


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	MC	<b>Date:</b>	18/12/2025	<b>Manager:</b>	LH	<b>Date:</b>	22/12/25
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	------------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0910			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	10/12/2025	<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 dwelling house (Class C3) to residential children's home (Class C2) for up to 2 children aged 4-18.
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	2A Monks Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FR

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>
<b>Longridge Town Council:</b>	<p>Requests that RVBC ensures that the possible intensification of car parking is considered. Envisages that this would be greater than for use as private dwelling and there may be impact on existing residents and businesses.</p> <p>Waste disposal should be considered appropriately.</p>

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>
<b>LCC Highways:</b>	Lancashire County Council acting as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) does not consider that the application as submitted fully assesses the highway impact of the proposed development and further information is required as set out in this response.

<b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>	<b>Additional Representations.</b>
-----------------------	------------------------------------

Five objections have been received from two addresses raising the following concerns:

- The location is not suitable for proposed use
- Concerns regarding parking issues with additional staff and visitors
- The property has little outdoor space or secure fencing around the front or sides for safety and privacy of children and young adults
- More suitable accommodation with bigger driveways and secure gardens
- The application does not demonstrate why this particular location is required and no evidence of other suitable accommodation
- Similar applications have been refused elsewhere
- Noise and disruption from staff changeovers
- The driveway cannot accommodate 2-3 vehicles and there would be increased on-street parking pressure
- Parking at Monks Drive is already problematic and the change of use would worsen the current situation
- The proposal would put strain on existing infrastructure including police, health services and social care
- The change is not in keeping with the character of the area
- The existing driveway can only fit one small car without the vehicle hanging off the driveway on to the pavement

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:****Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

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

**Adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan****National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)****Relevant Planning History:**

No relevant planning history.

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:****Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to single storey, detached bungalow located within the settlement boundary of Longridge, in a predominantly residential area.

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) for up to 2 children aged 4-18.

**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 local schools and a bus stop which is served by the number 1 bus which provides a frequent service every fifteen minutes to the City of Preston. 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 and disturbances that would arise from staff change overs.

The submitted supporting/management statement indicates that the dwelling would be occupied by 2 no. children between the ages of 4-18 who would likely be from the Lancashire Area with between two and four staff members on site, per shift. The supporting statement indicates that there would be three shifts per day, with changeovers taking place at 8am, 2pm, and 10pm. It also states that no staff would permanently live on site but would have an office/bed space within the property so that there is always staff on site.

The management plan states that the home would not be used for regular meetings or high volumes of visitors, with an expected maximum of 1 per week per child. There would be pre-arranged and limited to essential visitors only.

The scale and nature of 2 no. children 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 2 children or more could be possible. The number of children occupying the property could be conditioned to be 2 no. and any increase in the number of children would then need consent.

Notwithstanding this, there are concerns about the impact on amenity caused by the coming and going of staff, particularly during shift changeover. The supporting/management statement confirms that there would be three shifts per day, changing at 8am, 2pm and 10pm. Monks Drive is a residential road which, although adjoins the junction of Preston Road which is a major road through the town, it maintains a quieter, residential feel whereby the changing of between 2-4 staff members, three times a day, including late at night is considered to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. In addition, the Council could not control that the staff members have to park on the driveway and given the lack of parking, would likely result in the changeover staff leaving cars parked on the street. Monks Drive is not a wide trunk road and therefore the presence of up to 4 no. vehicles in the road would be a noticeable difference.

It is considered that the staff changeover pattern and frequency of visits would go 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 LNNDP3 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 LNNDP3 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 driveway in order to support more efficient parking provisions within the site and reduce the need to add to the existing demand for on street parking. Whilst 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, it would emphasise the intensification of use.

### **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. Objectors also note that there are existing on-street parking issues due to the expansion of the vets adjacent to the site, whereby customers are parking in Monks Drive. They also note that the existing driveway is short and when parking vehicles on the driveway, they overhang onto the footpath.

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.*
1. *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 (LHA) have provided comments on the scheme and they do not consider that the application as submitted fully assesses the highway impact of the proposed development and amendments are required.

The LHA note that the site has limited off-street parking provisions due to the length of the driveway measuring approximately 4m long. The LHA usually request that parking spaces measure 2.4m wide and a minimum of 4.8m wide. The proposal states that 2 looked-after children can be catered for and that, depending on the age of the children, 2-3 members of staff are likely to be present at the site. Given the limited length of the existing driveway and the presence of existing on-street parking taking place, the LHA would look for the driveway to be extended for at least 5m to the East, which they consider would help reduce the need for vehicles to overhang the footway and/or remove the need for a third vehicle to park on street.

The LHA note that the site is also located within a sustainable area with bus stops situated within walking distance on Preston Road, as well as local facilities and amenities situated within Longridge town centre. They also note that development also includes covered secure cycle storage, which would further encourage sustainable forms of transport. Although, it should be noted that the Council could not control whether staff travel to work by foot or public transport.

In addition to this, the Council consider that given the size of the driveway, the existing parking spaces do not meet the size requirements to constitute a parking space. Whilst the LHA response and the supporting statement states that there are usually 2-3 staff members present, earlier in the supporting statement, it is advised that there are 2-4 staff members usually present on site, per shift. As such, there is some ambiguity over the maximum number of staff members. Using a worst case scenario, there could be up to 4 no. vehicles requiring parking provision per shift, which is likely to put strain on the existing on-street parking within Monks Drive.

In the absence of an appropriate plan which identifies additional off-street parking as require by the LHA, the proposal is considered to result in inadequate parking provision which would put a strain on existing on-street parking, to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal.

**Other matters:**

Other concerns have been raised with regards to safeguarding and concerns that the site/garden is not secure. However, these are not considered to be a planning consideration.

**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 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 location and would put strain on existing on-street parking, to the detriment of highway safety.

The proposed development therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 135 (f) and Paragraph 116 of the NPPF, Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Plan.

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 LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.
<b>02</b>	The proposed change of use is considered to result in an intensification of the use, without sufficient off-street parking provision. The estimated vehicle numbers and frequency of staff changeover would likely lead to a reliance of on-street parking, to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to paragraph and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.