

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

31:01:2026

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Re: Planning Application Number 3/2025/929 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge

I wish to comment on planning application 3/2025/929. There are many discrepancies in the submitted documents.

The Planning Application form says no altered vehicular access, there will need to be a new vehicular access to the proposed parking spaces.

With respect to the planning statement in section 3 there are a number of inaccuracies. 3/2025/0614 is not a comparable site/application. It is in an open countryside area and part of an allocated employment area. It is a much bigger site with more space around it and no adjacent residential development. The approval of this application should not be used as a justification for the approval of 3/2025/929.

Paragraph 4.5 of the planning statement says that there are no changes proposed to the property. In fact there are two parking spaces proposed on the front garden of 17 Redwood Drive. These spaces will have to be accessed by a dropped kerb and driveway. This is a change that should be acknowledged. This will have a negative impact on the appearance of that part of Redwood Drive.

At 6.14 the planning statement says that there will be no adverse impact on residential amenity, local character or the environment. There have been many issues with the provision of children's homes in Lancashire. These are well known and well documented. Other Councils have adopted specific planning policy documents that have been written to address these issues. It is not possible to predict that there will be no adverse impact. The impact will occur in the future and will depend on how well the children's home is managed and the amount of visits by other vehicles and people in addition to the carers. If it is not well managed and many more vehicles are visiting the property it will result in intensification of use in what is a quiet residential area.

The planning application does not explain why four parking spaces are needed. Presumably when the staff change over there is a meeting to discuss any handover issues. At these times four cars will be parked in the spaces or around the property. This may create a similar level of car movements to a family home. However, there will also be visits from doctors, physios, counsellors, therapists, teachers and family members as well as deliveries of medical supplies and equipment. This will result in an intensification of use, when compared to a family home. More information should be provided, similar to the level of detail for the carers' movements. This would allow a more accurate assessment of the impact of the proposed development on residential amenity.

I would like to request that the following conditions are included if the application is approved:

- No more than one child should live at the premises.
- The premises should not be used for staff meetings and training.
- Additional children should not be brought to the premises for schooling/educational purposes.
- The proposed car parking should have a porous surface so that it does not increase run off rates.

Please keep me advised on the progress of this planning application including whether or not it goes to Planning Committee.

Kind regards

■

■

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

31 January 2026

Re: Planning Application 3/2025/929

Dear Maya Cullen,

I am writing to object to the proposed conversion of 17 Redwood Drive into a children's home. [REDACTED] and have significant concerns about the impact this proposal may have on the surrounding area.

One of my main concerns is the suitability of introducing a commercial children's home within a residential estate. Redwood Drive is currently a family-focused environment, and the proposed change of use would represent a shift away from the existing character of the street. This is an important consideration for residents who chose to live in this type of setting.

I am also concerned about the visual impact of the plans. The proposal involves altering the front garden to create parking spaces and removing a mature tree. These changes would noticeably alter the appearance of the property and the wider street frontage. The grassed areas and tree contribute positively to the appearance of the estate, and their removal would change the established look of the immediate area.

Traffic and parking form another significant issue. A home staffed on a shift basis, together with professional visits and deliveries, would increase vehicle movements. The proposal refers to the potential for four off-street parking spaces; two at the front and two to the Redwood Drive side. However, the property currently only accommodates one space on the front drive, with one of the two spaces at the side being a garage. It is doubtful that staff would use the garage on shift, so increased parking on the street is inevitable, potentially blocking access to driveways.

There is also the matter of residential amenity. The application notes that the child accommodated may have complex needs. This could lead to additional noise or activity compared with the current use of the property. The street is generally very quiet, and increased movements associated with staffing and support could affect that.

The application also refers to another planning decision as part of its justification. However, the referenced property differs in scale and context, as it was larger and situated in a less densely arranged setting. The circumstances on Redwood Drive, where properties are in close proximity, raise different considerations.

Further clarification is needed regarding future use and occupancy. Lancashire has previously been identified as having a higher-than-average number of children's homes relative to local need, and it is important to understand how placements would be managed to ensure they meet local requirements. It is also important for residents to know whether any future changes to internal layout or capacity may be proposed at a later stage.

Finally, I am concerned that the change of use may influence how the area is perceived by prospective buyers, which could affect the attractiveness and marketability of nearby properties.

For these reasons, I ask that my concerns are fully considered as part of the decision-making process. I would appreciate being kept informed of any progress regarding this application.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 January 2026 23:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-79312222

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17, Redwood Drive, Longridge, Preston

Comments: There are many points cited in this collection of documents which raise alarm bells for the residents living close to the proposed Younger Persons Care Home.

1) The fact that residents living in the cul-de-sac, Elmwood, have not been included, with the exception of No.1 Elmwood, in the list of neighbour notifications. Looking at the site plan it is obvious that Elmwood would be impacted by this development. It is a small cul-de-sac, and the house entrance and front of No.17 Redwood Drive face directly into Elmwood, despite the street address.

2) The comparison with planning application 3/2025/0614, for Higher College Farm, PR3 2YY is irrelevant, as Higher College Farm is a large site with many parking spaces and is situated outside the developed area of Longridge, and definitely not the type of residential housing estate where 17 Redwood Drive is, with its small roads and close proximity to many dwellings.

3) There is a large contradiction between the planning application form and the proposed site plan, namely the creation of two extra parking spaces covering the front garden of 17 Redwood Drive. This has been pointed out in the Highways document, which suggests that a further proposed site plan must be submitted before any progression of the proposal.

4) When reading the reasons for refusal of other similar applications nearby, it can be seen that, although this application states the number of staff staying at any time, their changeover times etc, the council would have no control over whether this changes in future, and whether the number of regular visitors would change. As similar applications have recently been refused, these would seem to set a more reliable guide to whether this proposal is approved, than the application cited for Higher College Farm.

They are:

3/2025/0713 - Proposed change of use from C3 Dwellinghouse to C2 Children's Residential Care Home (solo occupancy) – REFUSED

3/2025/0910 - Proposed change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to residential children's home (Class C2) for up to 2 children aged 4-18. - REFUSED

and both of these are in similar residential areas to 17 Redwood Drive, with similar effects on local residents.

I therefore OBJECT to this planning application on the grounds that it is an unsuitable use of a house in this residential area.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 February 2026 17:17
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793350833

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge, PR3 3HA

Comments: The only parking for 17 Redwood Drive is its garage (and the approach to the garage). I cannot see this being used for two cars as it's just too impractical. Cars could park directly outside the house on Elmwood, but this is street parking, and likely to inconvenience the residents in that cul-de-sac. Despite Redwood Drive being a quiet residential area, yet there isn't a great deal of parking space, large due to multiple car ownership by a lot of the properties. I feel that a Care House at 17 would only exacerbate the parking issue.

Similar applications to this application in Longridge have been refused, and in these cases, the areas are similar to Redwood Drive, in that they are residential areas. These two planning applications are 3/2025/0713 and 3/2025/0910.


I therefore object to this planning application as I don't believe 17 Redwood Drive is a suitable venue for a care home.



31/01/2026

Re: Application 3/2025/929

Dear Maya Cullen,

I have concerns about the plans that have been submitted to convert 17 Redwood Drive into a children's home for one child aged between 8-17 years with two staff present at any time (). I object to this planning application and proposed use for the following reasons:

Parking and Traffic Congestion: Though the application states there would be no change to traffic and parking; shift changes, staff cars, agencies, visitors, and deliveries would significantly add to traffic and would cause on-street parking problems resulting in intensification of use. This is due to the situation of the house which on the corner of a tightly packed cul-de-sac with no options for on-road parking which do not obstruct access to the cul-de-sac or resident's driveways. Further, the plans state there will be no changes to the property, yet the plans show four off-road parking spaces; two at the front of the property (which is currently a grassed front garden) and two to the side, with one of those spaces being the garage. Currently, there is only space for one car on the driveway, and it is unrealistic that staff will use the garage and swap places with each other between shifts. They would also be unable to do this for safeguarding reasons, as they would need to leave the child unattended to do so. Also, I highly doubt staff will park on the grassed area at the front of the property and risk muddying themselves whenever they go to their cars. Staff will be more likely to park on the road opposite my property which will obstruct access to my driveway and will cause a nuisance for pedestrians.

Environmental and visual impact: Granting this planning application would negatively affect the visual aesthetic of the area for existing residents. It will also create a harmful environmental impact if the private company removes the mature tree at the front of the property and replaces the grassed frontage with paving to accommodate staff parking, as indicated in the current plans. Such changes will disrupt the visual character of the estate, impacting residents' enjoyment.

Residential Amenity and Noise: Plans state that the children being housed may have complex needs, consequently the impact on residents could be increased noise levels or disturbances, particularly if the child screams and shouts frequently due to their needs. Increased noise levels from staff, children, and vehicles, will disturb the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring residential properties.

Character of the Area: Transforming a family home into a commercial property would fundamentally alter the character of the community. This type of use is out of place on a quiet residential street. I chose to live here precisely because it is a peaceful residential estate, not one containing commercial developments. Also, once one of these types of plans are accepted, it sets a precedent for other properties in the area to be converted using this as an example, which will significantly alter the established community and residential character of the area.

Inappropriate reference to another application used as justification: The planning application being referenced on the documentation as a justification for this commercial property is not comparable. The other property where approval was granted was much larger and accessed down an agricultural access road with only one other property in close proximity, hence the impact on residential amenity will be minimal.

Property Value: I have concerns this change to no.17 may reduce the value of properties in the area, make the area less attractive to families and make properties harder to sell on.

Changes to the original plan/ serving Lancashire's best interests: I would also like to know if the purpose of this development is to serve children in the community/near surrounding area or if children from other parts of the UK will likely be housed here? I feel it is important that homes in Lancashire are for Lancashire children and Lancashire communities are not used as a dumping ground for children from other areas of the country where housing is more expensive. As highlighted by this quote from July 2025:

*"In a section of the meeting for public questions, Bruce Ellison said Lancashire County Council – which is responsible for children's social care – had "confirmed" that the county has more children's homes than are needed for its own young people."*¹

Additionally, children who do not feel that they belong in the area are less likely to settle and are more likely to abscond². The excessive profiteering of private companies like Stepping Stones is bankrupting local authorities and is negatively impacting social care,

¹ <https://www.lep.co.uk/news/politics/call-for-crackdown-on-lancashire-childrens-homes-that-dont-take-the-countys-kids-5210749>

² Bowden, Francesca & Lambie, Ian. (2015). What makes youth run or stay? A review of the literature on absconding. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 25. 10.1016/j.avb.2015.09.005.

resulting in a skewed system where taxpayers and local communities are losing out³. Commercial housing such as this is damaging local authority infrastructure when the investment needs to be in local authority run homes which are cheaper and easier to control/hold accountable. Private homes such as these are unethical and cause issues for the children, the families and communities they come from, and the communities they are placed in.

Additionally, children in care frequently transition. Once the one child noted in this initial application has moved on, the developers may attempt to alter the planning permission to house more children. Private companies will always try to maximise profit. I have concerns that Stepping Stones may potentially change one of the downstairs reception rooms into another bedroom and/or convert the garage into an office space for staff so they can squeeze at least another two children in the house (as is frequently done with private lets). This is much easier to do once the initial approval has been granted and would make more money for this commercial business.

I hope you will consider my points of view seriously. Please keep us informed about the progress of this application.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

³ <https://basw.co.uk/about-social-work/psw-magazine/articles/childrens-residential-care-home-costs-scandal-how-i-got>

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 15:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793815916

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge, PR3 3HA

Comments: I object to the planning application above. The property is on the corner of our cul de sac. The area is very quiet, full of family homes and retirees and those wanting a quiet life. This application is not suitable, it will bring the tone of the area down, there will be increased noise and possible antisocial behaviour, police call outs and it will decrease the eco system with the destruction of the large grass area at the front. This needs to be stopped. All my neighbours on the cul de sac are up in arms about this inappropriate plan.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 15:52
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793821246

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive
Longridge
PR3 3HA

Comments: I object this application. This will completely ruin our lovely quiet area, this is upsetting a lot of people and it needs to be stopped. If you want more antisocial behaviour on the streets of Longridge then go ahead but you will ruin our town.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 16:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793828482

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge.

Comments: I don't think this is an appropriate location for a children's home. There are concerns regarding noise, parking, disorderly behaviour, increased traffic and disruption.

[Redacted]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 16:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793849600

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive

Comments: Looking at the plans I do not feel this type of change of use is suitable for its location. Possible increase in noise, not adequate parking as paving over the grass is not good for drainage, more traffic on already busy estate, disturbances during the night.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 16:50
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793854807

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive

Comments: Looking at the plans I do not feel this type of change of use is suitable for its location. Possible increase in noise, not adequate parking as paving over the grass is not good for drainage, more traffic on already busy estate, disturbances during the night.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 17:00
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793859856

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood

Comments: Looking at the plans I do not feel this type of change of use is suitable for its location. Possible increase in noise, not adequate parking as paving over the grass is not good for drainage, more traffic on already busy estate, disturbances during the night.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 17:42
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793872019

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood drive, Longridge, pr3 3ha

Comments: I am objecting to the house being changed into a children's home for a variety of reasons.

Reason 1 ~ I live in a small cul de sac and the house has its front door facing onto the cul de sac, I do not feel a children's home in this cul de sac to be fair.

Reason 2 ~ I have an [REDACTED] who lives with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] carers and cars and possibly the police calling could affect his well being.

Reason 3 ~ I feel strongly that such a home should be somewhere rural and not on a housing estate where families with young children live. Right across the road is a playground where these children play, with more cars and comings and goings this could lead to an accident.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 17:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793877173

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17, Redwood Drive
Longridge

Comments: Concerns over increase in noise.
Cars parking on Pavements, extra cars .

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 18:03
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793879133

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive Longridge PR3 3HA

Comments: I wish to object to the proposals. The proposal is an inappropriate use within an established residential setting. My reasoning being, regardless of how the scheme is labelled, it is, at its core, a business. I do not believe there will be any meaningful control, within the power of the council, to protect and maintain social business hours within the residential development. As such, it can not be guaranteed beyond reasonable doubt, that future changes brought about by a such a business would not effect the characteristics of the residential amenity and adversely affect the lives of local residents.

Equally, for the same reasons set out above, we do not believe there is any guarantee that the proposed change of use would not adversely effect noise and traffic issues in perpetuity.

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 18:22
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793885039

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive Longridge PR3 3HA

Comments: I would like to object to the application.

I do not believe such a proposal is appropriate in an established residential development and without surety into future business / care / shift patterns I am very concerned it will impact on the local area and residents. The presence of an essentially uncontrolled care facility which could, in the future generate significant visitors / staff changes at what could be unsociable hours causes me great concern.

I have insufficient information regarding the operation of the facility and in particular what control the Council will be able to readily enforce and control in the future. Without this I have to consider a worst case scenario where the whole residential amenity could be negatively impacted.

I fully appreciate that such facilities are required, however, I do not believe that retrofitting solutions within established residential settings are the answer. With all the new developments being constructed, I would consider it a more appropriate solution to ensure, through local and regional policy, developers are committed to provide a percentage of properties within their development boundary where ALL potential impacts have been fully assessed and considered. Properties can then be delivered to meet the needs of the children and carers and would be purpose built in a surrounding that meets the needs of all parties involved.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 18:27
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793890767

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge, Preston PR3 3HA

Comments: We are writing to object to changing the above residential home Class C3 to a commercial business property C2. This will change the residential character of the neighbourhood and generate noise and disturbance that goes with a business operating 24-hour shifts. The planning application form and the planning statement 4.5, state there will be no alteration to the one parking space at the property or additional driveways made. The garage could only accommodate a small saloon car which would not be practical to use either. The house is on a corner so we could envisage the lack of off-road parking for potentially four vehicles causing congestion and problems to other road users. We appreciate the need for residential care but feel this house is not in a suitable location to be changed to a C2 commercial business property.

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 02 February 2026 19:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application 3/2025/0929

 **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.

This application has little evidence as to the number and age of children expected to be housed here. It does not appear to be an appropriate change of use.

[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 19:50
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - Application 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793911642

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: Application 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive
Longridge
Preston
PR3 3WS

Comments: I am concerned because firstly, the vagueness of the wording 'small'.

Does it mean small children or children few in numbers. Either way the wording goes no way to explain the intended use. I fear this could be exploited too.

Secondly, the increased noise and lack of parking, will have a huge impact on those living & visiting the estate.

How will the children be supervised is also a concern. The area does not have good facilities for children. If there is a constant stream of children, this will also impact on the local schools and doctors etc etc etc

Therefore I am against this development of a small dwelling on Redwood Drive.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 21:13
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793940785

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge, PR3 3HA

Comments: Dear Maya,

I would like to object to this planning application. I do not believe the property is suitable for the proposed change of use from an existing C3 dwelling house to a C2 use.

The application states there will be two staff members present at the property at all times; however, the property only has one off-road parking space. This may result in the other staff member parking on the street which is already a problem on Redwood Drive and Elmwood.

Due to the nature of the proposed use, there is also likely to be increased traffic from other staff, service vehicles and visitors using surrounding roads. This could lead to increased noise, road obstruction and congestion within what is currently a quiet residential area.

For these reasons, I believe the proposed use is not suitable for this location.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2026 22:08
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application no: 3/2025/0929,17 Redwood Drive, Longridge.

 **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

I wish to voice my concerns regarding the proposed Childrens home.

Parking is an issue as cars will end up double parking. At change over times for the staff the parking will not be sufficient as the garage is very small hence not many residents use theirs.

There will also be staff meetings at times. Is there a plan in place for these occasions.

The application has been compared to the home on Lower Lane that is not in a residential area where parking is not a problem.

We also have extra cars when parents bring their children to the play area on Redwood Drive, just across the road from the planned home.

It is important that children can cross the road safely to the park. Visibilty will not be good as the property is on a bend.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 23:27
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793963599

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive, Longridge, PR3 3HA

Comments: I believe that this proposal is unsuitable for the following reasons:

1. Change of use: this is from residential to commercial use (as it is to be run by a company), the only such example in a consistently quiet community development of 98 houses in its 29-year history. Granting of this application sets a precedent for more such changes of use, either here or in other privately-owned residential areas. This application would result in an intensification of use and in the property exceeding its original purpose.
2. Parking: the plans show parking provision for 4 vehicles. This would affect the visual amenity of many, sets a precedent for parking on grass and, if paved, is not an environmentally desirable measure with its negative impact on drainage. Two parking positions are the garage and driveway, which will result in inevitable shuffling as the driveway is immediately in front of the garage. I have never ever seen the garage used for a car since moving here in 1999. The plans show that there is no net increase in the number of parking spaces, which is not true. Experience has shown that owner and tenants have been reluctant to park on the driveway because of the manoeuvring involved (and/or deposits from the trees above). Vehicles are very likely to be parked on the road, opposite existing driveways and, probably, on the pavement, restricting the movement of those using mobility scooters, prams or wheelchairs, making matters unsafe for those vulnerable groups.
3. Traffic: the application is almost bound to result in more traffic and consequent noise than a "normal family residence" and will cause much more manoeuvring and reversing (more than at any point in the last 29 years), due to the number of staff involved and staff changeovers. 4 adults could be present at some points in the day and night. There is concern over possible night-time callouts and consequent noise in the middle of the night.
4. Similar application: reference is made to an application granted in September last year (3/2025/0614) but this was at a much larger location with no neighbouring residential properties. It is down a lane and other people would not be affected by increased traffic, parking or noise. There was one objection to this application but it seems that there was only one party that would be affected. Therefore, this is not a valid comparison.

5. Notification: only 8 properties received a letter as a consultee, which is not all those who would be affected. Only one house in Elmwood received a letter and that house (one of the most affected) is currently vacant. Notification should also have included the rest of Elmwood, 16, 18 & 21 Redwood Drive and 2 Oakway.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 23:38
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-793971907

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] **Reference No.:** 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 redwood drive longridge PR33HA

Comments: This is inappropriate for the area the extra vehicle movements are surely dangerous near a children's play area