


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	MC	Date:	09/04/2026	Manager:	LH	Date:	13/4/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	------------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0013			 <p>Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</p>
Date Inspected:	10/12/2025 (previous application)	Site Notice:	n/a	
Officer:	MC			
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				REFUSAL

Development Description:	Proposed change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to residential children's home (Class C2) for up to 2 children aged 4-18.
Site Address/Location:	2A Monks Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FR

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
Longridge Town Council:	Longridge Town Council note there is very limited off-road parking and have serious concerns regarding parking. Concerns relate to the regular visits of staff, carers and social workers and parking concerns relating to the existing vets during drop off and collection.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	<p>Original response (26 January 2026) raises no highway concerns subject to conditions to ensure the 4 no. parking spaces are provided in full and available for use prior to first occupation, as well as a condition for the construction materials for the parking area. Comments were made in relation to the length of the existing driveway which was not considered adequate.</p> <p>Revised response (4 March 2026) following a query from the Planning Officer confirms the length of the driveway space should be 4.8m minimum. The LHA raise no objection but note that parking options 4 or 5 would be the preferred option to provide 3 no, suitably sized spaces in addition to the driveway space. No highway safety concerns are raised subject to conditions for the 3 no. parking spaces to be provided prior to first use/occupation, as well as a condition for the construction materials of the parking area.</p>

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
<p>Objections have been received from nine households raising the following comments/concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding increase in parking issues • On-street parking is made worse already due to customers of existing vets • The majority of neighbours are elderly and increase in traffic/cars parked would be dangerous • Elderly residents would feel vulnerable with proposed change of use • Risk of antisocial behaviour • The applicant is a business which is not appropriate in residential street • The proposed parking solution is unsuitable • Tandem parking would not be appropriate for staff changeover 	

- The new parking would stop the garden being used for children who would reside at the property
- The site is unsafe for children as there is no fence
- Contradiction between handover times
- Proposal would have a negative impact on property values
- Safeguarding concerns
- Alters the character of the land and reduces biodiversity
- Existing parking space in front of the garage does not meet the 2.4m x 4.8m and will overhang the highway
- Safety risk to pedestrians
- Concerns that the LCC have suggested 3 no. parking spaces is adequate
- Residents should not have to get used to the noise at 10pm during staff changeover
- There are no noise issues from existing buses
- The LHA have changed their view on which options would be more suitable
- The parking spaces would reduce existing off-street parking, disrupting further properties/homeowners and congesting further down the road
- The habitat plan does not show where the footpath would be from the parking spaces to the front door

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:

3/2025/0910

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

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:

This application is 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.

Planning permission has been recently refused for a similar scheme (which did not include any additional off-street parking) under planning ref: 3/2025/0910. This application was refused for the following reasons:

1. *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.*
2. *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.*

This resubmission now includes the addition of 3 no. parking spaces within the curtilage of the existing dwelling.

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 objections from neighbours raise concerns with the frequency of changeovers from staff which the agent for the application has clarified would be at 8am, 2pm and 10pm.

Officer concerns raised in the refused scheme related to the potential adverse impact during changeover as only one parking space was originally shown. The lack of off-street parking meant the comings and goings of 2-4 staff members at change-over time, particularly at night-time, including vehicle movements and car doors closing within the street outside of neighbouring houses was considered to result in greater activity levels typically associated with a C3 household and result in an adverse impact to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

The proposal now includes the addition of three new parking spaces (two of which are tandem parking) taking the total number of spaces within the curtilage to four albeit the existing space has previously been assessed as substandard in terms of size.

The applicant considers that as no. 2A is located at the top of Monks Drive close to the road junction with Preston Road and the veterinary practice, there is likely already increased activity when compared to other parts of Monks Drive which are located further away from existing commercial activity and the main road. As such, it is the applicants view that activity levels within the street are already increased at the site and the proposal would not result in any adverse impact on amenity through the provisions of additional off-street parking.

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. In addition, the supporting planning statement confirms that there would be 2-4 members of staff at the property at any one time and 2 or 3 persons arriving and departing, usually, at around 8am, 4pm and 10pm.

The previous application was refused as although the site adjoined Preston Road, Monks Drive was considered to maintain a quieter, residential feel whereby the changing of between 2-4 staff members, three times a day, including late at night was considered to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. In addition, given the lack of parking, this would 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.

The Council note the addition of 3 no. off road parking spaces. However, there are still concerns that as two of the parking spaces are tandem parking, the likelihood of both these being used is low given that the site is essentially a place of work for the staff who will want ease of access and manoeuvrability. In addition, although the highway authority state that the existing space is 4.8m in length, the Council retain concerns regarding the actual size of this parking space and its useability whereby larger cars/vehicles are likely to overhang the kerb. The worst-case scenario is that two staff members would park on site and the best-case scenario is four. However, even the best-case scenario would result in parking elsewhere in the street at change-over time and result in significant vehicle manoeuvring and associated noise and disturbance.

Whilst the applicant has put forwards a number of alternative parking options, which includes the parking spaces in a linear pattern, this would not overcome the concerns, and even more hardstanding would result in an additional visual impact to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, it is not considered that the additional parking as proposed (or as suggested in another option) would overcome the reasons for refusal in the original application and the number of staff and frequency of staff changeover would still result in adverse impacts to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to the intensification of vehicles associated with the development and the likely reliance on on-street parking due to the size/siting of off-street parking provision.

It is considered that the staff changeover pattern and frequency of visits would go beyond those of a family residential house which 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.

Concerns have also been raised from the occupiers of neighbouring properties regarding potential safety and well-being concerns that may arise from the proposed change of use. However, the proposed children's home would be occupied by up to two children only with appropriate management in place through staff policies and licences. No specific evidence has been provided to demonstrate why this use would result in harm on such matters. As such, this is not considered to be a reason to refuse the application.

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 main visual change to the site would be the loss of vegetation to the part of the front garden and the creation of 3 no. new parking spaces and new access of Monks Drive. The proposal would result in additional hardstanding, however other properties within the immediate vicinity of the site have paved front driveways/gardens and part of the soft landscaping would be retained.

As such, the proposed additional hardstanding is not considered to have a harmful visual impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Policy LNNDP3 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. 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) objected to the refused scheme (planning ref: 3/2025/0910), raising concerns that the application did not fully assess the highway impact of the proposed development. Concerns were also raised with regards to the limited length of the existing parking space.

The LHA have provided updated comments on this application, stating that their comments remain regarding the length of the existing driveway space which should be 4.8m in length to count as a formal parking space. Having measured the existing plans as part of this re-submission application, the existing driveway does measure approximately 4.8m, the same as the proposed car parking spaces. However, the Council have uncertainties as to the actual length of the driveway, given the LHA’s previous concerns and the appearance of similar driveway lengths within the street only being able to accommodate a small car without overhang. There is ambiguity over this existing car parking space size and whether this can be formally considered a parking space.

The LHA have removed their objection to the scheme and recommend a condition be added to any grant of permission which ensures that the 3 no. parking spaces as shown on the approved plans are provided and made available for use prior to the first use of the site as a children’s home. Notwithstanding this, the Council have raised earlier concerns within this report as to the likelihood of members of staff using the tandem parking during changeover times, three times a day.

Taking into consideration the above concerns and the ambiguity over the size of the existing car parking space, the Council still consider that proposed change of use is considered to result in an intensification of the use, without sufficient off-street parking provision. As such, 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 Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Landscape/Ecology:

The proposal would include the creation of three new car parking spaces which would impact on more than 25sqm of onsite habitat.

The agent for the application has now submitted Biodiversity Net-Gain (BNG) information as the proposal would impact on more than 25sqm of on-site habitat. Concerns have been raised from a neighbour with regards to the habitat plan not showing any pathway from the driveway to the front door. However, this is not a requirement for BNG purposes. Further assessment on the suitability of the parking spaces shall be made later in this report.

The Biodiversity Net Gain Statement confirms that the land is urban vegetated garden in the metric which amounts to 34.56m² of on-site habitat. The minimum 10% net-gain would be achieved adding 6.4m² of new urban vegetated garden (a new native species hedgerow along the western boundary in place of part of the current concrete parking area), and the new parking spaces will be constructed using SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems). This will deliver a 10.34% increase in biodiversity, exceeding the 10% requirement. The metric confirms the trading rules are satisfied with this. The biodiversity statement confirms that the exact details of the hedgerow species, and SuDS methods would be provided as part of the BNG statutory condition discharge, being the Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

The agent for the applications has clarified that the type of SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) could include permeable paving or a swale. However, the Council are not satisfied that these would constitute an appropriate habitat type for Biodiversity Net-Gain purposes. As such, the applicant would either need to provide an alternative on-site habitat or purchase off-site credits.

Notwithstanding the above, the concerns can be addressed as part of the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan secured as a planning condition to any grant of permission, to highlight how the additional net-gain will be met.

Other matters:

Concerns have been raised with regards to safeguarding and concerns that the site/garden is not secure. However, this could be secured by condition if considered necessary to make the development acceptable.

Some concerns have also been raised with regards to the potential impact on house prices as a result of the development. However, this is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this application.

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.

Concerns with the existing and proposed car parking spaces mean that the previous reasons for refusal have not been overcome and 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:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 01: | 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 likelihood of 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.
02	The proposed change of use is considered to result in an intensification of the use, without sufficient and appropriate 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.