



To, Maya Cullen  
Ribble Valley Planning  
Council Offices  
Church Walk,  
Clitheroe

28 January 2026

**Re: Planning Application No. 3/2025/0929**  
**Proposal: Change of use of the existing dwellinghouse (C3) to a small children's residential home (C2)**  
**Location: 17 Redwood Drive Longridge PR3 3HA**

Dear Maya

I wish to formally object to planning application **3/2025/0929** on the following material planning grounds.

### **1. Nature and Intensity of Use**

The application proposes accommodation for a maximum of one young person supported by two carers, operating on a rota of two days on followed by four days off, with shift changes at 09:00 and overnight staff presence to maintain 24-hour care.

Notwithstanding the limited resident occupancy, the staffing model represents a material intensification of use compared to a C3 dwelling. Regular shift changes, staff turnover and overnight staffing introduce activity levels inconsistent with the established residential character of the area.

If the Council is minded to approve the application, it is essential that **resident numbers, staffing levels, shift patterns and operational hours are secured by condition**. In the absence of enforceable controls, there is a clear risk of future intensification or operational drift resulting in a materially different use.

### **2. Parking Provision and Highway Impact**

The application states that the proposal requires no new driveways, infrastructure, or external alterations. This is **contradicted by the submitted site plan**, which shows the installation of an additional driveway to the front of the property accommodating two vehicles.

The plan indicates provision for four parking spaces, including one within the existing garage. Given the narrow dimensions of the garage, it is unrealistic to assume regular use by staff, particularly during shift changeovers, increasing the likelihood of on-street parking.

On-street parking in the locality is already constrained and poorly managed. Any deviation from the operational assumptions set out in the application would exacerbate existing highway and parking issues. The discrepancy between the written statement and submitted

plans raises concern regarding the accuracy and transparency of the proposal and its longer-term intentions.

### **3. Precedent and Comparable Sites**

The application relies on planning reference **3/2025/0614** as a comparable precedent. This comparison is not accepted. That site comprises a substantially larger six-bedroom property, benefits from eight on-site parking spaces, and is located on the periphery of the urban area. It is therefore not comparable in scale, context, or impact.

More relevant are recent refusals within **Longridge town centre** for change of use from C3 to C2, specifically applications **3/2025/0713** and **3/2025/0910**, which demonstrate that such uses are not considered acceptable in principle in this location. These decisions establish a clear and directly applicable precedent for refusal.

### **4. Deliverability**

It is understood that the property is leasehold, which may be subject to restrictive covenants limiting use. While not determinative in isolation, this raises additional concerns regarding the certainty and long-term control of the proposed development.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons outlined above — including inappropriate intensity of use, parking and highway impacts, internal inconsistencies within the application, reliance on non-comparable precedent, and lack of enforceable safeguards — the proposal conflicts with the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that planning application **3/2025/0929** be refused. In the alternative, any approval should be subject to stringent and enforceable conditions to prevent future intensification or deviation from the submitted details.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 January 2026 14:29  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application No 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.

In response to the above planning application I feel I must object to the proposal laid out in the planning application for 17 Redwood Drive Longridge.

Comments.

The house was only ever built for residential purposes. Age range of children not disclosed.

Would they be caring for children with special needs.

If it is leasehold are there any implications with the leaseholder?

The property is on a corner plot adjoining Elmwood.

Elmwood is a narrow cul de sac for vehicle entry and exit onto and out of Redwood Drive.

As such residents could be impacted with additional vehicles using it for turning round.

This could cause a noise pollution for residents in the vicinity as 24 hour care would be involved.

The increase of additional vehicles and parking would cause more congestion.

Current parking arrangements are not sufficient to support additional visitors i.e. Family. additional support workers.

Other properties in the Longridge area have been refused similar requests.

If agreed Ribble Valley Council will be opening the floodgates for similar services.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 29 January 2026 20:34  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-792376700

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

**Comments:** I'm not happy at the prospect of a nearby house being used to care for someone with potentially disruptive behaviours. This is a quiet residential area, and not suitable for placing a residential child home. I'm also concerned, that should this application be approved, that it could be expanded to care for more children.

The parking shown on the application is misleading. There is only road parking outside the house (as opposed to parking places on the grounds of the property). As regards the other two parking places, one of them is a garage, and I can't see two cars ever being placed there, as one car is likely to have to move to allow the other one out. As a consequence, I feel that parking problems will likely arise, thereby turning a quiet residential area into something else.