PLANNING STATEMENT

Application for a Lawful Development Certificate re: use of a (3a) dwelling as a children's home for up to three children, with a manager and three carers, two of whom would stay overnight, working on a rota basis(C2).

37 Albert Road,
MANCHESTER,
M19 2DU

9/10/2025

1. Background

1.1. I am writing on behalf of my client, Lynncroft Homes Ltd which is seeking a lawful development certificate to use 37 Albert Roada C3a use, as a small specialist care home for up to three children, who will either have been diagnosed with learning disabilities (LD) and/or emotional and/or behavioural difficulties, (EBD) looked after by up to three carers and a manager, which falls within use class C2 of the Use Classes Order.

1.2. The home will be registered with Ofsted as a specialist three-bedroomed children's home. Children will undergo a stringent impact risk assessment to ensure they integrate with the local community. This considers the home, the environment, the community, plus peer groups and risk assessments against each child as an individual prior to admission into the home. The children will live at the property long term, hopefully for many years. This is not a halfway house or emergency housing for children.

1.3. It is accepted, following the case of North Devon District Council v The Secretary of State (2003) EWHC 157 Admin, that the proposed use falls within Use Class C2 and hence the change of use from C3 is not an automatic permitted change. However, it is nevertheless argued that there is little material difference between the current and proposed use, meaning that planning permission is not required.

1.4. In *SSETR and Waltham Forest LBC [2002] EWCA Civ 330,* it was held that unless the old and new uses fell within the same use class, Section 192 requires a comparison between the proposed use and the actual previous use, rather than a hypothetical range of activities. Determining whether there has

been or will be a material change of use is a question of fact and degree and the focus of the investigation must be the character of the use (East Barnet UDC v British Transport Commission (1962) 2QB 484). In cases where the old and new uses are residential in nature, the decision maker should access the planning impact of the change, particularly on neighbouring properties (Devonshire CC v Allens Caravans (Estates) Ltd (1962) 14P&CR).

1.5. Section 55(1) of The Act defines the meanings of the term 'development' as including the making of any material change in the use of any buildings. Section 55(2)(f) essentially states that in the case of buildings which are used for a purpose of any class specified by the Secretary of State, the use of the building for any purpose within the same class shall not be taken for the purposes of The Act as amounting to development. Section 57(1) of The Act provides that planning permission is required for the carrying out of any development of land and Section 336(1) defines 'land' as including a building. Section 192 of The Act (as amended) makes provision for an application to be made to the local planning authority to ascertain whether any proposed use of a building would be lawful and which is the purpose of this application.

1.6. In a ministerial statement from Rachel Maclean (Minister of State (Department for Levelling up, Housing and Communities in May 2023) she stated: '*The planning system should not be a barrier to providing homes for the most vulnerable children in society. When care is the best choice for a child, it is important that the care system provides stable, loving homes close to children's communities. These need to be the right homes, in the right places with access to good schools and community support. It is not acceptable that some children are living far from where they would call home (without a clear child protection reason for this), separated from the people they know and love'.*

1.7. *Local planning authorities should give due weight to and be supportive of applications, where appropriate, for all types of accommodation for looked after children in their area that reflect local needs and all parties in the development process should work together closely to facilitate the timely delivery of such vital accommodation for children across the country. It is important that prospective applicants talk to local planning authorities about whether their service is needed in that locality, using the location assessment (a regulatory requirement and part of the Ofsted registration process set out in paragraph 15.1 of the Guide to the Children's Homes Regulations) to demonstrate this.*

Planning permission will not be required in all cases of development of children's homes, including for changes of use from dwelling houses in Class C3 of the Use Classes Order 1987 where the children's home remains within Class C3 or there is no material change of use to Class C2. An application to the local planning authority can be made for a lawful development certificate to confirm whether, on the facts of the case, the specific use is or would be lawful. Where a Certificate is issued, a planning application would not be required for the matters specified in the certificate.

1.8. The need for the home is set out in the Manchester City Council Our Children Sufficiency Strategy 2022 –27.

2. The Proposal

2.1. The home will aim to provide a smooth transition for children, who will come to live there through careful planning and consideration. It will primarily serve medium to long-term placements to minimise disruption to residents.

2.2. There will be no external alterations to the building or surroundings. From the outside, there will be no change in the appearance or character of the dwelling.

OFSTED

2.3. Before any home can open, it must gain the approval of OFSTED which has regulatory powers outside normal planning control. OFSTED will require a local risk assessment before approving the property as a care home. There will also be a risk assessment to ensure each child would find this a suitable location. The Planning is therefore not the only form of regulation which controls the suitability of the location. This has been reaffirmed in a recent appeal decision (APP/A3010/W/23/3322527).

2.4. A basic principle in assessing a planning application is whether there is other legislation which is more appropriate to regulate the proposed development. In the case of children's care homes, the relevant powers are set out in:

Care Standards Act 2000

The Care Standards Act 2000 (Registration)(England) Regulations 2010

The Children's Homes (England) Regulations 2015

Children's Homes and Looked after Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) Regulations 2013

2.5. Under the requirements of OFSTED, such care homes must be run as closely as possible to a typical family household, while accepting staff are employed on a rota basis to provide the parental support to the children so many have missed in their early years. The only internal physical requirements are those specified by OFSTED, which are not relevant to planning.

2.6. The OFSTED Guide to Children's Homes stipulates that all children's homes must have a children's guide. It advises that a cared-for child's bedroom should not generally be entered without their permission and that children should be provided with appropriate, lockable furniture to store their personal items, including any personal information. It also provides advice on the use of CCTV and monitoring equipment within the home. It stipulates at length the information, monitoring and record-keeping that a children's home must carry out and the procedures that it must have in place.

Fire Regulations

2.7. In terms of fire regulations for care homes, OFSTED will require a Fire Safety Strategy.

The Property

2.8. The property is a six-bedroom end terracd house, with one off-street parking spaces to the rear and unrestricted on-street parking.

2.9. It is the company policy to require staff to use public transport (with free bus passes or subsidised taxi fares) or bicycle (with the provision of a secure cycle rack) and not to allow on-street parking.

Staff rota pattern

2.10. Up to three children would live at the house, with three carers, working on a rota basis and a manager. Two carers would work for 48 hours, sleeping overnight, with a daily carer attending each day. A manager would also visit on weekdays. Six overnight carers would operate on a 48-hour shift

pattern, followed by 72 hours off. Except at changeover times, which last around fifteen to thirty minutes, there will be no more than four staff on the premises at any one time. The changeover of one of the two overnight care staff members occurs every 24 hours, usually around 8.30 am.

2.11. If a child with a higher level of need is allocated to the home, it is sometimes necessary for an overnight carer to stay awake. In these circumstances, one of the two overnight carers would arrive around 8:30 pm and work until 8:30 am, when a daytime carer would replace them. The maximum number of staff in the home would remain at two overnight and four in the daytime.

Other Visitors

2.12. In addition to OFSTED's one visit per year, there will be visits by local social services circa every four to six weeks and one Regulation 44 each month. Usually, each child's social worker would visit them individually but if they are from the same local authority one of the social workers may visit both children. All other professional or clinical appointments and meetings would take place away from the home where possible.

2.13. Depending on the needs of the individual children, there may be occasional visits by other professionals. In addition, there may be visits by family members and friends, although these are carefully managed in advance or the home will facilitate family contact outside the home, subject to child's individual care plan. These visits are no more frequent than those of friends or relatives to a typical family. They are quantified in Schedule 2 below, showing on average two friend or family visits over the weekend and one mid-week visit by another professional.

Purpose of the home

2.14. The purpose of the home would be to support the children to build their confidence, regulate their behaviour and emotions, help them in developing life skills and prepare them for life when they leave the home to fend for themselves. This type of support has been found to be most effective in helping these children to have normal lives and not experience problems in later life.

2.15. During the day it is expected that the child would engage in various activities, plus attend a mainstream, special school or engage in a bespoke individual education plan.

2.16. The proposed children's home seeks to replicate as closely as possible a normal family environment. This type of provision, which government policy is promoting, is to help children who often, through no fault of their own, have not had good parenting in their early years or who have had adverse childhood experiences. These are not children with special or additional needs, who would come under Use Class C2a.

2.17. The children's home model is to create a warm and nurturing family style environment for the medium to long-term care of a small number of children. This type of provision operates in the same manner as a regular family home, with up to three primary carers, to provide consistency and stability to the children who live there (similar to a fostering model).

2.18. Care is provided in small sized family units where residential carers help to develop the social and life skills needed when the child no longer live within an institution. Without such homes and positive interventions, these

children when they leave the controlled environment of care homes will often end up in adult institutions, suffering from long term emotional and mental health problems, experiencing homelessness, substance misuse and involvement in criminality.

Education

2.19. With regard to schooling, it is often the case that when young people come into care, they have missed an extensive proportion of their education or are affected in a way that they could not work effectively in a large classroom environment. Given this, they could be tutored from home initially. This is all achieved online without any tutors having to come to the house. They may then progress to a specialist unit (smaller class sizes) then hopefully onto mainstream. In cases where children may have a home tutor, this is no different from an ordinary family who choose to have their children educated at home. It makes no difference to the planning status of the use.

2.20. This home would be registered with, regulated by, and regularly inspected by, Ofsted. Having the appropriate planning consent will not of itself enable a residential children's home to open at the property if it does not also meet the strict regulatory requirements set out by Ofsted. Indeed, Ofsted's regulatory powers would also extend to it having the option to close the home if it subsequently failed to meet all of the regulatory requirements.

Risk Assessments

2.21. Before OFSTED will give their approval, they require a Location Risk Assessment to be carried out to determine the suitability of the area for a children's care home. This involves consultation with local police and social services departments. There will also be an impact risk assessment for each

child where a referral has been made. This impact assessment considers all the child's needs and examines their compatibility with the young people already living in the home.

2.22. Unless they are approved by a local authority social services department, children will not be placed in the home. They are also able to confirm the urgent need for this type of facility.

Statutory duty of local authorities

2.23. Under Section 22G of the Children Act 1989, local authorities have a statutory responsibility to take steps, as reasonably practicable, that ensure children in care are provided with accommodation that '(a) is within the authority's area; and (b) meets the needs of those children.' Three reports were published in 2020 by the Children's Commissioner: 'The Children who no-one knows what to do with'; 'Private provision in children's social care' and 'Stability index 2020', which point out the failings of local government to meet this responsibility.

2.24. The papers summarise the findings of three years of work by the Children's Commissioner's Office and explain the failure of both national and local government to adequately meet the needs of these children. The report (page 15) states: *'Local authorities are highly reliant on the independent sector, particularly for children's residential care. Costs are increasing but it's unclear why. Given this reliance, it is imperative the market works well and that commissioning and procurement are improved to ensure no child is placed in unsuitable care settings. Recommendations: The Government should consider the barriers to creating more residential care placements to increase supply'*.

3. Planning Assessment

3.1. It is accepted that where care is provided and this is not the main residence of the carers, the use falls within C2 and not C3b.

3.2. There is some case law which establishes that if the carers work on a rota basis and that it is not their permanent residence, the use must be regarded as C2 and not C3b. In the judgement of Mr. Justice Collins in North Devon District Council v First Secretary of State [2003]. J. Collins was clear on the facts of that particular case, that carers who do not live but who provide, not necessarily through the same person, a continuous 24-hour care cannot be regarded as living together and that, whilst there would be less than six residents, the children, without at least one adult living with them at the premises, would not be capable of being regarded in the true sense as a household.

3.3. Whether the change of use would be material is also well established by the courts. Notwithstanding whether the use is considered to be within Class C2, rather than Class C3b, planning permission would not be required if the change would not be a 'material change' of use. It is still necessary to consider therefore, whether that change of use would be 'material'. It is a matter of fact and degree, in the circumstances of an individual case, as to whether a change of use will be 'material'.

3.4. By way of a guide, differences which might be considered 'material' are those which are measurable or quantifiable as resulting in a significant or substantial change or step up in the character or impact of a use.

3.5. In terms of comings and goings, there would be little difference in terms of numbers or the times of these visits, from the current use as a

dwelling to influence its character. These movements are considered further below. There will not be regular visits by any other care staff or clinicians. The local social services would normally send one or two officers each six weeks to inspect the premises, plus two inspectors from Ofsted annually.

3.6. Depending on the individual children's needs, there may be occasional visits by other social workers. Additionally, there may be visits from family members and friends, although these are carefully managed in advance, subject to each child's individual care plan. These visits are no more frequent or at different times than those to a typical family by friends, relatives and professional visitors, is reflected in the scheduled two below.

4. Assessment

4.1. The task must be to compare against that 'baseline' the character of the current land use with what is now proposed. In so many respects, the use would operate in a way that is very similar to a normal family home. The property would provide the children with their sole and main residence, with free and shared access to living, dining, and kitchen facilities, and the ability to take shared meals prepared for them or make their own food or drink.

4.2. The children would be taken to and brought home from school each day, plus be taken to out-of-school activities. Their carers would interact with the property and the residence in a way that is very similar to an adult resident, parent or guardian. The residents would eat together and carry out domestic chores in line with developing their semi-independence living skills. The home would seek to foster lifestyles which would be the same as if the children were living in a family home.

Comings and goings

4.3. The comings and goings (people and not vehicular movements) can have an impact on the character of a property and its impact on neighbours. They would not be significantly different in amount or times of day, from those associated with the previous use by a family. The proposed movements are based upon the experience of similar homes.

4.4. The home manager would arrive most weekday mornings (around 9 am) in a car and leave when appropriate, based upon the needs of the children (two movements each weekday). The other two staff members would normally arrive by taxi, public transport, or bicycle. Overnight staff typically work on a 48-hour shift basis, with only one of the two going off duty each day.

4.5. All household chores, such as cleaning, cooking and gardening, involve the children, and no additional staff are employed at the premises.

4.6. As stated above, these children do not require regular visits from social workers and clinicians, with most of these meetings, if they are required, taking place away from the home. However, the schedule of comings and goings (2) does allow for an average number of mid-week professional visits.

4.7. There will not be a material difference. In the schedule below each figure represents a single movement either in or out over a typical week

Schedule 1- Current occupants, two families, 4 adults and 5 children)

Activity	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Travelling to work		4	4	4	4	4	
School run		10	10	10	10	10	
Shopping/ Social/recreational outings	8			2			8
Visitors	2			2		2	4
Total Movements (in and out)	10	14	14	18	14	16	12

Schedule 2 – Proposed use (based upon experience of other homes)

Activity	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Home Manager and daily carer.	2	4	4	4	4	4	2
Overnight	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
School run		4	4	4	4	4	
Shopping/ Social/recreation	4						4
Visitors (other professional/ friends/ relatives	2			2			2
Total Movements (in and out)	10	10	10	12	10	10	10

4.8. On this basis, it is maintained that the proposed use as detailed in this supporting statement would not be materially different from the previous use. This is supported by the Egerton Appeal (Appeal Ref. 3161037), where the Inspector concluded a similar use would not result in significantly more movements to give rise to planning concerns.

4.9. A similar conclusion is drawn in the Dale Road appeal (Appeal ref. 3263178) : '*The number of these movements is unlikely to be significantly more*

than the number that would be undertaken by a family and certainly not enough to result in a level of intensification in the use of the site that gives rise to concerns from a planning point of view. There is insufficient evidence before me to show that the use would be likely to result in greater levels of noise and disturbance than the existing authorised residential use.'

4.10. Appeal (Ref. 32993519) also provides a useful assessment of a similar care home. In paragraph 12 it states:

'Whilst there will be some additional comings and goings associated with the use as a residential care home, there is no evidence before me to dispute the appellant's case that the use will not give rise to a greater level of disturbance than could be generated by the lawful use as a C3 dwellinghouse. The additional comings and goings identified by the appellant and Council are at a sufficiently low level so as to remain within the parameters of what could be usually expected of a family home and not therefore materially different so as to change the character of the property. Similarly the number of people who will be typically present at the property, and therefore the associated waste generated, is not significantly higher than could be expected with its current lawful use'.

Impact of the presence of staff

4.11. Visually, the property would look no different to the adjacent houses. During the day, there could be three members of staff in the property at any one time, but this would have no impact on the amenity of the area.

4.12. In terms of the nature of the proposed use, Paragraph 25 of Circular 05/2010 is relevant. It states that the criteria for determining whether the use of particular premises should be classified within the C3 use class (or similar) includes both the manner of the use and the physical condition of the

premises. The circular states that the premises can properly be regarded as being used as a single dwelling house where they are:

- *a single, self-contained unit of occupation which can be regarded as being a separate 'planning unit' distinct from any other part of the building containing them.*

- *designed or adapted for residential purposes containing the normal facilities for cooking, eating and sleeping associated with use as a dwelling house.*

4.13. In an appeal in Stockport (Appeal ref. 2162636) an Inspector noted that although the building would be fitted with an office [and fire alarm], this was not uncommon in many dwelling houses around the country and would not materially alter its basic character as a dwelling house. There are no major modifications required to this property.

Fear of Crime/Anti-social Behaviour

4.14. The fear of crime and anti-social behaviour is a material planning consideration which might weigh against the granting of planning permission. The application is not an application for planning permission, however, and given that this is a matter of planning merit and in the absence of any basis to conclude that crime and anti-social behaviour are an inherent part of the character of the proposed use, such a fear is not relevant to the determination of this application for a Lawful Development Certificate.

4.15. There can be concern that the use would result in more noise and possibly anti-social behaviour due to the background of the children. A useful answer to this concern is contained in appeal decision (Appeal Ref.2162636-):

11. The fear of crime is a material consideration in the determination of the appeal. However, the weight that can be attributed to it depends on whether or not the evidence shows that the potential risk of crime is shown or expected to be high and the consequences for the community and individuals are serious. Whilst it is acknowledged that the incidents cited by the local residents would cause upset, they are not altogether unusual occurrences in modern society. Some of the incidents raised issues relating to the running of the home which have the potential to be overcome by changes to the management of the site. None of the evidence suggests that the potential risk from crime is shown or expected to be high or that the consequences for local residents are serious.

12. The evidence therefore leads me to conclude that the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings regarding risk of crime would be low and carries insufficient weight to warrant dismissing the appeal on these grounds.

4.16. The nature of the children is not therefore material to the determination of this application.

5. Conclusion

5.1. It is maintained that there is no material difference in planning terms between the proposed use and the current use as a dwelling. The carers, working on a rota basis, would effectively live at the dwelling house to provide 24-hour care, as a single household. Facilities such as the bathroom/wc, kitchen and living rooms would be shared and the living mode would be communal. The comings and

goings associated with the use would not be materially different from the current use as a family dwelling.

5.2. The proposed use is to provide a stable home environment for the occupants as their main and sole residence and that the length of stay is generally more than temporary or passing. It would not be a 'half way' house or provide overnight emergency lodgings for example. However, in any event, the courts have provided some assistance in determining the significance of there being a commercial factor to a residential use or an arrangement where the occupants have generally only a limited period of stay.

5.3. Following Gravesham BC v Secretary of State for the Environment [1982], the court accepted that the distinctive characteristic of a dwelling house was its ability to afford to those who used it the facilities required for day-day private domestic existence. It did not lose that characteristic if it was occupied for only part of the year, or at infrequent intervals, or by a series of different persons, or if it was under commercial management.

5.4. The lawful use of a dwelling house, included in Class C3 of 'the UCO 1987', is broad in scope and could in association bring with it considerable activity, associated and ancillary use, or vehicular movement. The prevailing character of the proposed use would be that of a small group of children living together and using the property in a way similar to that of a family home where they would be supervised and cared for by adult guardians. While there might be identifiable differences, between proposed and existing uses, these would not be 'material' or easily measurable and quantifiable against the rather flexible characteristics and impacts of a lawful dwelling house.

5.5. It is maintained that the nature of the use is not materially different from the current use as a family dwelling. Comings and goings would be no greater than occur at present, hence there would be no undue disturbance to any neighbours.

5.6. The local authority is therefore respectfully requested to support the application to allow this much-needed facility to be established.

5.7. To support the current proposal, we have reviewed recent decisions from other local authorities that have granted lawful development certificates for similar projects. These precedents provide relevant context and demonstrate consistent planning outcomes for comparable developments.

Successful LDC applications:

Hynburn Council: 11/19/0238

Sunderland Council: 21/02212/CLP

Redbridge Council: 1006/23

Bolton Council: 15060/22

Dudley Council: P 20/0074

Kirklees Council: 2021/CL/91398/W

South Ribble: 07/2021/01196/CLD

Fylde Council: 24/0207

Manchester Council 142294/LP/2025

Oldham Council: *CEA/353207/24*

West Northants: *2024/4161/LDP*

Bedfordshire Council: PL/24/2314/SA

Coventry City Council: PL/2024/0002190/LDCP

Milton Keynes: 24/01924/CLUP

Enfield Council: *2*4/04255/CE

Slough Council: P/10175/001

Spelthorne Council: 25/00393/CPD

Reigate & Banstead: 25/00322/CLP

Successful LDC appeals:

Derbyshire Dales: APP/P1045/X/20/3263178

Lewisham: APP/C5690/X/23/3329560

Welwyn and Hatfield: APP/C1950/X/23/3325924

Liverpool: APP/M4320/X/22/3300633

Wyre Council: APP/U2370/X/21/3277997

Bassetlaw: APP/A3010/X/21/3277785

Sefton: APP/M4320/X/22/3300633

Ashford: APP/E2205/X/16/3161037