

## **QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 4<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

### **Item 7 – 24-01373-FUL- Land South West of Brooklands, Sheepcotes Lane, Little Waltham, Chelmsford, Essex**

#### **Question from Mrs D (updated from previous meeting)**

Good evening Councillors,

My name is xxx and I am a planning consultant for Ceres Property, representing Stratstone Developments.

The starting point for assessment under Part B of Policy DM7 is the condition of the existing site, its contribution to local character, and how it is perceived within the Green Wedge.

In its current state, the site detracts from the surrounding landscape and rural character. It does not contribute to public access of the Green Wedge, and sitting on the edge of a housing estate amongst existing residential properties, as shown on the supporting map (Appendix 1), it's further development will not risk sprawl or coalescence.

During recent committee debate, we heard about the importance of the Green Wedge in protecting the character of Chelmsford's river valleys. This site is not a protected flood plain, it is previously developed land with no direct relationship to the river. Your policy supports the redevelopment of brownfield land in the Green Wedge.

Given the limited role of the site already, it should not be automatically assumed that any change to the site would negatively impact the Green Wedge. Instead we have an opportunity to enhance the site's contribution and overall appearance, as can be seen from the accompanying CGI imagery (Appendix 2). You will note that your Officers consider the scheme to be of high quality design and agree that the physical relationship with neighbouring properties is acceptable.

Contrary to the officer's report, any increase in scale or massing would not be perceivable from public viewpoints, as other than Sheepcotes Lane, there are none. The report mentions views from the allotments, which are merely glimpses as opposed to any appreciation of the site as a whole. They would also be completely screened by the proposed ecology and landscape buffer which is to include 10 new trees.

When considering different design options through pre-application engagement with Officers, the advice received specifically acknowledged that the "the semi-underground level would not be readily visible from the road", and that the proposals would be "visually comparable to the existing Nissen hut".

The applicant has worked proactively to address comments received during the consultation period, and there are no statutory objections to the proposals.

We respectfully request your support for this opportunity to provide a sustainable and low impact family home, on previously developed land in a residential area.



### Question from Mr B (carried over from previous meeting)

We wish to make the following comments to the Committee regarding the above application.

We hope the Committee agree with the councils recommendation to refuse this application. Along many other valid reasons, it poses such great risk to the natural ecosystem in the vicinity. This includes a large natural spring in close proximity. There are a many underground watercourses on the plot and such excavations could be disastrous. The watercourse at the bottom of the plot also runs directly into our garden, which then feeds into the village stream, and eventually into the River Chelmer. This watercourse is frequently overwhelmed with fast flowing water. We have video footage of this which we can provide if needed. The applicant has paid no regard for this aspect of the terrain, and even refer to the Spring as a 'pond' which it is not.

The applicant has provided no clear details as to how they intend to dispose of their sewage safely and within legal limits. They are far too close to water to install a septic

tank or sewage pump. It's our view that this property can not even be built legally. We are shocked its even got to Committee stage and are baffled as to why it has been. The planning department have come to the same conclusion as us local residents, that this application should rightly be refused.

Thank you for considering our comments.

### **Question from Mr M**

I live adjacent to the plot being discussed and wish to make the following comments to be presented to the planning committee.

Firstly I would like to agree with the Planning Officers recommendation to refuse this application based on the fact it will spoil the rural setting. It will create an urban feeling to a much valued country path, with a '2 vehicle car park' and parked cars being visible from the top of the lane creating an 'eye sore'. We all enjoy the lane as it is, a sanctuary from development. Development on this site has been rejected numerous times previously based on the same reasons so I don't see how this application is any different. In fact it is on an even larger scale!

Here in Little Waltham we are already surrounded by huge new developments which are more than catering for any local and even national need. There are also many more thousands of homes planned in the parish so the Developers saying this property is meeting a need is simply not the case. This property does not provide affordable housing (which is what is needed nationally), it is a vanity project purely for commercial gain. It provides nothing for the local community, in fact quite the opposite applies, as it is poses great risks to our local environment. It would involve the destruction of green wedge which is so precious in our area.

I also wonder how they intend to build the property without blocking the single track narrow lane. Essex Highways have said it must remain unobstructed to vehicles and pedestrians at all times. I don't see at all how this will be possible due to the lack of space!

Finally, they have completely ignored the fact that the plot sits directly next to a large natural spring with underground watercourses, which are likely to run underneath the proposed building. The spring is the main source Little Waltham stream which runs through the village and eventually into the Chelmer. So not only do they risk disturbing the flow of water, there is also a risk of pollution as they cannot dispose of their sewage legally or safely. The Parish Council have recommended refusal as they also have great concern about the nearby Spring and any unforeseen damage which could be caused.

I have noted that the developers have already put this plot up for sale on Rightmove, so bizarrely they don't have any intention of building it themselves. They simply wish to make an instant profit.

In summary, the risks to our environment far outweigh the developers need for profit.

Thank you for listening to my comments.

## Question from Mr S

Members of the planning committee,

As the husband of Mrs S the lawful owner of this property since October 2008, I submit this Statement in support of this application and to provide context about its use by us over the past 15 years.

It's worth noting that before the purchase in 2008, this land was vacant for years and used as an illegal dumping ground. We took the initiative to clear the accumulated waste, to deter further fly-tipping.

From October 1982 to August 2022, my wife and I resided at the neighbouring property, 19 Church Hill. Following the purchase of this plot we used the Nissen Hut and the surrounding land for various domestic purposes.

As illustrated by the photographic evidence in Appendix 1 [below], the Nissen Hut has primarily served as domestic storage and garaging by us, housing gardening equipment, tools, building materials, and vehicles.

In 2012, we obtained permission to use the surrounding land as part of our garden.

Since then, we've maintained it meticulously, using it for leisure, planting, and as an allotment. The hardstanding area has been used for parking and hosting visitors. On several occasions the land and our garden at 19 Church Hill was open to visitors as part of the "Little Waltham Open Gardens Event".

Without this proposed redevelopment, the land's future use is uncertain. If sold on the open market, it could become a storage facility or revert to a builder's yard for which it was used for many years by the previous tenant at Brooklands, the next house up the lane, until Brooklands was sold without this plot and the area left derelict and unused for many years

This outcome would be less sympathetic to local environment and out of character with the area.

This application presents a high-quality, well-designed, contemporary scheme.

We believe it will have no material or visual impact on the rural character of the area. Instead, it offers a modern living solution that respects and reflects the current structure's outline.

I firmly believe this project would be a positive addition to Little Waltham, providing much-needed housing while enhancing the area without compromising the village's essential character.



In conclusion, I urge the committee to view this application favourably.



### Question from Mr F

Good evening, members of the planning committee. I'm xx, Land and Planning Manager at Stratstone Developments.

We're a local developer proposing an opportunity for a family to create their own unique home in a highly sustainable location, abutting the settlement edge of Little Waltham. Since 2023, we have been working with a local family, the xx, who own the site. The xx have submitted a statement for your consideration tonight, setting out the history of the site, and I would urge you to read it in order to provide context.

The primary concern appears to be the perceived intensification of domestic activity resulting from the creation of a new residential home, and whether that impact is harmful to the character and setting of the Green Wedge. However, the context of the site is of crucial importance.

Firstly, the site is already domestic in nature.

- The proposed garden area has been lawfully used for domestic purposes for over a decade.
- The existing building has served as domestic storage for even longer.
- The hardstanding area has been regularly used for parking, vehicle turning, and accommodating visitors during social events.

The Council asserts that parking on the site frontage would be detrimental to the area's character. However, recent photographic evidence (see Appendix 1) from a random site visit yesterday morning reveals unauthorised parking of three unknown vehicles. The landowner has confirmed that unauthorised parking is a common occurrence.

Our proposal aims to formalise parking arrangements by positioning two parking spaces behind enhanced landscaping, thereby benefiting both the immediate area and the wider Green Wedge.

Secondly, the statutory declaration provided by the site owners confirms the existing domestic character of the site. This indicates that a significant level of residential activity is already present.

Any potential increase in activity should be evaluated in the context of:

- The existing use and its potential intensity
- The benefits of redeveloping brownfield land
- The creation of a new family home
- And The improvement to the site's appearance within its rural setting

In essence, any increase in domestic activity, must be balanced against the current use and the overall benefits our proposal would bring to the area.

While each application is decided on its own merits, planning decisions within the last two years set precedents for similar impacts and increases in activity. In previous correspondence to Officers and Councillors, we provided 7 directly comparable planning permissions for; the redevelopment of domestic outbuildings to provide separate dwellings in rural locations.

In one case involving redevelopment of an outbuilding with a dwelling in Broomfield, the Planning Officer noted that "*the subdivision of the plot would not change the activities taking place on the site, which are already domestic in nature.*" This closely mirrors our proposal, where the site is already in domestic use.

In another similar case, in Little Waltham, it was concluded that "*Overall, the proposal would increase activities on site, but would improve the visual appearance of the site with the removal of the existing garage.*" Our proposal similarly aims to enhance the visual character of the area by replacing the existing Nissen hut with a high-quality, sensitively designed dwelling.

With recent planning reform affirming the importance of brownfield development, schemes like ours, causing little to no material impact, should be viewed proactively.

On specific neighbour objections, we've provided a Drainage Strategy letter from an expert which determined that local watercourses will be unaffected by our proposal. And we would happily agree a Stage 4 Drainage Design as a Planning Condition, should you decide to approve our application.

In conclusion, to reiterate:

- The site is already domestic in use.
- The benefits of the scheme outweigh any perceived increase in activity.
- Local planning case studies support the approval of this application.
- This development represents sustainable growth.
- And what else could this site be used for, if not for a new residential home?
- Thank you for your time.



Appendix 1



## **Item 10 - 88/02105/S73 - Daniel Kirby House Care Home, Moulsham Street, Chelmsford, CM2 9AQ**

### **Question from Mrs B**

With reference to the above planning application I would like to submit a statement, regarding the removal of condition 3, variation of condition 4 & 7 to approved planning application to remove age constraint.

I consider that there should be a minimum age of 55 upwards with people's needs who the staff can manage & who's behaviour will not be disruptive to the privacy of residents & neighbours, whether they are in the home or allowed out.

I would also like to add that I have concerns regarding the parking situation when the residence is completed.

### **Question from Mrs S**

Good evening Councillors, thank you for this opportunity to speak again this evening. Ceres Property are planning consultants acting on behalf of Calm Futures Limited.

As your Officers have just detailed, Daniel Kirby House has an existing permission for use as an elderly care home.

Calm Futures offer supported living care facilities which fall under Use Class C2. As this sits within the same use class as an elderly care home, formal planning permission is not required for this change of use to take place.

This application therefore seeks permission purely for the removal of Condition 3 and amendment of Conditions 4 and 7 applied to the original consent, as these conditions currently restrict the age of residents being cared for within the property to being over the ages of 60 and 65.

It is important that this is the matter considered this evening, as opposed to the principle of the property being used for supported living instead of an elderly care home, given this is permitted to take place under the allowances of the Use Class Order. Simplistically, this application considers only the age of residents, not the type of care.

We feel it important to emphasise that the change of age of users of the property would not result in a material change to the operation of this site to an extent which would render the original planning permission unacceptable in planning terms. The nature of supported living care for over 60s would not be materially different to the care offered to younger members of the community. As such, the impact on the local environment would see no change as a direct result of lifting the current restriction.

Should there be concerns over risk of public nuisance or noise, whether founded or not, any such matters are of course managed through separate Environmental Health and public safety legislative and regulatory processes.

Given that the use of the site to provide supported living care is already deemed acceptable in principle, and your Officers have confirmed that the proposed change is in accordance with the relevant adopted Local Plan Policies, we respectfully request



your agreement to remove and amend the relevant conditions to ensure that this facility can support the needs of a full range of users, for which there is a significant care demand in Essex, as opposed to only those over 60 and 65.

### **Question from Mr B**

Good evening, my name is xxx, Managing Director of Calm Futures Limited. We are a care provider in Essex, supporting people with learning disabilities, autism, and associated needs. Our mission is to support people achieve maximum independence, enjoy the same opportunities as others, and live enriched lives. For context the average age of the people we support is 37 yrs.

Our senior leadership team consists of:

xxx, our CEO, who is a qualified Mental Health Nurse with over 25 years of experience. He founded two award-winning care organisations—Aldanat Care in 2008 and Autumn Care in 2014.

xxx, our Operations Manager, is a qualified Learning Disability Nurse with 25 years of experience. She has held roles from support worker to quality manager, specialising in care and compliance.

As Managing Director, I have nearly 40 years of experience in social care, starting at Essex County Council at age 16 and holding senior roles in both public and private sectors.

We already operate several services in Mid Essex, recently taking over a contract at Goldlay Square, Chelmsford, where the council asked us to mobilise at short notice as the previous provider's contract was terminated. We were selected for this contract due to our quality-of-service delivery.

Daniel Kirby House has been developed in conjunction with Essex County Council, with officers stating that this service addresses the high demand for accommodation with support in the area. They have praised our collaborative approach during the process, which sets us apart from our competitors.

We are regulated by the Care Quality Commission (CQC), which assesses us against legal standards through its ongoing holistic evaluation process, including unannounced visits, and all external feedback received. As part of this, CQC considers feedback from the council's quality monitoring team, who routinely assess us against national performance indicators.

Before opening a service, we undergo a thorough CQC registration process, including a detailed application, site visit, and management team vetting. Additionally, ECC conducts rigorous care and property compliance checks before 'on-boarding' the service for operation.

Our quality rating with CQC is Good and are seen by Essex as one of their top-quality care providers.

## **Question from Mr W**

My name is xxx, I have been a registered Mental Health Nurse for 17 years and I am the Chief Executive of Calm Futures.

Daniel Kirby House is a state of the art, supportive environment for adults with learning disabilities, designed to the requirements of the team at ECC, to meet the specific needs of people that it has a statutory duty to provide care for.

There is a shortage of this type of care bed in Chelmsford. This leads to residents being sent out of County at a greatly increased cost to the taxpayer.

In ECC Supported Living demand bulletin from October 2024, Chelmsford has the second largest unmet demand. Of the total number of people County wide actively seeking suitable accommodation, 92% are under the age of 55.

Despite our best efforts to reassure the local community, including inviting Councillor Pooley and our neighbours to meet the individuals we support and discuss our work, some concerns remain. We have made it clear that we are registered to care for individuals with learning disabilities. We have no instances of drug use. We are not a drug or alcohol unit, as has been mistakenly suggested.

It is very clear to us that one resident's views appear to have brought us here tonight, despite there being nothing within planning policy for the application not to be approved.

xxx referred to the Goldlay Square service we operate. That is 5 minutes from DK House and in a built-up residential area. It is operated without issue or danger to local residents. As are the other similar facilities other providers operate in Chelmsford. Why Should DK House be viewed differently?

The Officer has succinctly set out the planning issues and clarified why the proposals accord with the relevant planning policies. ECC Market Vision in the current Market Shaping Strategy paper is to Enabling people to live their lives to the fullest through a vibrant and sustainable care market, supporting Essex residents to develop their strengths and personal independence. There has been a huge interest and request for placements since the service was approved by CQC and on boarded by the ECC. If either had a concern about location, or our ability to operate the service it would not have been approved.

The need for this service is urgent, and every day that we are delayed impacts the well-being of the individuals we are dedicated to supporting.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## **Question from Ms N**

Good evening,

My name is xxx, I am the mother to K (born xxx).

I have spent all of K's life fighting for her rights.

We spent most of K's early years in hospital trying to find out what was wrong but nobody could find anything specific. GOSH report stated that K was a demanding child who needed 24 hour care.

Fortunate for us we found Hargrave House based in Sandon Chelmsford which was an amazing place and felt like home.

K thrived here and settled well.

Unfortunately, we were told without a great deal of notice that Hargrave House was shutting, another under 18 care facility closing without any alternative care in place.

We have spent years fighting to find a suitable place for K, including a court case to prevent her being moved to the North of England because of no suitable accommodation locally.

After a lot of fighting K was temporarily transferred to Lavender house in Colchester, this was for short breaks/respite care and not for long term living.

Again, another fight commenced to keep K local to Chelmsford. K's father pushed for K to move to the property at 67A Cromwell Road Brentwood. I do not think that this property is suitable for K as the other residents are all much older. K is still only 23. But this was all we could find within a short distance of her family.

In January 2024, we spotted the sign for Calm Futures outside the property Daniel Kirby House on Moulsham Street.

Immediately I contacted Calm Futures and spoke to Alan Betts, who was very helpful and advised what they were offering and that I would need to contact my Social Worker Doug Jones to proceed with applying for a placement for K.

This has taken a year but hopefully, will be worth it.

I have visited Daniel Kirby House. The property is stunning and with some adjustments will be able to meet all of K's needs.

She will be 5-10 minutes away from all of her family. Which will not only give K but her family, precious time together.

I have been advised that the intention is the residents will be younger than where she is now which will provide a more stimulating environment for her.

The government and Council talk about Diversity and inclusion, but it still seems that certain parts of society are still not accepting of this.

Placements like Daniel Kirby House are impossible to find, believe me I have spent years searching for somewhere that K could live and continue to see her family.

At the cost of my marriage and my mental health the fight for K has had its toll.

I am just a Mum trying to find the best place for K.

K is a 23-year-old beautiful girl who through no fault of her own was starved of Oxygen at birth and will now spend the rest of her life in a wheel chair being fed through a tube, registered blind and quadriplegic CP.



To read some the objections is heartbreaking. There appears to be a lack of understanding, empathy and a prejudice again people with different and/or complex needs.

K is not a drug addict or a threat to society. K isn't a danger to young people in the park, nor to dog walkers. It seems one or two people want secure fencing and large walls build around Daniel Kirby House to lock people away.

Thank you for your time.

## Question from Mr Y

**A question for Committee** (*proposed by our legal advisor*)

**The Reasons the Council gave for Condition 3&4 state;**

***The effect of the use on the amenity of nearby residents and the amount of space available for car parking has all been assessed on the nature of the use and activity generated. The circumstances pertaining to an alternative use within the same use class would be unlikely to meet these criteria and would be unacceptable'.***

**The Council considered there to be a need for the elderly age condition to be imposed when the planning permission was originally granted – what has changed?**

Since the Condition was placed on Ashley House (now Daniel Kirby Care Home) to protect neighbourhood amenity in 1989, the neighbourhood has grown considerably:

The location plans for the 1989 and 2024 planning applications confirm;

- New blocks of flats have been built at Brooklands Walk.
- The Lions, Briar House and Oakwood have also been built on the land originally belonging to Stump Cross.

**NB: Officer's Report / Point 2.4 |Stump Cross has been completely omitted from the 'Description of Site' – home to Mr & Mrs and their young family.**

## Neighbourhood Amenity

- We bought Stump Cross in 2007 for our family – at that time, our solicitor Chris Allnutt, highlighted the condition placed on Ashley House as a positive attribute - and we felt assured in the knowledge that the Council, by their conditions and reasoning, were fully committed to protecting our neighbourhood amenity.
- We subsequently built The Lions to the rear of Stump Cross, and partly alongside Ashley House in 2015, with the same sense of conviction.
- We have now sold Stump Cross and live in The Lions.
- Ashley House was advertised (and purchased) as a care home with the elderly age condition highlighted – and we were pleased that the building was going to be brought back to life. It had stood idle for several years due to its closure enforced by the CQC and prolonged pandemic.

- **Of course there is a need for care homes and assisted living for people with complex needs – but there is also a demand for care homes and assisted living for elderly people.**
- According to the 2021 Census and the Council website; the elderly population in Chelmsford is the fastest growing sector. The median age has risen to 41 years.
- The number of people aged 65 to 74 years rose by 25.4%, and residents aged 50 to 64 also rose marginally.
- In comparison, the number of residents between 20 and 24 years fell by 7.8%.
- Calm Futures Ltd can adapt their business plan to help meet the demands of an increasing older generation. A care home providing assisted and independent living for the elderly could be a great asset for Old Moulsham - especially for those experiencing loneliness.
- *Natasha Ketley at Moulsham Residential Home Ltd, (Moulsham Street), has said: 'There's a big demand for care homes for the elderly in this area and the population is getting older'.*

### Officer's Report

- **Exec Summary / 1.4** – 'potential for increased noise and disturbance and fears about their safety and wellbeing'
  - Documents provided by Calm Futures describe screaming and physical abuse to staff and potential harm to the public.
- **Exec Summary / 1.4** – 'These concerns are not supported by any authoritative evidence'
  - **Evidence is difficult as the facility isn't open, however;**
  - Evidence lies within several documents supplied by Calm Futures Ltd
  - The Planning Dept. have not asked for authoritative evidence – and surely it should be for Planning Officer's to provide evidence that we will be safe if this condition is removed, and not the other way around?
- **Details of the proposal / 3.9** – 'granted permission for a single storey extension to the rear to provide two independent living units'
  - Why is this not shown on the plan on page 15? Is it because the new building will fall short by just a few meters of our house and in particular our daughter's bedroom window?
- **Planning considerations / 6.1 / a**
  - This sentence should read; 'Is a care facility for adults **with complex needs** in need of care as opposed to solely elderly care an appropriate use in a residential area.
- **Planning considerations / 6.1 / c**
  - Yes, given the additional carers and support staff required to properly care for adults with complex needs – more car parking will be required.
  - On street parking, and parking in the private visitors spaces at Brooklands Walk is already taking place. Cars are also now being parked on the pavement opposite Daniel Kirby House by the bus stop.



## Other concerns

- Calm Futures Ltd is a relatively new company, started in 2021 - and this is the first care facility of this size and nature within their portfolio.
- Calm Futures are also currently opening multiple other care homes in other counties.
- The 3 Directors are also currently Directors of numerous other companies.

Please reject this application.

**Thank you,**

## Question from Mrs Y

Thank you for bringing this application before the Planning Committee and for listening to our concerns regarding our;

- I. loss of neighbourhood amenity;
- II. loss of privacy
- III. noise concerns (which are likely to be day and night)
- IV. but mostly our fears for the safety of our families, and for others.

The Reasons the Council gave in 1989 for the Conditions 3 & 4 stated that they were to protect our neighbourhood amenity. The neighbourhood has grown, and we still need the Council's protection. ***The decision today could have an irreversible impact on us all.***

This planning application includes care documents that appear inadequate – and if they are, and if the Council approves this application - will the Council therefore be endorsing the scheme and be liable for the consequences of what may follow?

## Neighbourhood Amenity, Care of duty & Human Rights Act 1998

- For 18 years we have lived happily next door to the care home, protected by The Council's Planning Condition (3 and 4) placed on Ashley House.
- We are kind people - and we don't want to deter others from living alongside us and enjoying the amenities such as Oaklands Park and Museum on our doorstep – but the young individuals with complex needs described in this planning application with loud and threatening behaviour, is causing a great deal of anxiety.
- Our concerns are not just for our family and for our neighbour's, but also for the 12 young people with complex needs who could be living together – a new scheme, and something that hasn't been proven to be of any benefit.  
A pilot scheme, that our neighbourhood may be forced to take part in.
- Elderly people are also very deserving of Daniel Kirby House – With a fast growing aging population, the demand for assisted and independent living for older people is becoming ever greater.
- This is a business for Calm Futures Ltd, and while we understand adults with complex needs may be the best income generation - these are our homes, our families and our everyday lives.
- We made our home here long before Calm Futures Ltd purchased the care home – and it would be unfair to impose such a fundamental and potentially dangerous change to everyone's lives.  
To do so, it would appear that the Council no longer considers our neighbourhood amenity or its care of duty towards us.



- *It would go against the Local Plan DM29 and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998.*

### Safety fears

Our safety and privacy concerns are very real. People with complex needs suffer the most serious mental health problems - and they are the most dangerous.

The fear of service users approaching my young adult children, perhaps after dark as they return home from work or after an evening out - and possibly harming them, simply fills me with terror – This planning application has been on my mind for months and I can hardly sleep.

We often see in the news, what happens when vulnerable people aren't properly supervised – and these tragic stories add to my anxiety.

The owners are aware their service users can be violent – one social media video shows the safety measures they've implemented (TV's behind Perspex, no radiators on the walls and electric window shutters 'to protect them and staff').

**Their supporting documents also outline e-learning training only, for staff to deal with incidents – how to prioritise incidents; and which to escalate to senior managers, the police, ambulance or the fire service.**

### My experience

I have previously worked for Mind and I have first-hand experience of how reactive and unpredictable service users can become in a moment, with triggers very different for each. Individuals can unexpectedly experience an outburst that cause's a danger to themselves and to others.

Each person will have an individual care plan and will need a great deal of support.

**The suggestion of just 2 members of staff to care for 12 adults with complex needs is unbelievable.**

### A compromise / a fair resolution

- Please reject this application and recommend a new application to amend the condition to resident's aged 50+ for all. If residents have complex needs, they will be in a later stage of life and hopefully more adapted to living in an urban residential environment peacefully.
- Reduce the overall number of residents to 10 (in line with the accommodation they currently have), to include a maximum of 6 residents with behaviour problems, autism and complex needs to live in the main care home only, in order to meet their care needs and ensure neighbourhood amenity.
- The help with privacy issues (sight and sound), a fence alongside our mostly transparent hedge/boundary at The Lions, and a high wall to the front border with Stump Cross, (in keeping with the street scene) will be very welcome.
- An undertaking for no music or social gatherings outside the property after 9pm would help reduce noise (particularly for the young children sleeping next door)
- To provide neighbours with a management plan, outlining staff contingency plans and 24hr emergency contact numbers for the senior management team.
- For the owners and Council to meet with neighbours every 6 months, to discuss any issues and provide the latest advice and emergency plan in the event of incidents.

*(Images of borders with*



*The Lions & Stump Cross)*

Please refuse this application.

***Thank you and Best wishes***

## **Question from Mr R**

Every document provided by Calm Future Limited, to Essex County Council and Social services – all referred to the prospective residents as those with complex needs (Calm future advertised to pay £17.04 per hour for Complex Support' (the highest payment).

My first highlight is on the Management Strategy:

When it comes to ensuring safe staff level CQCs regulatory requirements – “if your residents have greater needs, than more qualified staff are required on-hand in your home”

Daniel Kirby House strategy is 2 staff for evening & weekend for 12 residents with complex needs. No other staff information is provided for weekdays.

I work in a similar setting and we need to provide various support depends on the needs of the persons with complex need (1:1 or 2:1 support or a group of 9 people which requires 4 staff members)

Is the proposed staff ratio sufficient for residents' safety as well as neighbourhood's safety?

Also there is no information about the criteria of the residents who will be living in the independent living areas.

Process for On-boarding by Essex County Council:

- Shared houses, usually 2-4 tenants living together' (Calm future proposal says 12 people of different ages with complex needs.

How will Calm Future able to manage the requirement of 12 people with complex needs under the CQC regulatory?

In the officer's report (section 2.4), our property Stump Cross, which is immediately next to Daniel Kerby House, has been completely omitted from the Description of the site.

We bought Stump Cross with the knowledge that Ashley House (currently called Daniel Kerby House) is a care home with the age restriction that Council put to protect the neighbouring amenity. That gives us the confident to buy Stump Cross and live there with our 3 young children.

We propose to reject this application and recommend the age limit to be 50+. We also propose to extend the current height of the brick wall in the front to ensure our privacy. We also propose there needs to be a condition for no music or outside gatherings after 8pm, so children can sleep in the neighbouring properties.

## **Question from Mr K**

Ref: Daniel Kirby House

I would like to ask the Council committee that the council put the age restrictions earlier to protect the neighbouring amenity. What made the council to remove the age restrictions

when there are more neighbours around the Daniel Kirby House?

Please reject the application

Thank you,