport agreements with local education providers.

12.

Page 3: Missing from Home Protocols

The OMP describes procedures for handling children who go missing, including a 72-hour return interview, but offers no specific measures to prevent absconding into the surrounding woods and farmland, a risk exacerbated by the Hertfordshire Constabulary's noted response delays from Hitchin. This breaches Regulations 12 and 13 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which require minimising risks and ensuring protection from harm. Legally, it contravenes section 2 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which imposes a duty to ensure staff can respond to emergencies. The compliance gap is the absence of locally agreed protocols with North Hertfordshire or Bedfordshire authorities.

Page 4: Children's Rights and Anti-Discriminatory Practice

The OMP lists children's rights, including the right to a "warm, clean, and safe home," but the potential for lockdowns and absconding incidents contradicts the promise of a stable environment, raising doubts about the fulfilment of these rights in a rural area with limited oversight. This breaches Policy SP11 of the Local Plan, which aims to support health and

well-being. Legally, it contravenes the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which guarantees dignity and safety. The compliance gap is the lack of proof regarding diverse staff recruitment to support these rights.

Page 13: Police & Emergency Services

The OMP dismisses police response delays from Hitchin by referencing 999 routing and cross-border arrangements, but this does not address the Constabulary's concern about actual attendance times in a rural setting. This breaches Regulation 13 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which requires protection from harm. Legally, it contravenes Regulation 12, which mandates location suitability. The compliance gap is the absence of partnership agreements with police. This approach ignores the real risk to children, particularly those with absconding tendencies noted on Page 2, and fails to address the unlit roads documented in our traffic photographs. This breaches Regulation 13 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which requires protection from harm, as delayed responses could endanger lives. Legally, it contravenes section 2 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which mandates safe working conditions for staff responding to emergencies, and the operator's dismissal of expert input could invite legal challenge if a safety incident occurs.

13.

Page 3: Key Worker Sessions and Monitoring

The OMP states that staff will monitor children's whereabouts using a daily running log and guide them to outdoor activities, yet it fails to address the absence of a gate at the entrance, as noted by Hertfordshire Constabulary, which could allow unsupervised departures in this rural context with woodlands nearby. This breaches Policy SP9 of the Local Plan, which seeks to protect residential amenity from disturbances. Legally, it contravenes Regulation 13 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which mandates protection measures. The compliance gap is the lack of a sample log or boundary management strategy.

14.

Page 4-5: Cultural/Religious Support

The OMP promises support for cultural and religious needs by encouraging attendance at places of worship, yet it lacks a plan to ensure access in this rural area where transport challenges could limit such opportunities, as evidenced by the unlit roads in our traffic photographs. This breaches Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which requires meeting cultural needs. Legally, it contravenes the Equality Act 2010, which mandates reasonable adjustments. The compliance gap is the absence of details on staff expertise or transport arrangements.

15.

Page 5: Parking

The OMP asserts that space for 5-7 vehicles exists on-site at Hazel Blossom House, with "ample public parking" within walking distance, but our photographs of traffic congestion and the parking plan with a handwritten boundary note demonstrate the lack of available overflow space, particularly given the private road's constraints. This breaches Policy T1 of

the Local Plan, which requires safe parking provisions. Legally, it contravenes Article 15 of the Order 2015, which requires consultation on land interests. The compliance gap is the absence of a parking overflow strategy or Crown Estate agreement. This breaches Article 15 of the Order 2015, which requires consultation on third-party land interests. Legally, it contravenes section 3 of the Crown Estate Act 1961, which mandates consent for developments on Crown land. The compliance gap is the lack of a parking overflow agreement or evidence. It also ignores reported collisions on the narrow road, as per resident accounts.

Page 8-9: Highway Safety & Access

The OMP claims that vehicle movements will be “limited and managed carefully” to minimise traffic impact through staggered shifts and pre-scheduled visits, but it offers no concrete evidence or traffic management plan to support this assertion, especially given our photographs showing existing road constraints. This breaches Policy T1 of the Local Plan, which prohibits unacceptable highway impacts. Legally, it contravenes section 2 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which requires safe access for staff and children. The compliance gap is the absence of a detailed traffic management strategy.

16.

Page 6: Addressing Concerns - Selection Criteria

The OMP refers to the “Selection Criteria for the Admission of Residents” section in response to the North Herts Environmental Protection & Housing Officer’s concern about behavioural issues, but it provides no specific criteria tailored to the rural setting of Hayes Cottage, leaving the impact assessment incomplete. This breaches Regulation 12 of the Children’s Homes Regulations 2015, which requires location suitability. Legally, it contravenes Article 7 of the Order 2015, which mandates accurate application details. The compliance gap is the lack of a detailed response addressing the officer’s query.

17.

Page 6-7: Crime Data

The OMP cites a local crime rate of 64.6 per 1,000 residents to reassure against safety concerns, yet this data does not address the Hertfordshire Constabulary’s objection regarding response delays from Hitchin, which directly affects child safety in this isolated location. This breaches Regulation 13 of the Children’s Homes Regulations 2015, which requires protection from harm. Legally, it constitutes misrepresentation by using irrelevant statistics to dismiss a valid safety concern. The compliance gap is the absence of a site-specific crime risk assessment.

18.

Page 7: Neighbour Assistance and Community Participation Reluctance

The OMP expects neighbours to knock for assistance (Page 7) and encourages child introductions (Page 7/8), but lacks proof of staff insurance/training and ignores 29 objections. This breaches Care Standards Act 2000 s.11 (competence) and NPPF paragraph 40 (consent), as residents, per our submission, reject unwanted engagement.

19.

Page 8: Security Measures

The OMP proposes adding mirrors instead of gates to enhance visibility at the entrance, despite acknowledging that gates might be needed later, which conflicts with the police's recommendation for improved security given the types of children to be housed. This breaches Policy SP9 of the Local Plan, which requires design compatibility with the rural character. Legally, it contravenes Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which mandates risk minimisation. The compliance gap is the inadequacy of mirrors to prevent absconding, as noted by police.

Page 11: Safety & Security Fears

The OMP promises "24/7 staff supervision" with at least two staff members on duty to address safety fears, but the lack of a gate at the entrance, as highlighted by the police, leaves the property vulnerable to trespass in this isolated area with woodlands nearby. This breaches Regulation 13 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which mandates protection from harm. Legally, it contravenes section 2 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which requires safe premises. The compliance gap is the lack of a security patrol schedule.

20.

Page 10: Local Character/Environment

The OMP asserts that the home will "blend naturally" with the rural character, but the proposed installation of security lighting and fencing contradicts this, potentially impacting the biodiversity of the front hedge shown in our photographs. This breaches Policy NE1 of the Local Plan, which requires the protection of landscapes and biodiversity. Legally, it contravenes Schedule 7A of the Environment Act 2021, which mandates biodiversity net gain assessments. The compliance gap is the absence of an ecological impact study.

21.

Page 11: Health & Well-Being

The OMP describes children as "low to medium risk" with minimal behavioural issues, but the inclusion of aggression and absconding in the admission criteria contradicts this assessment, posing risks to the health and well-being of elderly residents in the vicinity. This breaches Policy SP11 of the Local Plan, which aims to support health and well-being. Legally, it contravenes the Equality Act 2010, which requires impact assessments on vulnerable groups. The compliance gap is the absence of a health impact study.

22.

Page 12: Unsupervised Activities

The OMP outlines a "strict zero-tolerance policy" for unsupervised activities, including drugs and bullying, yet it admits risks of exploitation and substance misuse, which are not adequately mitigated given the rural surroundings and proximity to schools. This breaches Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, which requires minimising environmental risks. Legally, it contravenes section 47 of the Children's Act 1989, which

mandates investigation of potential harm. The compliance gap is the absence of a detailed activity calendar.

23.

Page 13: Emergency Protocols

The OMP states that “clear and comprehensive emergency protocols” are in place for fire drills and lockdowns, but the absence of detailed procedures or evidence of past implementation raises doubts about their effectiveness in managing incidents on narrow roads. This breaches Policy T1 of the Local Plan, which requires safe access for emergencies. Legally, it contravenes section 2 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which mandates emergency preparedness. The compliance gap is the lack of a review process or log examples.

24.

Page 14: Property Values & Rural Character

The OMP claims that the home will not reduce property values based on “experience from similar homes,” but the lack of supporting data or local studies undermines this assertion in the context of Putteridge Park’s rural character. This breaches Policy SP1 of the Local Plan, which promotes sustainable communities. Legally, it constitutes misrepresentation by relying on unverified claims. The compliance gap is the absence of market impact evidence.

Page 14: Equality Impact

The OMP asserts that the home will not strain local disability services, yet our traffic photographs indicate potential access issues for disabled residents, which the plan fails to address with a specific equality impact assessment. This breaches the Equality Act 2010, which requires assessing impacts on protected characteristics. Legally, the absence of an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) contravenes the Act’s public sector equality duty. The compliance gap is the vague commitment to collaboration without details.

25.

Page 15: Proximity to Schools

The OMP suggests that proximity to schools is a benefit due to supervised integration, but the need for such supervision, as admitted, contradicts the claim of no safeguarding risks given the woodland proximity and lack of school consultation. This breaches NPPF paragraphs 92-93, which require support for educational facilities. Legally, it contravenes Regulation 12 of the Children’s Homes Regulations 2015, which mandates location suitability. The compliance gap is the absence of liaison records with schools.

The OMP’s lack of Ofsted registration, admission of absconding risks, institutional protocols, oversights by the Conservation Team, Environment Health’s noise oversight, as evidenced by our photographs and the HCC’s “no collision” claim, underscore its unsuitability.

We do not appreciate the reactive approach of the applicant, who has failed to vet the area fully or consult neighbours beforehand, nor the council’s handling, which places an unfair

burden on us to highlight these safety issues. We note the applicant's lack of pre-consultation and the council's inadequate engagement. As a community that knows this area best, we seek meaningful engagement. While we would welcome vulnerable children in a safe context, the current proposal is unsuitable. The council and operator must recognise the 29 objections and consider relocating this facility to a more appropriate site.

In conclusion, the OMP, Environmental Health comments, Conservation Team comments and HCC comments do not adequately address the identified issues. The proposal poses unacceptable risks to Children and the community. We request its immediate rejection by 12 October 2025, addressing the critical concerns highlighted in this letter. Approval of this application, despite the 29 objections, an increase to 41 consulted properties from 6, and extensive breaches including non-registration under section 11 of the Care Standards Act 2000, Regulation 12 of the Children's Homes Regulations 2015, and NPPF paragraph 183, would expose the council and operator to significant legal challenge. Such a decision could be deemed procedurally unfair or irrational, potentially leading to judicial review under *R (Finch) v Surrey County Council* [2024] UKSC 20, which supports overturning decisions that ignore material objections and evidence. This may undermine public confidence in the planning process, while the operator risks regulatory sanctions and civil liability due to non-compliance with statutory requirements, including inadequate consultation under Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Yours faithfully,

Tracy & Chris Rainbow
2 West Lodge

Nissan Elvi & Saima Khan
3 West Lodge

Jack Nixon
4 West Lodge

Robert Wharton Smith & Family
5 West Lodge

Amar & Hannah Patel
6 West Lodge

Paul & Trudi Gibbins
8 West Lodge
Richard and Merly Langeveld
Calders Cottage

Justin & Nicky Crossland
Home Farm Cottage

Jacqueline & Brian Rainbow
2 Home Farm Court

Alison & Nick Richmond
9 Home Farm Court

Karyn & Stuart Godfrey
11 Home Farm Court

Gary Vella
14 Home Farm Court

Karina Barnicoat
15 Home Farm Court

Brian & Bernadette Whitehead
22 Selsey Drive

Shah Sayed
26 Selsey Drive

Peter Walker & Susan Miller
39 Harlestone Close

John & Valerie Peace
12 Birling Drive

Cherry Newbery & Gary Hooper
32 Birling Drive

Edward & June Arden
50 Birling Drive

Paul & Kathleen Read
64 Birling Drive

Sarah Winter
93 Putteridge Road

Sheila Dixon
212 Putteridge Road

Jackie Salter
14 Rogate Road

Nicola & Michael Shadbolt
3 Balcome Close

Neil & Kelly Rees
6 Pevensey Close

Harsukh Soni
13 Middleton Road