


**Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.**

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	MC	<b>Date:</b>	13/11/2025	<b>Manager:</b>	LH	<b>Date:</b>	14/11/25
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	------------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0713			 <b>Ribble Valley Borough Council</b> <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a>				
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	06/11/2025	<b>Site Notice:</b>	N/A					
<b>Officer:</b>	MC							
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>					<b>REFUSAL</b>			

<b>Development Description:</b>	Proposed change of use from C3 Dwellinghouse to C2 Children's Residential Care Home (solo occupancy)
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	15 Caton Close, Longridge, PR3 3RH

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
<b>Longridge Town Council:</b>	No response received.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>LCC Highways:</b>	No objections subject to conditions relating to the car parking areas and dropped kerb.
<b>Lancashire Constabulary:</b>	General comments made in relation to secure by design best practice.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
Three objections have been received from two addresses raising the following concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Concerns that neighbour was not consulted on application</li><li>- Concerns regarding an increase in on street parking associated with development</li><li>- Works have started within the property</li><li>- Concerns regarding increase in noise and disturbance from the change of use including staff changeovers</li><li>- Inconsistences regarding staff patterns</li><li>- Concerns that staffing patterns could change once permission granted</li><li>- Most information within the application has been replicated from the certificate of lawfulness</li><li>- Safeguarding concerns</li></ul>	

<b>RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
<b>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</b>
Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations
Policy DMG1: General Considerations Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations Policy DMG3: Transport & Mobility Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy
<b>Adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan</b>

## National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### Relevant Planning History:

#### 3/2025/0503

Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed change of use of an existing residential dwelling (Use Class C3) to a single-occupancy children's residential home.

*Refused*

### ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

#### Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application relates to two storey, semi-detached dwelling located within the settlement boundary of Longridge. The site is situated in a predominantly residential area in a cul-de-sac location.

In addition, the site is located within the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area.

#### Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning consent is sought for a proposed change of use of the application property from a dwellinghouse (use Class C3) to a children's residential care home (Use Class C2).

This application for full planning permission follows a recently refused certificate of lawfulness (3/2025/0503) which was refused for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed use as described in the application would not fall within Use Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). The proposal by virtue of the nature of the use as a children's home involves a change of use from the existing lawful use which is Class C3 to Class C2. Having regard to the nature of occupation and care provision, visits to the property and the property's cul-de-sac location, the proposed development would amount to a material change of use requiring planning permission. Accordingly, a certificate of lawfulness is hereby refused having regard to Section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and an application for planning permission is required.*

#### Principle of Development:

Key Statement DS1 of the Core Strategy seeks to direct the majority of new development to the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge as well as the Tier 1 settlements.

Policy DMG3 of the Core Strategy requires decision taking to consider the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from new developments. This is consistent with the NPPF which requires development proposals to promote sustainable transport.

In this instance, the application site lies within the defined settlement limits of Longridge which is identified as a main Settlement in the Core Strategy. In addition, the application site is sited in close proximity to two bus stops which are served by the number 46 bus which provides an hourly service between the hours of approximately 18:45 and 19:10 to the nearby villages of Broughton, Goosnargh, Woodplumpton, Ashton-on-Ribble and the city of Preston in neighbouring authorities. The site is also located within walking distance to the centre of Longridge.

Accordingly, the proposed development would satisfy the requirements of Key statement DS1 and Policy DMG3.

### **Impact Upon Amenity:**

Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy stipulates that development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature and not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area. Furthermore, Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy requires all proposals for development to consider the effects of development upon existing amenities.

Paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

*“create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”*

Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan states that proposals should:

- c) have no significant adverse impact on residential amenity for existing and future residents*
- d) Do not contribute to, or suffer from, adverse impacts arising from noise*
- h) Create safe environments that minimise opportunities for crime*

With regards to loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impact, given that there are no extensions or alterations proposed to the property, it is not considered that there would be any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties on the above grounds.

Turning to potential noise and disturbance, there have been concerns raised from the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regards to potential noise pollution from the ‘waking night’ staff shift, as well as potential disturbance from the staff changeovers.

The Council’s Environmental Health Officer suggests two conditions however these are not considered to be relevant to the planning application.

The submitted management plan indicates that the dwelling would be occupied by 1 no. looked after children between the ages of 11-18 and two staff members would work two shifts on and four shifts off (48-hour shifts with overnight stay). The submitted management plan indicates that during each 48-hour shift, one carer would sleep overnight while the other remains on waking duty if required. It should be noted that the staff changeover times have changed from 8:00 – 9:00 as submitted within the refused certificate of lawfulness to “typically” between 10:00 – 11:00.

The management plan states that the home would not be used for regular meetings or high volumes of visitors, but essential visitors such as social workers or regulatory professionals would be welcomed in accordance with a structured visitor policy by prior appointment and meetings with professionals would be held off-site where appropriate.

The presence of a child and 2 no. adults in the property, would not be dissimilar from the number of persons that could occupy the existing 3-bedroom dwelling. The scale and nature of 1 no. child being present at the property would function on a similar level to a family residential dwelling and noise from young people i.e. playing in the garden would not be different from that which would be generated by a family unit living at the property, where there would be no restrictions on the number of children living there. For this size of dwelling with 3 bedrooms, occupation by a family with 1 child or more could be possible. The number of children occupying the property could be conditioned to be 1 no. and any increase in the number of children would then need consent.

Notwithstanding this, the Council could not condition that shift patterns must operate on a 48-hour basis. It is noted that a 48-hour shift pattern would help to alleviate some noise and disruption to local residents, reducing staff changeovers to every two days rather than daily, but the Council would not be able to enforce such planning condition nor could it control the number of staff or visitors to the property during the day, as such there would be the potential for shift patterns and visits to change resulting in an increase in the frequency and times of staff changeovers and visits. The development therefore has the potential to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

As such, limited weight can be given to the proposed staff model of 48-hour shift patterns and structured visitor policy.

There would likely be a maximum number of 4 no. vehicles present at one time in the morning when staff are changing over. Given that there would likely be some overlap during staff changeover times to ensure that the child is not alone at any given point, it is likely that there would be 4 no. vehicles parked at the site at any one time on those days. Whilst the dropped kerb would mean that 1 no. parking space could be accommodated in front of the driveway, it is considered that there would likely be vehicle manoeuvring taking place to allow the staff finishing their shift to leave. Only 1 no. car would be able to park in front of the driveway, meaning that during changeover time, another car would have to park elsewhere within the road. In addition, the Council could not control that the staff members have to park on the driveway which could result in the changeover staff leaving cars parked on-street. In addition, the siting of the dwelling, at the end of a small cul-de-sac is considered to exacerbate the impact of the change of use and comings and goings of visitors given the close proximity to neighbouring properties. As noted previously, the Council are unable to restrict the staff changeover pattern and frequency of visits and therefore the dynamic of a children's home which could have multiple comings and goings, beyond those of a family residential house is considered to result in an adverse impact to the amenities of neighbouring properties in a quiet, residential location.

As such, the proposal fails to comply with paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan Area.

#### **Visual Impact/Design:**

Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states:

*“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.”*

Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy provides additional general design guidance as follows:

*“All development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style...particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character.”*

Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan also states that:

*“All new development proposals will only be supported when they are of good design that responds positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the surroundings.”*

The supporting application indicates that the proposed development would not result in any external changes to the dwelling or the site. Notwithstanding this, the highway authority recommends extending the dropped kerb to access off-street parking provisions. However, this change is not considered to result in any significant harm to the visual amenities of the street scene in accordance with the above policies.

**Highways and Parking:**

The Council are in receipt of objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties which raise concerns with respect to the impact of the proposed change of use upon highway safety arising from potential occurrences of on street parking.

Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios”*.

With regards to parking, Policy DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:

*“All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards”*.

Policy DMG1 also states that development must:

1. *Consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*
2. *Ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.”*

The Local Highway Authority have provided comments on the scheme and they note that whilst the existing driveway has been extended internally, the vehicle crossing situated within the highway has not been extended across the entire driveway opening. Therefore, to prevent damage to the footway and to protect the services beneath the footway, the existing vehicle crossing should be extended across the entire driveway opening. The Local Highway Authority consider that this would support acceptable access to off-street parking provisions.

With regards to parking provision, the Local Highway Authority are aware that there are 2 off-street parking spaces within the existing driveway. When considering how the site will operate as described within the Management Plan, they note that there would be 2 members of staff present as such off-street parking can meet the regular staffing needs. Whilst normally the LHA would require further off-street parking to be provided to support external visitors, given the size of the site, this is unlikely to be feasible. The Local Highway Authority consider that the road fronting the dwelling could cater for an additional on street parking space, which during the visit would block the use of the driveway and could be used by any short-term external visitors should it be required. As such, they consider that the effect of the development on the operation of the local highway network would be negligible. Whilst the local planning authority has concerns about increased pressure for on-street parking, due to position of the highways authority this concern is not considered to justify a refusal reason on highway safety grounds.

Subject to conditions to ensure the parking is retained and the dropped kerb is installed within three months of the permission being granted, the proposal is considered to accord with the above policies.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal.

**Other Matters:**

Other concerns have been raised with regards to safeguarding which are not considered to be a planning consideration.

One neighbour has raised concerns that they were not consulted on the application. However, the Councils records indicate that the neighbour was formally consulted. A neighbour has also raised concerns that works have already started, however the Council do not have control over any internal works made to the dwelling, and any works undertaken are carried out at the applicant's own risk in the absence of securing planning permission first.

**Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

The proposed change of use of the application property, by virtue of the increase in activity levels that would likely occur within and around the property, is considered to amount to an intensification of activity at the site that would adversely harm the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in the residential cul-de-sac location.

The proposed development therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (c) & (f) and 191 (a) of the NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy.

As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That planning consent be refused for the following reasons:

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| <b>01:</b> | The proposed change of use of the application property, by virtue of the increase in activity levels that would likely occur within and around the property, is considered to amount to an intensification of activity at the site that would adversely harm the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The intensification of vehicles associated with the development and the reliance on on-street parking during staff changeover and visits would be to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring residents, contrary to paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNPD3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan. |
|------------|--|