

**Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.**

|                |                 |           |              |            |                 |           |              |                |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|
| <b>Signed:</b> | <b>Officer:</b> | <b>MC</b> | <b>Date:</b> | 10/09/2026 | <b>Manager:</b> | <b>LH</b> | <b>Date:</b> | <b>10/9/26</b> |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|

|                                    |                                      |                     |     |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Ref:</b>            | 3/2026/0502                          |                     |     |  <div>Ribble Valley<br/>Borough Council</div> <hr/> <div>www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</div> |
| <b>Date Inspected:</b>             | 10/12/2025<br>(previous application) | <b>Site Notice:</b> | n/a |                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Officer:</b>                    | MC                                   |                     |     |                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:</b> |                                      |                     |     |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|                                    |                                      |                     |     | <b>APPROVAL</b>                                                                                                                                                           |

|                                 |                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Development Description:</b> | Proposed change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to residential childrens home (Class C2) for one child aged 4-18. |
| <b>Site Address/Location:</b>   | 2A Monks Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FR                                                                                      |

|                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>          | <b>Parish/Town Council</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Longridge Town Council:</b> | <p>Longridge Town Council note there is very limited off-road parking and have serious concerns regarding parking. They consider that the site plan fails to show the mature trees which run along the front of the garden which would require removal.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised with regards to highway safety and visibility on the corner of the site.</p> <p>The Town Council consider the shift patterns and running of the site to constitute an intensive activity that is disproportionate to the character of the area and would impact on residential amenity.</p> |

|                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>            | <b>Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>LCC Highways:</b>             | <p>The Local Highway Authority (LHA) would prefer Option 2, 4 or 5. However they raise no objection to the scheme on highway safety grounds, noting that the dropped kerb would need to be extended.</p> <p>They recommend conditions relating to the provision of parking prior to first use and hard surfacing materials.</p> <p>Additional comments have been made from the Local Highway Authority stating that they consider 3 parking spaces should be sufficient (two staff and a shared manager/external agency space). With regards to the existing parking space, the current standards are a minimum of 2.4m and 4.8m long and it has been measured at 4m on site (notwithstanding the approved plans). Nonetheless the LHA would not object to the continuous use of this space as it has been operating without incident for years.</p> |
| <b>RVBC Countryside Officer:</b> | Recommends that the BNG details are secured.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>CONSULTATIONS:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>Additional Representations.</b> |
| <p>Fifteen Objections have been received from eight households raising the following comments/concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding increase in parking issues</li> </ul> |                                    |

- Longridge is seeing an increase in this type of development
- Dangerous to highway and pedestrian safety
- Granting of this permission would alter the character and appearance of the area
- Negative impact on property values
- Safeguarding concerns
- The parking is not supported by highways
- Concerns regarding the number of staff changeover
- Visual amenity concerns from loss of side garden
- Proposal does not reference manhole which would be impacted by development
- Concerns regarding antisocial behaviour
- Reference is made to a refused application at another Local Planning Authority

#### **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:**

###### **3/2026/0013**

Proposed change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to residential childrens home (Class C2) for up to 2 children aged 4-18.

Refused

###### **3/2025/0910**

Proposed change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to residential childrens 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 1 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.*

A re-submission was received which also included 3 no. additional parking spaces within the curtilage of the existing dwelling but was also refused under planning ref: 3/2026/0013 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 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.*
- 2. 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.*

#### **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 addition, Policy HO9 of the NPPF requires specialist community-based accommodation (including accommodation for looked after children) to be located where residents will be able to access frequently-used services easily and safely.

Policy TR3 also states:

*'So that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure, development proposals should reflect the following principles, taking into account the vision for the site, the type of development and its location'.*

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. The Ribble Valley Core Strategy does not have a policy which requires development within a settlement boundary to meet an identified need and as such, there would be no in principle objection to this change of use. 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 the above Policies.

### **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.

Policy P3 of the NPPF states that:

1. *Development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people).*
2. *Within this context development proposals should:*
  - a. *Provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life. Where necessary suitable mitigation measures should be incorporated to secure acceptable living conditions;*
  - b. *Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to reduce pollution affecting the wider area (such as through traffic and travel management or improved external lighting);*
  - c. *Sustain and contribute to compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives and targets for air pollutants including PM2.5. Development proposals should take account of Air Quality Management Areas and be consistent with the objectives of relevant Air Quality Action Plans, Clean Air Plans and Local Air Quality Strategies;*
  - d. *Mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise, not result in levels of noise exposure which would have a significant observed adverse effect, and maintain the character of tranquil areas (those areas that have remained relatively undisturbed by noise from human sources and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason);*

- e. Limit any adverse impact from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes (those areas entirely, or largely, uninterrupted by artificial light) and nature; and*
- f. Assess and mitigate impacts where the development could have an unacceptable adverse effect on water quality, especially in relation to sensitive water bodies such as chalk streams.*

*In applying this policy, it should be assumed, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, that separate regulatory regimes for the control of pollution will operate effectively, as set out in policy DM7. This means that it will be appropriate to take into account emissions limits set through those other regimes.*

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.

It should be noted that the scheme is now for 1 no. looked after child rather than 2 no., as previously proposed. The agent for the application has provided an amended Design & Access Statement which confirms that staff changeover would now be at 8am and 5pm, a reduction in one changeover from the previous scheme and removing the need for a late-night staff changeover.

The statement confirms that staff numbers would be 1-2 members on site per shift, depending on the needs of the children in care and no staff will permanently live on site, but will have an office/bed space within the property so that there is staff on site at all times. In addition, it is anticipated that visitors would be a maximum of 1 per week and would be pre-arranged and limited to essential visitors only.

This application is similar to the refused scheme in terms of the level of parking required but the number of children and changeover frequency has been reduced. The Council previously raised concerns with regards to the proposed parking spaces being tandem parking which would result in 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, which would likely result in significant vehicle manoeuvring and associated noise and disturbance.

In addition, the staff changeover pattern and frequency of visits was considered to 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.

Since the most recent application was refused, there has been a recent appeal decision in Longridge for a similar scheme at 15 Caton Close. The constraints of the site are somewhat similar, insofar that they are both located in residential areas and would be for 1 no. looked after child.

This appeal (ref: 6003516) was allowed with conditions and the Inspector considered that the number of persons permanently occupying the dwelling would not be dissimilar to its existing use as a three-bedroom dwelling, which would be suitable for a family of 2 adults with 1 or 2 children and they concluded that the children's home would be comparable to the level of activity of a family dwelling. The Inspector also noted that the staff changeovers being 10am – 11am every 48 hours and the use for occasional external meetings would generate a degree of noise and disturbance from comings and goings but considered there was little substantive evidence that the proposal would give rise to a significantly greater number of visitors than a

family dwelling, even if rota patterns differed from those stated in the evidence or changed. The Inspector considered that a family dwelling could consist of adults, children and teenagers who, in occupying the property, would generate considerable activity in the form of comings and goings for work, school and leisure activities at various times of the day and potentially at night.

The above appeal is a material planning consideration and whilst the staff changeovers would be greater than the appeal site, being at 8am and 5pm daily, it is considered that taking into account the above material planning consideration, this would not be dissimilar to that of a family dwelling.

In addition, the fourth parking space has since been removed from the proposal which has removed the need for tandem parking. The LHA have confirmed that whilst the existing parking space does measure below the size requirements of 2.4m x 4.8m, given that the parking space has been operating without issue, there would be no objection to this parking space being included and the scheme should provide a minimum of 3 no. parking spaces. This can be secured by way of planning condition.

### **Visual Impact/Design:**

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 LNDP3 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 2 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 LNDP3 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 have also previously noted 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 and the busy high school on Preston Road. They also note that the existing driveway is short and when parking vehicles on the driveway, they overhang onto the footpath.

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."*

Policy TR4 of the NPPF also states that:

*'To contribute to creating well-designed places, transport considerations should be integral to the design of development, proposals for which should...*

*...e. Provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan, and including adequate provision of spaces and infrastructure that allow for the charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.'*

Following ongoing discussions, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) raise no objection to the scheme, noting that there should be at least 3 no. parking spaces. They consider that whilst the existing parking space is substandard in size, given that it has been operating without incident for years, its continued use would not raise an objection from the LHA. As such, parking space 4 no. has been removed from the scheme to reduce the need for tandem parking.

Subject to conditions relating to the provision and retention of the parking prior to first use and securing the hard surfacing materials, the scheme is considered to comply with the above policies.

#### **Landscape/Ecology:**

The proposal would include the creation of two new car parking spaces which would now result in the loss of approximately 23.9sqm of on-site habitat and would fall within the 'de minimis' exemption.

#### **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.

The proposed hedge has been removed from the scheme (adjacent to the existing parking space) and there would no longer be a need to re-locate an existing manhole as noted in one of the neighbour objections.

#### **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

For the reasons outlined above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That planning consent be granted subject to condition(s).