

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 February 2026 17:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0013 FS-Case-797726456

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0013

Address of Development: 2A Monks Drive Longridge PR33EP

Comments: [REDACTED] the properties located [REDACTED] this planning application. I am writing this letter to formally object to the proposals to turn 2A Monks drive into a residential Children's home. I have read the previous applications and noted the recent responses regarding the new planning application for the staff parking/drive way. This property is located on an already extremely busy road and also at the very corner opposite the local vets. When I pay [REDACTED] [REDACTED] around the corner on a different road as there is already no where to park- even kerbside. This is due to the sheer volume of services users for the vets as parking is really limited to 3 customer cars. A property owner [REDACTED] which is regularly parked kerbside on Monks drive - directly opposite the vets car park which can sometimes cause a viewing obstruction when pulling round the corner in order to head onto Preston Road. On many a time the [REDACTED] complained that cars are parking across their driveway (all be it trying to make way for the property vehicle- they simply do not leave enough space.). This results in trips to the vets so as to find the owner and move the car. The applicant has suggested there will be spaces made on the corner land for staff cars to park in front of each other within the land boundary. I can already see an accident waiting to happen - the staff vehicles moving directly onto the bend of the road (for staff changes - which could be 4 staff per shift trying to leave or park at the same time), whilst a customer of the vets is trying to pull off the limited spaces directly in front of the Vets. I am also aware that most properties directly surrounding the proposed site are inhabited by elderly residents who have lived there for decades, with the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The location is very much inappropriate based on its locality first and foremost, being on a corner very close to a busy road junction. Already saturated parking turmoil's which are already ongoing daily (without staff changeovers on the proposed parking site) and the adverse worry this could have on the elderly residents who have lived there quietly for years.

kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 February 2026 10:21
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0013 FS-Case-797518918

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0013

Address of Development: 2a Monks Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FR

Comments: As per my response to the previous application for this property to change the use to a children's home, I again object to this new application which simply proposes inappropriate parking in the front/side garden area. I can see they have a preference of one parking solution but have proposed 5 different options. I would strongly advise the planning committee to either visit the site or even google map/street view it as the proposed parking solutions are unsuitable. The space at the side of the house could not possibly fit 3 cars in it. Furthermore - if 3 could be squeezed into the small space how would the car parked at the back (some proposals are suggesting one car to be parked in front of another) be easily driven away following a handover of staff? They would be blocked in by the person starting the shift which would mean even more manoeuvring of vehicles before/after handover of staff on a bend in the road in a very busy street due to the busy vet practice and on road parking situation. As I mentioned in my previous response this road has far more traffic than a usual residential street already and this application which just make the situation more unbearable. I mentioned in my previous response about the number of cars that have been driven/bumped into [REDACTED] and I can confirm that another incident happened to [REDACTED] that was parked [REDACTED] during the Christmas period - a customer of the vets [REDACTED].

I not only think the proposed parking options are not physically possible in the small space available, if they did put hardstanding (? concrete/tarmac/gravel) and dropped kerbs to enter/exit (not mentioned) then the staff would not use the parking spaces as they are not physically usable. I know the size of that garden [REDACTED] various maps/aerial views and the proposed parking spots are not physically possible to fit in that gap. The majority of the garden of the property is the side garden and parking spaces would also prevent this being a garden for children who would reside at the property. As per my previous response to their original planning application, the garden at the back/side has no fence and is open and as the proposal is for children from age 4 then that is unsafe as they could easily run out into the road - this would now be even more unsafe as they would be accessing a potential car park.

I would also like to point out a contradiction in the application which now states that the handover times are 8am, 2pm and 10pm. The original application said 4pm, not 2pm. Further in the application/proposal the changeover time of staff is still quoted as 4pm. So which is it? Are staff

really going to be given a 6 hour shift from 0800 to 1400? I suggest that the time has been changed in a bid to avoid the very busy 4pm time but I am not convinced the shift times would actually change in reality and I find this discrepancy concerning.

This residential street is already experiencing higher levels of traffic due to the vets, vicinity of 2 high schools (it's popular for drop off/collection of school children) and extra on street parking due to the loss of parking outside the 2 x HMO's on Preston Road due to the new bus layby, and I would ask the council to please consider the impact that an additional business and associated parking problems that this proposal would have on residents. Thank you