

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 October 2025 09:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0713 FS-Case-759857623

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0713

Address of Development: 15 Caton Close Longridge

Comments: I have just been told about this application which was refused months ago. I did not receive a letter on 3/10/25 regarding this application. My concern is the number of cars in a cul de sac area we already have residents parking on the pavement who cannot park outside their houses. It is very difficult for neighbours to reverse out of their drives because of parked vehicles. If more cars are parked on Caton Close it will be very difficult for deliveries etc. Ambulances, Fire engines binmen.

From:

24 October 2025 19:42

To:

Planning

Subject:

Objection to Planning Application 3/2025/0713 – 15 Caton Close

⚠ External Email

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Dear Maya Cullen,

I am writing to object to the proposed change of use at 15 Caton Close, Longridge, PR3 3RH from a dwelling house to a children's residential care home. While I fully appreciate the need for suitable accommodation for children requiring care, I have concerns about the suitability of this particular property and its location for such a use.

I am deeply concerned about the impact this proposal would have on my daily life and wellbeing. I live [REDACTED] noise carries very easily. I have [REDACTED], from which I only finished [REDACTED]. I have also recently [REDACTED]. As a result, [REDACTED] and rely on peace and quiet for my [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] will also be [REDACTED], meaning he too [REDACTED] during the day. [REDACTED] and similarly at home most of the time. Any increase in noise, movement or staff and visitor traffic would directly and continually affect our homes and quality of life.

The applicant notes the staff changeovers are scheduled between 10am and 11am to minimise disruption but this doesn't take into account residents who are home during the day. For those of us [REDACTED], daily staff arrivals and departures would cause consistent disturbance.

The property is located at the end of a small residential cul-de-sac with very limited parking and turning space. Any increase in daily traffic, staff changeovers or visitor activity would have a disproportionate impact on the quiet residential character of the street.

The claim that 'no additional parking demand will arise beyond what's typical for a household of this size' is inaccurate. During staff changeovers there will be at least four vehicles on site at once, plus potential visits from managers, social workers and other professionals. The driveway accommodates two cars, leaving no realistic space for additional vehicles without obstructing neighbour's driveways or public footpaths.

It is also relevant that a previous application for a Certificate of Lawfulness under C3(b) for this property was refused, while the refusal was primarily on the grounds that the proposal represented a C2 use and therefore required full planning permission, the council also raised concerns about the property's location at the end of a small cul-de-sac and the potential impact of additional vehicle movements and comings and goings on neighbouring properties. These factors still apply and therefore the issues identified have not been resolved.

There also appears to be an inconsistency within the application regarding staffing patterns and overnight supervision. The previous submission stated that two staff members would work 48 hour

shifts and both sleep overnight, whereas the new documents now state only one will do so. The cover letter states that 'one carer will sleep overnight to replicate family dynamics' while the management plan states that 'one carer will sleep overnight while the other remains on waking duty if required'. If one carer is expected to remain awake overnight, they would reasonably require rest during the day, which would reduce daytime staffing and could lead to irregular comings and goings as staff rotate or rest off site. Having somebody awake all night could lead to noise and disturbance during unsociable hours, particularly in a [REDACTED]

It is also unclear what happens when waking duty isn't required. If the second staff member leaves the property overnight, this would create additional vehicle movements that have not been accounted for in the application.

The description of staff arrangements is ambiguous, particularly phrases such as 'if required' and the use of 'typically' for changeover times. This lack of clarity could allow the provider to alter the rota or staffing pattern after approval, potentially increasing morning & nighttime activity and associated noise. This vagueness makes it difficult to trust the applicant's claim that disruption will be minimal. Overall, the uncertainty about staffing and shift arrangements makes it hard to see how the property could genuinely operate as a 'family style' home.

It is also concerning that much of the documentation submitted appears to have been reused from the previous application, with references still made to 'C3(b) use' despite this being a new application for C2. This suggests the application has not been properly reviewed or updated to reflect the specific requirements of a C2 use, which reduces confidence in the level of care and attention given to this important matter.

The application states that staff are expected to maintain good relationships with neighbours and ensure the home remains indistinguishable from other family homes. However, with a minimum of six different staff members on site each week (2 days on, 4 days off rota), this seems unrealistic. The company is newly established, it was incorporated in June just 2 weeks before their original application, so staff are likely to be new, temporary or locum employees and there is a risk of high turnover. This would make it very difficult to maintain consistency, familiarity or good relationships with neighbours, undermining the claim that the property could remain indistinguishable from other homes in the street.

I also note that the council has recently approved other C2 applications locally where the properties were significantly larger, detached and set within their own grounds such as -

Application 3/2025/0614 - Higher College Farm, Lower Road, Longridge, PR3 2YY

Application 3/2025/0159 - Alston Lodge, Lower Lane, Longridge, PR3 2YH

These sites clearly provided the necessary space, parking and privacy for this type of use.

It is also relevant to note that a more similar application was refused last year for a semi-detached house - Application 3/2024/0155 - 26 Whalley Road, Langho, BB6 8EJ

The application was for more children and staff but the property was larger, had a bigger driveway and was situated on a main road, meaning any additional parking or vehicle movements would have been far less noticeable. Even so, the council concluded that the change of use would result in 'an increase in the number of people, parked vehicles, activity levels and comings and goings' which would be 'incompatible with the residential character of the area' and cause 'harmful noise and disturbance' to neighbours. In contrast, 15 Caton Close is in a small cul-de-sac with very limited turning space and parking, where neighbouring homes are much closer together and have no passing traffic. If a larger, better situated property was found unsuitable for this type of use, this location at the end of a narrow residential cul-de-sac is clearly even less appropriate.

These examples demonstrate that property size, parking provision and potential impact on neighbours are key considerations.

Finally, we are also very concerned about safeguarding. There is a [REDACTED] living on the street, [REDACTED]. The proximity of a [REDACTED] raises serious safety concerns for any vulnerable child placed in a home here. While this may fall outside typical planning considerations, it is clearly relevant to the suitability of this location. The presence of [REDACTED] makes the street unsuitable for a children's home and would be a significant concern for Ofsted when assessing the safety of the property and its surroundings.

Given all of this, it's hard to see how a small semi-detached property on this quiet cul-de-sac could be suitable without significantly affecting the neighbours and the character of the street. I respectfully ask that the council take these points into consideration and refuse the application.

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider my concerns.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]