

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date: 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2026.

**Re: Opposition of change of use of 36, Moor Field BB7 9SA, from a domestic dwelling to a Category C2 Commercial Children's Home.**

**Planning Application Number: 3/26/0256 Re: Proposed change of use**

Dear Ribble Valley Borough Council/ Planning Committee,

We wish to state our opposition to the proposed above change of use, on the following grounds.

- Change of a purely domestic dwelling to what is a commercial enterprise.
- We draw your attention to the attached Deed Of Covenant – specifically “**Restricted Covenants**” “**i**” and “**j**”. Clearly commercial use would breach these by altering the domestic nature of the whole estate and its peaceful ambience.
- The aforesaid change would be completely out of character of the estate, where the average age is 85+ and many long-term residents are housebound/ vulnerable and live on their own. We consistently hear that Governments want elderly people to downsize, in order to free up larger houses for the younger generations, yet here we see blatant contradiction of that mantra, by the removal of a bungalow from the domestic market when this type of accommodation is desperately required by many elderly residents, in order that they can live full and independent lives and not be a drain on public services.
- We would be very surprised if RVBC housing plan states a need for more childrens’ homes in the borough. Indeed, it appears that Lancashire is housing most of the LACs from the whole of the UK, who are not fostered. The Ribble Valley is not a designated area of deprivation.
- The cul-de-sac is very narrow (14 feet & 2 inches, to be precise) and disruptive parking would clearly be an issue, as there would be potential for 5+ vehicles at the property during change-overs. We find it hard to believe that the carers are going to be constantly shunting their vehicles, as would clearly be required. LACs in the MLDD and SLDD categories would require extensive social support services and interventions over and above their day- to- day care requirements and this would have the potential to vastly increase vehicle numbers accessing the site. To infer that staff/support services/ family etc can park away from the bungalow is simply moving the problem from one part of the estate to another, **NOT** addressing it. There is not room for residents to park on the road, never mind business staff.
- As far as we understand, to park on pavements is technically illegal, yet permanent pavement parking would clearly be a direct consequence of this change of building usage. There have been instances in the past where emergency services have not been able to reach poorly, vulnerable residents due to parking. Indeed there have been instances of conflict due to disrespectful parking of carers on the estate in the past.

- The application indicates that there is a large garden for the children. This is clearly not the case as all the front garden has been tarmacked for parking, requiring constant car shunting and the rear garden is tiny, to say the least and more of a “yard”.
- To suggest that vulnerable LACs would in an environment to thrive and develop both personally, academically and mentally is questionable, to say the least. Undeniably, they will have complex needs, may display challenging behaviours, be socially unaware/disconnected etc which many domestic residents would find frightening and unacceptable.
- To aggravate this situation further, this application is for up to two children whereas the original “Certificate of Lawfulness” application was only for one child, vastly increasing standard daily care staffing and support services/intervention staffing. Parking will be a huge issue not to dismiss the associated comings and goings at all times of day.
- We hope that RBVC will not lower standards to countenance this degradation of the residents’ peaceful, happy urban existence.
- To conclude; clearly this will impact all residents on the estate, diminish the peaceful ambience of the area and vastly heighten the chances of socially unacceptable behaviours, noise, 24 hour traffic and conflict. This is a premier, residential area and should remain thus.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 April 2026 11:29  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0256 FS-Case-828672866

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0256

**Address of Development:** 36 Moor Field  
Whalley  
Lancashire  
BB7 9SA

**Comments:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

15th April 2026

Opposition to the change of use of 36 Moor Field, Whalley, BB7 9SA from a domestic dwelling to a Category C2 Children's home.

Planning application number: 3/2026/0256 Proposed change of use.

Dear Ribble Valley Planning Committee,

We would like to put in our opposition to the proposed change of use to the afore mentioned bungalow

- The change of use from a domestic dwelling to a business venture is contrary to deeds that we have when we bought our property, this we understand is to keep the estate as Soley domestic with emphasis on keeping the peace and quiet and the friendliness of its residents.
- This is a small and quiet place where its very elderly residents reside in complete confidence of being safe in their homes without being frightened of their lives being disrupted by the comings and goings of the proposed change.
- This bungalow has two ninety+ year old direct neighbours on either side of the property and one across the road with the excess traffic of changing staff, deliveries, visiting family at all times of the day and night would find it very difficult to cope with.
- Digging up the whole of the front garden to make parking does not solve the issue of moving vehicles in and out of a very narrow side road, it will inevitably get ignored as it will become too much of a hassle to do. Also, the deliveries for larger vehicles, there is only a very narrow turning space at the end of the Cul de sac and could also become a problem. This was always a major problem for the homes opposite when visitor and carers came and went without using the drive that was already there.
- This has also taken away any outside space for the residents to play off the road, the back garden is

very small, just a back yard really.

- We are also aggrieved that a perfectly good bungalow has been taken away from the market, of which there are precious few, that a downsizing couple can buy that may be older and infirm. Who wish to live independently or homeowners needing one floor living.
- The ages of the children are being said to be between 8-18 of which there are no facilities in our adjacent area having a lone teenager or child living in a Cul de sac of elderly people can be neither enriching nor aid their personal development.
- As the application indicates that the children/teenagers will have emotional behavioural and physical disabilities, I should like to know what safeguards have been put in place for our very elderly residents that live adjacent to the property if they decide to enter their home or other private properties of the residents nearby. It may increase the chance of antisocial behaviour, noise and general disruption.
- We are also at a loss why the cash strapped council would pass this band E (£2829.91) 2 bedroomed true bungalow residence, of which there could only comfortably have one child living there along with various paid for carers staying there, at a push there could be two residents could be cost effective. The savings we know will be minimal compared to the cost of housing a vulnerable child/teenager.
- We also notice that there has been a change to the number of residents, going from one child/teenager in the Certificate of lawfulness, application to two. But the building hasn't grown and the outside space has diminished purely to try and fudge the application and help it pass, just box ticking and with no thought to us as residents.
- To conclude that, financially, logistically and emotionally for all concerned, we think this is a bad idea, it is one of the few safe elderly living areas in this area, in a growing village of bigger houses we feel this is worth saving from the corporate world.

Regards



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 April 2026 16:52  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0256 FS-Case-828331305

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0256

**Address of Development:** 36 Moor Field  
Whalley  
BB7 9SA

**Comments:** Thursday 16th April 2026

3/2026/0256

Development address 36 Moor Field Whalley BB7 9SA

Proposed change of use of a dwelling house C3 to a children's home C2

As a very concerned resident of the Ribble Valley

I wish to express my object to the change of use of this property on these grounds;-

Scale ,appearance and design

This property is on a narrow cul de sac and does not have the required parking necessary. I have read Toto Group mitigation for this in their proposal, however, having had experience of this type of property, the staff ( are human and and are just coming to work ,so with the best of intentions, the community are not their main focus ). Staff tend to hand overs and meetings this means double cars. Toto's mitigation for visitors and overflow parking is that they park away from the property.....All this leads to, is the problem being elsewhere..... Is that a professional approach?

This will leave the surrounding properties and neighbouring streets with poor parking as with a similar property on Croasdale Drive Clitheroe owned by LCC.

Will it always be possible for emergency services to reach all properties in this location?

Parking will be impacted for all

The design of the property is that of a home and the bedrooms are situated on one side of the property leaving the neighbouring house on that side , to be possibly subjected to any noise from these rooms. This was the case in Croasdale Drive , Clitheroe. The Environment Health department of RVBC had to get involved and a notice to desist was issued. Sadly by this point the impact on surrounding properties/people was considerably. I have read Toto Group's wish to mitigate noise with double glazing ,appropriate curtain closing and considerate staffing. In my experience this was not enough on Croasdale Drive, Clitheroe and will not help with any outdoor noise disturbances. These outdoor noise disturbances are not necessarily from the children but from every person attending the

property and there will be many.  
Noise levels will be impacted

There will be a loss of privacy for the surrounding properties because this will become a workplace and therefore will have many visitors:- staff, children, family members, workmen on a regular basis ,ofsted inspections, teachers, any medical staff required not to mention the possibility of regular police visits.

This is all still happening on Croasdale Drive, Clitheroe  
Privacy will be impacted

The impact of these type of properties in my experience on the surrounding communities is significant:-

Numerous email complaints by many residents to RVBC councillors  
Numerous email complaints by many residents to LCC county councillors  
Meeting by many residents about the complaints with Jonathan Hinder MP  
( this led to Jonathan Hinder MP writing to LCC)  
Multiple crimes reported to the Police  
3 Community Trigger processes on the same property instigated by RVBC  
Anti social behaviour review done by relevant agencies and only stopped when the child was removed  
Environment Health RVBC for noise  
Police visits over a eighty three times and still counting  
British Transport Police visiting  
LCC forced into a public meeting by the then County Councillor Sue Hind  
Social Care Ombudsman compliant ongoing  
And still no apology from LCC  
Shocking

So PLEASE don't do this to another community  
Find a property that has more space around it so that it's possible to allow vulnerable children a place to make mistakes without coming into direct contact with their neighbours and the staff to have the room to do their jobs properly.  
In my experience in Clitheroe of a poorly located property leads to multiple agency responses, unhappy communities and unhappy children.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 April 2026 17:44  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0256 FS-Case-828362147

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Planning Application Reference No.:** 3/2026/0256

**Address of Development:** 36 Moor Field  
Whalley  
BB7 9SA

**Comments:** 3/2026/0256  
Thursday 16th April 2026

As a very concerned resident of the Ribble Valley  
I wish to object to any change of use of this property

The reasons are:-

Scale, appearance and design:-

This property is on a narrow cul-de-sac and does not have the required parking necessary. I have read Toto Group's mitigation for this in their proposal ,however , having had experience of this type of property, the staff ( are human, and are just coming to work, so with the best of intentions, the local community and not their main focus). Staff tend to have hand overs and meetings, this means double cars. Toto Group's mitigation for visitors and overflow parking is that they park away from the property..... All this leads to is the problem being elsewhere.....Is that a professional approach? This will leave the surrounding properties and neighbouring streets with poor parking as with a similar property on Croasdale Drive ,Clitheroe owned by LCC.

Will it always be possible for emergency services to reach all properties in this location?

Parking will be impacted for all

The design of the property is that of a home and the bedrooms are situated on one side of the property leaving the neighbouring house on that side , to be possibly subjected to any noise from these rooms. This was the case on Croasdale Drive Clitheroe. The Environment Health department of RVBC had to get involved and a notice to desist was issued. Sadly by this point the impact on surrounding properties/people was considerably. I have read Toto Group's wish to mitigate noise with double glazing, appropriate curtain drawing and considerate staffing. In my experience this was not enough on Croasdale Drive Clitheroe and will not help with any outdoor noise disturbances. These outdoor noise disturbances are not necessarily from the children but from every person attending the property and there will be many.

Noise levels will be impacted

There will be a loss of privacy for the surrounding properties because this will become a workplace and therefore will have many visitors:- staff, children, family members. Workmen on a regular basis, ofsted inspections, teachers, any medical staff required not to mention the possibility of regularly police visits. ( This is all still happening in Clitheroe)  
Privacy will be impacted

The impact of these types of properties in my experience on the surrounding communities is :-  
Numerous email complaints by many residents to RVBC councillors  
Numerous email complaints by many residents to LCC county councillors  
Meetings by many residents about the complaints with Jonathan Hinder MP ( this led to Jonathan Hinder writing to LCC)  
Multiple crimes reported to the Police  
3 Community Trigger processes on the same property instigated by RVBC  
Anti social behaviour review done by relevant agencies and only stopped when the child was removed.  
Environmental Health RVBC for noise  
Police 83 visits and still counting  
British Transport Police visiting  
LCC forced into a public meeting by the then county councillor Sue Hind  
Social Care Ombudsman complaint ongoing  
And still no formal apology from LCC  
Shocking

So PLEASE don't do this to another community or children  
Find a property that has more space around it so that it's possible to allow vulnerable children to make mistakes ,without coming into direct contact with their neighbours and the staff to have the space to do their jobs properly. In my experience a poorly located children home only leads to multiple agency responses ( as listed above ), unhappy communities and failed children

16 APR 2026

15<sup>th</sup> April, 26.

Dear Ms. Cullen,

Re. Planning app<sup>n</sup> no. 0256, at  
36, Moor Field.

I wish to register my strong objections to this application, and to the general principle of taking properties out of residential use in order to create a small business, which is what Toto group are hoping to do, by converting a small bungalow into a residential children's home.

The idea that two children, aged between 8 and 18, could share a tiny bungalow with at least one live-in carer, is unworkable, as the property has two bedrooms, one of which is approximately 3.5m. square. Children in care are not allowed to share a room, so it doesn't need Einstein to work out that the idea is a non-starter. There is a small garage, but even to convert that would be wrong - the property is unsuitable for the proposed purpose. There is no outside space for children to exercise or play, as the space in front has already been gouged out in order to park cars.

This is a small estate, of about forty properties, most of which are bungalows, mainly owned by

elderly people. The age range is currently 50-99, and residents greatly value the peace and security of the street. The road is narrow, and frequently difficult to navigate because of parked vehicles. The idea that ambulances, minibuses, wheelchair-compliant vehicles and staff cars would not be a problem is patently untrue. The presence of up to five vehicles where the garden used to be would be detrimental to the privacy and amenity of nearby houses. Delivery vans and bin lorries already struggle on occasion to pass through, and further vehicles would exacerbate the problem. The previous application for this children's home was objected to by the traffic specialists at LCC, and I urge you to heed their opinion.

A further cause for worry for the neighbours is the fact that some children would have serious behavioural problems, leading to possible confrontation and associated risk. There are no other children living nearby, and poor transport links, so it would not be plausible to allow children to wander the area.

In my [redacted] years on RVCB, I have repeatedly banged the drum for more bungalows, as we have an ageing population, and people

are better able to stay in their own home if it is single-storey. This theory that children in care can be successfully integrated into a quiet residential area is, I contend, merely wishful thinking. The economics of having a separate property and staff for every two children is unworkable from an economic point of view, as well as being an unrealistic ideology. To remove no. 36 from the pool of available bungalows would be a retrograde step, and I urge you to refuse the application.

Faithfully yours,

