


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

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	MC	<b>Date:</b>	17/02/2026	<b>Manager:</b>	LH	<b>Date:</b>	4/3/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	------------	-----------------	----	--------------	--------

<b>Application Ref:</b>	3/2025/0929			 Ribble Valley Borough Council <small>www.ribbonvalley.gov.uk</small>
<b>Date Inspected:</b>	08/01/2026	<b>Site Notice:</b>	n/a	
<b>Officer:</b>	MC			
<b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b>				<b>REFUSAL</b>

<b>Development Description:</b>	Change of use of the existing dwellinghouse (C3) to a small children's residential home (C2).
<b>Site Address/Location:</b>	17 Redwood Drive Longridge PR3 3HA

<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 objection subject to conditions

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

There have been 28 representations received raising the following comments/concerns:

- Concerns regarding noise/disturbance due to change of use
- The garage parking space is not large enough
- Conflict between planning statement and plans
- Planning ref: 3/2025/0614 is not a comparable site
- Proposal will result in an intensification of the use
- Harm to appearance of street scene resulting from loss of the tree
- Increase in on street parking
- Further information is required with regards to management and occupancy
- Properties in Elmwood have not been consulted
- Cul-de-sac location would result in inappropriate parking for visitors
- Unrealistic that staff would use garage to park
- The type of use is out of place in a residential street
- Concerns regarding property value changes
- Potential increases to number of children and changes to the way the house is run
- Concerns regarding antisocial behaviour
- Negative impact on drainage paving over the grass
- The scheme is a business
- The area lacks facilities for small children
- Granting this would set a precedent for future inappropriate development
- Conditions should be imposed to restrict occupancy and shift patterns
- The proposal may go against restrictive covenants on the property

**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:**

3/1995/0116  
ERECTION OF 90 No. HOUSES (RESUBMISSION)  
Approved with Conditions

3/1994/0540  
ERECTION OF 90 No. RESIDENTIAL HOUSES

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to two storey, detached dwelling 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 one young person between the age of 8 and 17.

**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 numerous bus stop which include services for 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 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 and the potential noise/disturbance/antisocial behaviour that may arise from the proposed C2 use in general. With regards to potential antisocial behaviour given that there would be 1 no. child living at the property. Whilst paragraph 6.9 of the applicants planning statement does indicate that the dwelling may be occupied by a young person with additional care needs, given there would only be 1 no. child living at the property, the potential for antisocial behaviour would not necessarily be any greater than the use as a C3 dwelling with a child living at the property with additional needs. In isolation, this would not warrant refusal of the application.

With regards to the operation of the children’s home, the planning statement indicates that the child would be looked after by two members of staff who would work shifts on a rota basis. The staff would work two days on, four days off and the changeover of staff would occur at 9am. As such, there would be multiple members of staff staying at the property per week.

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 2 children 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, there are concerns about the impact on amenity caused by the coming and going of staff, particularly during shift changeover. The planning statement confirms that there would be one changeover, every two days at 9am. Whilst the Council acknowledge that the applicant is seeking to minimise disruption though changing staff at a time where the road is likely to be busier with people leaving

for work/school, the site is located in a quiet, residential area where there is likely to be an element of disturbance through four cars manoeuvring in a short period of time during changeovers.

In addition, there is conflict between the submitted plans which indicate that there would be 2 no. additional parking spaces required and paragraph 4.5 of the planning statement which indicates that there would be no new driveways created as part of the proposed development. Whilst the site has a garage and parking space to the rear of the dwelling, the creation of two new parking spaces are proposed at the front of the site in accordance with drawing ref: 003. Any disturbance resulting from the proposed change of use would be exacerbated as the additional driveway would be located at the front of the site, within close proximity to other residential properties. There is limited provision for on-street parking adjacent to the dwelling as Redwood 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, if staff were to choose to park on the road. The Council could not control that the staff members park on the driveway and given the lack of parking, would likely result in the changeover staff leaving cars parked on the street, which would result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

In addition to this, the Council would not be able to condition the times and frequency of staff changeovers, resulting in potential additional noise and disturbance for the nearby residential receptors if the frequency of changeover times were to increase or they were to take place at a different time during the day. No information is provided within the application with regards to the nature and frequency of other visitors to the property such as healthcare professionals, social workers and family, which could result in additional noise and disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the proposed change of use, by reason of the operation of the C2 use with staff on a rotating basis, which the Council would have limited control over, in a quiet, residential location would result in an adverse impact to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The applicants planning statement makes reference to planning ref: 3/2025/0614 at Higher College Farm for the change of use of a dwellinghouse to a small children's residential home, which was granted in September 2025. However, the Council do not consider that the two schemes are directly comparable as the site at Higher College Farm is not located in a cul-de-sac location and on a larger plot as such comings and goings and parking of vehicles would have a reduced impact on neighbouring properties compared to the proposed scheme.

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."*

Despite the planning statement advising that there would be no changes to the dwelling, including the creation of new driveways, drawing ref: 003 shows the paving over of part of the front garden to create two additional driveways. It should also be noted that the tree which is located to the front of the driveway is not shown on the existing or proposed site plan.

It is considered that the paving over of the front garden with a proposed driveway to facilitate a change of use would contribute to the change in nature of the site. As such, it is considered that the loss of front garden to facilitate a change of use would visually detract from the character and distinctiveness of the surrounding residential area, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNPD3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

#### **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. They also consider that the driveway is unlikely to be used for the parking of vehicles.

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 have been consulted on the application and have provided comments on the scheme. They have reviewed the submitted Planning Statement and raise no concerns on highway safety grounds and recommend conditions be added to any grant of permission so that the proposed driveway is provided for parking spaces are available for use parking and manoeuvring prior to first use, as well as the surfacing of the driveway in bound porous material and retained as such to reduce any increase in flood risk (which has been raised as a concern by a neighbour).

Whilst the Local Planning Authority cannot ensure that staff members and visitors would utilise the driveway and as such, there could potentially be an increase in on-street parking pressure as a result of the development, due to position of the Local Highway Authority, this concern is not considered to justify a refusal reason on highway safety grounds.

#### **Landscape/Ecology:**

No ecological constraints were identified in relation to the proposal.

#### **Other matters:**

There have been a number of comments made by the occupiers of neighbouring properties regarding other matters which will be discussed below.

Concerns have been raised with regards to the potential impact on house prices, resulting from the proposed development. However, it should be noted that this is not a material planning consideration that would impact on the granting of this application. Concerns have also been raised regarding the potential conflict with private covenants on the property. However, these are also not a planning consideration.

Other concerns raised are that not all of the properties along Elmwood have been consulted. However, the Council are required to directly consult with all adjoining properties of the site. The Council are satisfied that all adjoining properties have been directly consulted on the application.

Objections have also been received raising concerns that the scheme is a business. Whilst the use of the site would be a residential institution (C2), the Council has considered the impacts of the site as a workplace for staff, in particular when arriving at and leaving the site.

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

The proposed change of use of the application property, by virtue of the change to activities that would occur within and around the property, which the Council would not have control over in the future, 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. In addition, the loss of front garden to facilitate a change of use would visually detract from the character and distinctiveness of the surrounding residential area, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development 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 change and potential increase in activities 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, 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 loss of front garden to facilitate a change of use would visually detract from the character and distinctiveness of the surrounding residential area, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNDP3 of the adopted Longridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.  |