

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 April 2025 17:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0864 FS-Case-701907964

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0864

Address of Development: The Conkers Day Nursery, Dewhurst Road, Langho. BB6 8AF

Comments: [REDACTED] The Conkers Day Nursery. I and the other [REDACTED] have not been consulted by the RVBC planning dept. regarding this application and it has only just been brought to our attention via a third party. This application for change of use is too ambiguous in title. We and other relevant neighbours have grave concerns regarding the ultimate use of of this building. We have been informed by a reliable source that the intended use is for special needs children and or, a reform school. If these were to be to made exclusions within the application, then I would not oppose this application. This planning application as it stands, I oppose.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 April 2025 11:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2024/0864 FS-Case-702889422

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2024/0864

Address of Development: Conkers Nursery Dewhurst Road Langho BB6 8AF

Comments: Objection to the planning application as an [REDACTED] to the location of the applicants property to which the application relates.

[REDACTED]
to the applicants property.
[REDACTED]

I notice there are various contradictions on the application and much of the applicants statement raises more and concerns than it answers.

ACCESS TO PARKING. The applicant states parking already exists at the property. This is incorrect. There is only drop off and collection area. Not staff parking. I notice staff park regularly on Dewhurst Road which causes a nuisance. Furthermore, the applicants firstly omits to provide a number of claimed parking spaces, yet later in the same clause claims there are 8 existing parking spaces without requiring more, however his site plan shows 10 parking spaces.

SEAMLESS TRANSITIONS. This further contradicts the access to parking clause. The addition of parking means extra vehicles, extra children mean extra vehicles for the drop off and collection. The statement mentions nothing of the care staff to children ratio. What extra level of staff is required to provide the facility and applicator intends? What extra auxiliary staff are required such as cleaners catering staff and visiting members of governing bodies?

SUSTAINABLE ACCESS. What outdoor facilities are to be provided for children? The applicant intends to remove much of the wooded area to provide parking. So what outdoor provisions will be provided for the children and staff ? Dewhurst Road is a cul-de-sac. Extra vehicles will impact on neighbouring properties. Without proper details of the intended new use of the building and it grounds it is feared the new use will also have a detrimental impact. The applicant has not provided adequate details in this regard to warrant granting permission.

DESIGN And IMPACT ON CHARACTER. Architectural integrity. The applicant states there are no internal alterations. However the plan shows alterations.

TRESS And PROTECTED SPECIES. Many of the TPO trees have already been removed. I'm not aware that permission was granted for there removal. There are some remaining within the area designated for parking. It is my understanding that cars are not permitted to cross roots of protected trees.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE . The same argument as above . The applicant intends to clear the site to provide parking.

PARKING And HIGHWAY SAFETY. This is another contradiction to the access to parking clause No parking exists at present. The claim to existing compliance is totally false .

06 CONCLUSION. Complete ignorance of the contradictions within the majority of the statement. The lack of information can only be seen as intentional. Local residents deserve and must demand their objections be listened to by the council. The applicant would not make an investment into changing the use of the existing business without expecting increased use and expansion of the business. Expansion always comes at a cost to the neighbouring properties and environment.

07 RECOMMENDATION. The council cannot recommend this application for approval with a statement as inadequate as the one the applicant has provided.

HIGHWAY RESPONSE. It seems the highway department has been led to believe the required parking is to be provided solely within the existing drop off zone . The plan clearly shows this is not correct. The rear wooded play area is to be used . I have not found any documentation that supports the claim there will not be an increase in staff . As stated previously there is NO existing parking at all .

LOCATION PLAN . As I stated [REDACTED] The existing location plan is incorrect. The parking shown does not exist and certainly not in the location shown. The location shown is the wooded outdoor play area. Not as shown on the location plan which is not even to scale . The scale is to the benefit of the applicants statement. However the red line does not extend as far south, [REDACTED]

The council will have records of the original planning approval. The council will also have records to addition land purchased from them . The land purchased from the council to provide a wooded play area and drop off area for Conkers Day Nursery and restricted solely for those purposes. Those restrictions should remain in place .

Sincerely

[REDACTED]