

Planning Application Comment

27th January 2026

Application Reference : 3/2025/0929

Development Address : 17 Redwood Drive Longridge PR3 3HA

My Details :



1. Whilst we have no objection in principle to the application put forward, we are very concerned by discrepancies and potential future deviances from the principles set out within the associated planning statement.

The planning statement states:-

- a) The home would accommodate a maximum of one young person residing at the property. Care would be provided by up to two staff members present at any one time, with provision for staff to sleep overnight where required
- b) Carers will work on a rolling rota basis of two days on followed by four days off. Shift changeovers occur at 9am, at which point a new team of carers begin their shift, ensuring full 24 hour care is maintained at all times.
- c) The property provides sufficient space for staff and visitor parking. The proposed use would not require any extensions, new driveways, or additional infrastructure, and no external alterations to the dwelling or wider site are proposed

In relation to the above points, we would comment as follows:

- a) Can these parameters be included in the approval as a condition to assure that any deviances in terms of staff / occupancy in the future requires planning permission. We are concerned that once change of use permission is granted, this would leave an open door to future changes which would be incontestable to the neighbours.
- b) Again, can these parameters be included in the approval as a condition to assure that any deviances in terms of staff / occupancy in the future requires planning permission. We are concerned that once change of use permission is granted, this would leave an open door to future changes which would be incontestable to the neighbours.

This is of paramount importance and sited as a reason for refusal in both applications listed in point 2 below. The councils officer stated in their reasons for refusal “It is noted that a shift pattern would help to alleviate some noise and disruption to local residents, reducing staff changeovers, but the Council would not be able to enforce such planning condition nor could it control the number of staff or visitors to the property during the day, as such there would be the potential for shift patterns and visits to change resulting in an increase in the frequency and times of staff changeovers and visits. The development therefore has the potential to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. **As such, limited weight can be given to the proposed staff model of shift patterns and structured visitor policy.**

This highlights the importance of our concern. Whilst the planning statement quotes amenable change over times, evidently this cannot be protected or enforced, and it is considered that in the future staff changeover patterns and frequency of visits would go beyond those of a family residential house which in turn **would result in an adverse impact to the amenities of neighbouring properties in a quiet, residential location.**

- c) The planning statements sets out “the proposed use would not require any extensions, new driveways, or additional infrastructure”. This is directly contradicted on the associated proposed site plan which shows an additional driveway being installed to the front of the property for two cars. The proposed plan shows a total of 4 parking spaces, which we can only assume the applicant feels necessary to facilitate the proposed use.

This again causes reason for concern that we aren't being told the long-term aspirations for the application site. On street parking in the residential area of Redwood Drive is already, like most streets, problematic. The road currently suffers from haphazard parking on roads which were not geometrically designed with the intention for on street parking. On many occasions the road is blocked to all but small cars. Again, any deviation from the principles set out within the planning statement would surely exacerbate the existing problems. We also note that one of the spaces allocated on the attached plan is within the existing garage. Whilst in principle we agree, human behaviour clearly suggests that staff will not go to the trouble of opening the garage door and using a very tight garage to park their car during their shift, they will simply park on road.

2. The planning statement also refers to a "comparable site", planning ref 3/2025/0614. It then goes on to state "The approval of this comparable application demonstrates the Council's recognition of the need for smaller scale children's care homes within the borough, and provides a clear precedent that such proposals are considered acceptable in principle where appropriately located". We would contest this statement. The property referenced in the above application is a large, detached, 6-bed house with 8 parking spaces set on the outskirts of the urbanised environment. Therefore, drawing comparison to this application is in our opinion largely incomparable and on the contrary, does not set a precedence.

More so, reference can be made to very similar applications within the Longridge town centre environment for change of use from C3 to C2 in residential areas. There may be more available, however these are both from recent times:

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**

Thus, on the contrary to the planning statement, the above applications clearly set a precedence for **REFUSAL** of comparable applications within the residential settlement of Longridge town centre.

3. Whilst perhaps not a planning consideration, we are aware that many properties on Redwood Drive are leasehold and as such, if this property is, it may go against the covenants set out within the deeds.

Conclusion

As it stands, as local residents we would **OBJECT** to the above application on grounds that there are too many open-ended possibilities, which, in time, have substantial potential to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of noise, unsociable visiting patterns and impacts on local residential streets.

Through formal consultation and response on similar planning application within Longridge, RVBC planning officers have clearly set a precedence in agreeing that there is no way of ensuring via planning condition future staff rota's and change over requirements and hence there is no way of ensuring that any such adverse impacts would be avoidable.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 January 2026 22:13
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 360486437768 FS-Case-790965948

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 360486437768

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive
Longridge
PR3 3HA

Comments: I wish to object to this application on planning grounds.

The proposed change of use represents a significant intensification compared to its current use as a private dwelling. A children’s home would operate on a 24-hour basis, with staff shift changes, visitors, deliveries, and associated activity, which would increase noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties, particularly during evenings and night-time hours. This would harm the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

The application site is located within a residential area characterised by low-density housing. Introducing a use of this nature would be out of keeping with the established character of the area and would undermine its quiet residential nature.

Parking is limited, and the application does not adequately demonstrate how the additional demand generated by staff, visitors, and service vehicles will be accommodated without causing congestion or obstruction on surrounding roads.

Insufficient information has been submitted regarding the operational management of the facility, including shift patterns, visitor arrangements, and measures to mitigate noise and disturbance. Without this information, it is not possible to properly assess the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties.

For these reasons, the proposal is considered contrary to local planning policies which seek to protect residential amenity and the character of established residential areas, and the application should therefore be refused.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 January 2026 18:16
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2025/0929 FS-Case-791382068

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2025/0929

Address of Development: 17 Redwood Drive Longridge PR3 3HA

Comments: We object to the plans to change the house to a business, as it is not legal under C3 (a) C3 (b) as it fall into the classification of C2 usage, this would have a massive impact on our neighbourhood having a business put in the middle off it. Changing from C3 to C2 means the property could be used for other purposes without requiring full planning permission. Carers will not be registered at the house for council tax purposes, and will have a main residence elsewhere, the house would be a place off work which they get paid to attend, household bills will not be in the name off the carers. Whilst we are in favour off integrating children into society we feel that in the middle off a residential area is not the place. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 January 2026 18:38
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to planning application 3/2025/0929 17, Redwood drive, Longridge PR3 3HA

⚠ 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.

Maya, with reference to the above planning application, please can I make it clear that both of us object on the following grounds. The property would not be legal under a C(a) or C3 (b) as it would fall into the classification off C2 usage the reason being, carers would not be registered for council tax as the will have a main residence elsewhere, the house would be a place of work which they would get paid to attend, household bills would not be in the carers names. Changing from C3 to C2 means the building could be used for other purposes without requiring full planning permission. Whilst in favour of integrating children into society we feel this is not the property to be invested in, it would have a massive impact on our estate having a business in the middle of a residential area.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad