

Agenda

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2025-2026



HYNDBURN

The place to be
an excellent council

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 12 November 2025 at 3.00 pm,
Scaitcliffe House, Ormerod Street, Accrington

Membership

Chair: Councillor Dave Parkins

Vice-Chair: Councillor Bernard Dawson MBE

Councillors Mike Booth, Joyce Plummer, Loraine Cox, Clare Pritchard, Ethan Rawcliffe, Kath Pratt, Judith Addison, Scott Brerton, Stephen Button, Noordad Aziz, Stewart Eaves and Josh Allen

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence, Substitutions, Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting (Pages 3 - 6)

The Minutes of the last Planning Committee held on the 15th of October 2025 were submitted for approval as a correct record.

Recommended – That the minutes be received and approved as a correct record.

3. Town and Country Planning Act 1990- Planning Applications for Determination

The Chief Planning and Transportation Officer submitted a series of reports setting out the recommended action on the planning applications below.

- a WITHDRAWN - 11/25/0167 - Church Bridge Works, Mill Street, Church, BB5 4EL (Pages 7 - 18)

NOTE: THIS APPLICATION HAS NOW BEEN WITHDRAWN BY THE



Telephone Enquiries: Holly Townsley, Democratic Services, (01254) 380184

Email: Holly.Townsley@hyndburnbc.gov.uk

Published on Tuesday, 4 November 2025

Page 1 of 2

APPLICANT AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING.

Change of use of existing building (Use Class E (c) (iii)) to private hire function hall (Use Class F2) (Retrospective)

- b 11/25/0343 - 7 Bluebell Way, Huncoat, Lancashire BB5 6TD (*Pages 19 - 28*)
Full: Change of use from a dwelling to a residence providing care for one child.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 15th October, 2025

Present: Councillor Dave Parkins (in the Chair), Councillors Bernard Dawson MBE (Vice Chair), Loraine Cox, Clare Pritchard, Kath Pratt, Judith Addison, Scott Brerton, Stephen Button, Stewart Eaves, Josh Allen and Munsif Dad BEM JP

Apologies: Councillors Mike Booth, Joyce Plummer, Ethan Rawcliffe and Noordad Aziz

182 Apologies for Absence, Substitutions, Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

Apologies for absence were received by Councillors Mike Booth, Noordad Aziz, Ethan Rawcliffe and Joyce Plummer.

Councillor Munsif Dad BEM JP substituted for Councillor Aziz.

183 Minutes of the Last Meeting

The Minutes of the last Planning Committee held on the 3rd of September 2025 were submitted for approval as a correct record.

Resolved – That the minutes be received and approved as a correct record.

184 Town and Country Planning Act 1990- Planning Applications for Determination

185 WITHDRAWN - 11/24/0417 - Land South of Blackburn Road, Oswaldtwistle, BB5 3RE

The Application was WITHDRAWN by the Applicant and was not discussed in the meeting.

a 11/25/0277 - Hyndburn Road Showroom, 9 Hyndburn Road, Accrington BB5 1PY

Mr Joshua Parkinson, Planning Manager (Development Manager), presented the application to the committee.

The application consists of a commercial property on Hyndburn Road within the urban boundary of Accrington. With the surrounding properties being mainly commercial.

The application seeks a change of use from a bathroom showroom to retail (Class E). The property would be occupied by East Lancashire Hospice Shops Ltd.

No objections have been received from Lancashire County Council Highways or Hyndburn Borough Councils Environmental Protection team.

Mr Parkinson informed the committee that the applicant had submitted a sequential test alongside the application which satisfied officers that there were no other available sites located in the Town Centre which were of an appropriate size. This satisfied the requirements of policy DM3 of the Development management DPD.

Members discussed the application site and noted that its previous retail use did not cause any adverse parking issues and so shouldn't cause any issues for nearby residents.

Similarly, members agreed that it would be a benefit to see the site in use due to its visible location along a major road.

Resolved – The application was approved as per the officer recommendation with the subsequent conditions noted in the report.

N.B. – 1. Claire Shilton – Spoke in support of the application.

- Emphasised the important work that East Lancashire Hospice undertake and informed the committee that their retail stores are an important part of funding the services offered.
- The stores encourage recycling and sustainable practices by giving goods a second lease of life.
- Provides Employment and Volunteering Opportunities.
- The site layout is ideal for deliveries as it is all on one floor and visible from the main road.

b 11/25/0270 - Railway Hotel, 2 Station Road, Huncoat, BB5 6LS

Mr Joshua Parkinson, Planning Manager (Development Manager), presented the application for the Railway Hotel in Huncoat.

The Railway Hotel is a two-story traditional public house with a basement, located adjacent to Huncoat Railway Station.

The application proposed a change of use from a public house to an office (Use Class E) to be occupied by Bridge It Housing who are said to be a not-for-profit organisation dedicated to addressing housing needs.

Mr Parkinson explained that according to policy BD1 of the Core Strategy individual proposals should adhere to the principle of Accrington Town Centre being the principal centre and providing for the Borough's key services, retail and town centre needs

The site proposed is located out of Accrington Town Centre and an alternative site had been located by the Local Planning Authority (99–101 Blackburn Road) which would be of a suitable size to accommodate the proposed application. This property has not been considered within the submitted Sequential Search, and no justification has been provided for its omission. As such, the Sequential Assessment could not be regarded as comprehensive or robust.

Mr Parkinson also noted policy DM8 on page 5 of the report. The evidence provided by the applicant failed to demonstrate compliance with all the relevant criteria of Policy DM8. Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate the Railway Hotel had been appropriately marketed without success.

Additionally, Mr Parkinson noted that adequate alternative provision would not exist within the locality. The application is therefore considered to not accord with Policy DM8 of the Development Management DPD.

Members discussed the application and noted that while it is a shame to keep a building empty it would not be appropriate to approve the application with the insufficient evidence provided.

Resolved – The application was refused as per the officer recommendation.

c 11/25/0315 - 65 Balmoral Road, Accrington, Lancashire, BB5 6DB

Mr Joshua Parkinson, Planning Manager (Development Manager), presented the application for the erection of a single-story side and rear extension with raised decking area to the committee.

The applicant proposed to a single storey side and rear wrap around extension. The side extension would project 5m from the original side elevation of the property and would meet with the proposed rear extension which would project 4.3 metres (m) from the original rear elevation of the property. The extension would be topped with a mono-pitch lean to style roof that would feature two rooflights and would be constructed using grey tiles/slates. The elevations of the extension would be built using a matching brick to the existing dwelling. A 3m rear decking area was proposed which would be constructed using timber.

No Objections were received.

Mr Parkinson informed the committee that the proposed development is of an appropriate scale and design, sitting comfortably with the host property and its surroundings. The extensions would use materials that complement the existing dwelling and would not appear out of character within the street scene. In terms of residential amenity, the proposals would not give rise to unacceptable impacts in respect of privacy, outlook, or loss of light for neighbouring properties.

Resolved – The application was approved as per the officer recommendation with the subsequent conditions noted in the report.

N.B – The application was brought before the committee in the interest of transparency as a member of staff in the planning department is closely related to the applicant.

Signed:.....

Date:

Chair of the meeting
At which the minutes were confirmed

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO:	Planning Committee
APPLICATION REF:	11/25/0167
APPLICATION ADDRESS:	Church Bridge Works, Mill Street, Church, BB5 4EL
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Change of use of existing building (Use Class E (c) (iii)) to private hire function hall (Use Class F2) (Retrospective)
DATE REPORT WRITTEN:	31 October 2025

Reason for Committee Decision

The application is presented to Planning Committee as the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer considers that the application should be considered by members.

Description of the Site and the Proposed Development

The application site relates to part of Church Bridge (or Churchbridge) Works located off Mill Street, Church. It is within the urban boundary of Accrington and its townships. The site is part of a designated existing employment area, which was identified as good quality by the Hyndburn Borough Council Employment Land Study: Final Report (January 2016).

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the change of use of the building to a private hire function hall. It would be used for events such as Asian weddings, seminars, workshops and training events. The proposed operating hours for seminars, workshops and training events are 09:00am until 17:00 Monday to Friday with weddings being mostly seasonal but seven days a week from 10:00am to 23:00.

Consultation Responses/Representations

Consultation

Hyndburn Borough Council (HBC) Ecology: 23 May 2025: No Objections

HBC Environmental Health: 22 October 2025: The application is recommended to be refused based on the grounds of an adverse impact on residential amenity and the submitted noise assessment being considered inadequate to demonstrate the use would not significantly impact on nearby residential properties.

Lancashire County Council (LCC) Highways: 27 October 2025: Recommend that the application is refused based upon the lack of information regarding the wider car parking management at the site should the remaining parts of the building become occupied. A shortfall in car parking for the remaining units may result in overspill car parking onto the surrounding highway network which would be a highway safety concern.

Publicity

Neighbour notification letters were sent and a site notice was placed in the area. 33 objections were received which highlight the following concerns (summarised):

- The noise generated by weddings unacceptably impacting on occupiers of residential properties in the surrounding area which has already been experienced.
- The light generated unacceptably impacting on occupiers of residential properties in the surrounding area which has already been experienced.
- The dense vegetation mentioned within the submitted information was removed approximately 2 years ago. Therefore, does not act as a sound barrier.
- The wildlife and farm animals in the surrounding area will be impacted by the use.
- The application site is in the centre of a residential area.
- The additional traffic and large numbers of cars being left on the highway results in harm to highway safety.
- The vulnerable residents in the area would be impacted by the noise generated by the use.
- The rooftop garden would intensify the harm of the noise and light pollution.
- The use would harm the enjoyment of the canal.
- There are concerns about residents not being consulted.
- There are fireworks being set off past 11pm
- There is anti-social behaviour taking place with cars have been witnessed speeding through the area, revving engines, and performing dangerous stunts such as "donuts" in the car park late at night.

- The rooftop garden area generating a loss of privacy in the wintertime due to the loss of foliage.
- The proposed use of the building depreciating the value of nearby residential properties

Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history.

Relevant Policies

Hyndburn Core Strategy (CS)

Policy BD1 The Balanced Development Strategy

Policy E2: Protection, Modernisation and Development of Employment Sites

Policy Env6 High Quality Design

Policy Env7 Environmental Amenity

Policy A2 Accrington Town Centre

Hyndburn Development Management Development Plan Document (DMDPD)

Policy DM1 Employment Development

Policy DM3 Development of main town centre uses

Policy DM26 Design Quality and Materials

Policy DM29 Environmental Amenity

Policy DM31 Waste Management in all new development

Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

DMDPD GN3 Materials and colour

DMDPD GN8 Car parking and access standards

Observations

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory Development Plan for Hyndburn includes the CS and DMDPD.

The main issues raised by this application relate to whether the location is suitable for the proposal with particular regard to employment and town centre policies; impact on residential amenity; impact on highway safety and parking provision; and the impact on the character and appearance of the area. Each of these issues will be considered in turn.

1. Whether the location is suitable for the proposal with particular regard to employment and town centre policies

Loss of existing employment use

- 1.1. Policy E2 of the CS seeks to safeguard and enhance the Borough's existing employment land while encouraging its gradual modernisation. The policy recognises the value of retaining good and adequate employment sites for continued or improved business use, while allowing for the redevelopment of poorer-quality sites for alternative uses, such as housing, where appropriate. Where redevelopment occurs, proposals are expected to include an element of modern employment provision to offset any loss, ensuring that Hyndburn maintains a balanced supply of employment land and supports sustainable economic growth. Policy E2 of the CS states:

“a) Existing business parks, major industrial estates and other good quality employment sites will be retained for employment uses.

b) The development of existing employment sites of adequate quality for alternative uses will only be permitted when part of the site is redeveloped for appropriate employment (within class B1) and where the criteria set out in part (c) below are satisfied.

c) Employment sites not falling within the scope of a or b above will remain in employment use unless it can be demonstrated that:

- continued use of the site would give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts, or;*

- *there is no current or likely future demand for the site or premises for employment uses, or;*
- *permitting an alternative use is the only viable means of retaining a building or premises which has particular architectural or historical significance.*

In all cases, redevelopment for alternative uses should not prejudice the operating conditions of other remaining employment uses.”

- 1.2. Policy E1 of the CS defines employment uses as the former Use Class B1 (now Use Class E), Use Class B2 and Use Class B8.
- 1.3. The application site is part of a designated existing employment area, which was identified as good quality by the Hyndburn Borough Council Employment Land Study: Final Report (January 2016). The proposed use would not fall within the employment uses defined by Policy E1 of the CS. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policy E2 of the CS, which seeks to retain existing good quality employment sites for employment sites. While it could be argued that the proposal only relates to part of the employment site, for the reasons given below, it is likely that the proposal would also prejudice and sterilise the rest of the employment site due to the parking provision impact.
- 1.4. Although not in reference to good quality employment sites, the supporting text of Policy E2 of the CS states that in order to demonstrate that there is no current or likely future demand for the site or premises for employment uses the site shall be marketed by at least one commercial agent for employment purposes for at least 18 months. Additionally, applications for non-employment uses will need to include information as to why they cannot be redeveloped for employment purposes. The marketing must relate to the sale, and leasing, of land or property and either the reuse or redevelopment of the site or premises for employment purposes.
- 1.5. Additionally, Policy SP5 of the Emerging Local Plan would only permit the redevelopment of good quality employment sites in exceptional circumstances where the applicant can demonstrate sound reasons why the employment use cannot remain on the site and the proposed new use will be expected to comprise a reasonable scale of employment on site to compensate for the loss. The terms reasonable will be considered in terms of the previous use and job on the site.
- 1.6. The submitted Loss of Employment Land & Marketing Justification Statement states that the application premises have been marketed by several different Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors accredited agents since August 2024. Therefore, the site has not been marketed for the minimum time expects by Policy E2 of the CS for lower quality site. Moreover, limited information has been submitted regarding the marketing strategy, periods of listings, or details of any offers received. Consequently, it is not

possible to assess whether the property has been marketed to attract a continuing or new employment use.

- 1.7. The submitted Loss of Employment Land & Marketing Justification Statement includes an email received from Taylor Weaver property agents. It is mentioned that market demand for space of this specification and size within East Lancashire is very limited with there being no enquires of that size currently seeking space. It also mentions that the demand for office space in Hyndburn is low, presenting that in general office space is in less demand after COVID-19. However, the lawful use of the site presumably comprises some form of general industrial or storage and distribution use with an incidental officer. Therefore, this justification is not relevant.
- 1.8. In short, the submitted justification for the loss of the existing employment use should attract limited weight in favour of the proposal. It is not sufficient to outweigh the conflict with Policy E1 of the CS identified.

Proposed town centre use(s)

- 2.1. Policy BD1 of the CS states that, amongst other things, individual proposals should adhere to the principle of Accrington Town Centre being the principal centre and providing for the Borough's key services, retail and town centre needs.
- 2.2. Policy A2 of the CS reiterates that Accrington Town Centre will consolidate and develop as the principal centre, providing for the Borough's key services and comparison and food retailing needs. It states that new comparison and convenience (including food) retailing will be focussed in Accrington Town Centre. Existing and future day to day shopping needs will be met in town, township and neighbourhood centres and, at an appropriate scale, in sustainable locations where there are identified deficiencies.
- 2.3. Policy DM3 of the DMDPD sets out that proposals for main town centre uses that are not located in defined Town Centres or Local Centres, and are not in accordance with specific policies in the Site Allocations DPD, should address the following:
 - a. demonstrate that no sequentially preferable site is available or suitable through a proportionate but thorough assessment of more central sites;
 - b. that in the application of the sequential assessment above, developers and operators demonstrate flexibility in terms of scale and format;
- 2.4. The NPPF defines main town centre uses as retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment and more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, nightclubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo

halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).

- 2.5. The application site is located within an out-of-centre location for the purposes of town centre policies. The submitted Sequential Assessment considered four alternative sites within Accrington Town Centre and edge of centre defined areas. The assessment demonstrates that the sites identified were significantly smaller than the than the application proposal. Alongside a review of the submitted Sequential Assessment, an assessment of available premises listed on Rightmove and Zoopla was undertaken by the Case Officer, extending to properties within a tolerance of $\pm 10\%$ of the proposed floor area. However, no premises were identified as suitable to accommodate the requirements of the proposed development within or on the edge of Accrington and Oswaldtwistle town centres. Therefore, no available and suitable sequentially preferable site was found.
- 2.6. In conclusion, the submitted Sequential Assessment has demonstrated that there are no suitable and available sites in sequentially preferable locations for the proposed main town centre use(s). However, the proposal would involve the loss of a good quality employment site, which conflict with Policy E2 of the CS. The submitted justification for the loss of the existing employment use should attract limited weight in favour of the proposal. Therefore, the location is not suitable for the proposal.

3. Impact on the living conditions of nearby occupants

- 3.1. Policy Env7 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect environmental amenity, seeking to ensure that new development does not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts or loss of amenity through a range of factors including traffic, visual impact, noise, dust, odour, over-looking and loss of light. Policy DM29 concerns environmental amenity and, amongst other things, sets out the distances that should be taken into consideration when examining the relationships between existing and proposed development including outlook and overlooking.
- 3.2. Hyndburn Council Environmental Protection have objected to the application. Their response is summarised as follows.
- 3.3. In August 2025, the Council received ten separate noise complaints relating to a function held at the application premises. The complaints referred to amplified music, fireworks, and vehicle noise originating from the venue and affecting residential properties to both the south and west of the site.
- 3.4. Given these previous complaints, it was expected that a detailed and informed noise assessment would be submitted in support of the application, addressing sound

insulation and mitigation measures to prevent recurrence of disturbance. However, the submitted Noise Assessment Report does not adequately reflect the proposed use described within the accompanying planning documents and fails to address the issues previously raised by the Environmental Protection team.

3.5. Specifically, the noise report makes assumptions and omissions which undermine its reliability, including:

- There has been no consultation with the Environmental Protection during its preparation, despite several months in which such engagement could have occurred.
- There are inconsistencies between the report and other submitted documents. The submitted Planning, Design, Access and Transport Statement refers explicitly to the venue's use for Asian weddings, and the revised floor plan dated 26 March 2025 shows features characteristic of a wedding venue (such as a bride's room and large round banquet tables for up to 500 guests).
- The report's suggestion that weddings will be occasional and that there would be no internal speakers conflicts with the scale and function of the venue as described elsewhere in the application. It is considered unrealistic that a wedding venue of this nature could operate without live or amplified music.
- Lack of clarity regarding the monitoring locations and the sound level assumptions used. The report references an internal noise level of 85 dB(A), derived from health and safety regulations, without justification that this figure accurately reflects the likely operational noise levels associated with the proposed use.
- A failure to properly assess the impact of car park activity and fireworks, despite previous complaints and the site's proximity to sensitive residential receptors.

3.6. The HBC Environmental Protection team considers that the submitted noise report is inadequate, lacking in transparency, and fails to accurately assess the true nature and intensity of the proposed use. In its current form, the report does not provide a reliable basis upon which to determine the likely noise impacts or to establish appropriate mitigation measures. It is highly likely that the proposed use would have a negative impact on the amenity of occupiers of nearby premises. It is recommended that the application be refused.

3.7. The objections received mentioned that lighting would result in a detrimental impact on the occupiers of residential properties nearby. However, as HBC Environmental Protection have not raised any concerns regarding lighting.

3.8. In view of the concerns raised by HBC Environmental Protection and the inadequacy of the submitted noise assessment, it is considered that the proposal fails to demonstrate that the proposed use could operate without giving rise to significant adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policy ENV7 of the CS and policies DM25 and DM29 of the DMDPD.

4. Impact on highway safety and parking provision

4.1. GN8 of the DMDPD does not provide specific parking requirements for a venue of the proposed use. LCC Highways have been consulted and their final response mentioned the following with regard to parking:

“Parking

There are 170 car parking spaces allocated to the proposal within the red edge. Based upon a maximum capacity of 500 guests at the venue and regularly 100 guests would attend a wedding and 50 for a meeting or seminar this number is acceptable. This equates to a range of between 33 – 167 car parking spaces based upon an average of 1 space per 3 guests and we would expect guests to travel by car rather than by other sustainable modes.

We would expect staff to be supported to travel sustainably by the provision of secure and covered cycle parking.

The site is part of a larger complex of buildings which share the car parking at the site. It is stated that there are a further 195 spaces at the site. Although the other parts of the building are currently vacant it is important for us to establish that the remaining car parking provision is suitable to accommodate the other uses, should they become occupied.

We would seek to apply the parking standards to the remaining part of the building for its approved use - B2 use – ratio 1 space per 45sqm, B8 – ratio 1 space per 100sqm.

No floor areas are provided.

The information states that the leisure use would not conflict with the remaining B2/B8 uses at the site which are daytime uses, however it is commonplace for large manufacturing warehouses to operate shifts with overnight and weekend working therefore we would request that approximate floor areas are provided to provide some assurances going forward.

Conclusion

Lancashire County Council acting as the Highway Authority would recommend that the application is refused based upon the lack of information regarding the wider car parking management at the site should the remaining parts of the building become occupied.

A shortfall in car parking for the remaining units may result in overspill car parking onto the surrounding highway network which would be a highway safety concern.”

- 4.2. In conclusion taking into account the above it is considered that insufficient information has been provided to determine if the remaining units on site, if brought back into use, would result in in overspill car parking onto the surrounding highway network which would be a highway safety concern. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if the proposals would accord with Policy DM32 of the DMDPD.

5. Impact on the character and appearance of the area

- 5.1. Policy Env6 of the Core Strategy seeks to conserve and enhance the quality of Hyndburn’s urban and rural environment through the application of high-quality design. Policy DM26 is concerned with design quality and materials and sets out a variety of criteria that should be taken into consideration when assessing planning applications.
- 5.2. There are no external changes proposed under this application. The loss of the existing use would not significantly harm the character of the area. Therefore, the proposal accords with Policies ENV6 of the CS and Policy DM26 of the DMDPD.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1. In conclusion, the proposal seeks to redevelopment an existing good quality employment site, which conflicts with Policy E2 of the CS. Moreover, there are significant concerns regarding the impacts on the living conditions of nearby occupants and highway safety with particular regard to parking provision. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole.
- 6.2. The proposal would be accompanied by some social and economic benefits. However, there is no demonstrable need for the proposal. Moreover, for the reasons given, the submitted justification for the loss of the existing employment use should only attract limited weight in favour of the proposal. It is not considered that the benefits and other considerations outweigh the conflict with the development plan and harm identified.

6.3. On this basis, as the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the plan, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

Recommendation:

That planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing good quality employment site. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policy E2 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy. The submitted justification for the loss of the employment use does not outweigh the conflict or harm identified
2. The submitted Acoustic Survey and Assessment fails to provide a robust or reliable evaluation of the likely noise impacts associated with the proposed wedding and events venue. It does not accurately reflect the scale and nature of the proposed use and omits consideration of key noise sources, including amplified music, vehicle movements and outdoor activity. As such, it cannot be demonstrated that the proposed use would operate without giving rise to significant adverse impacts on the living conditions of nearby residents. It is likely that the proposed use would have a negative impact on the amenity of occupiers of nearby premises. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policy ENV7 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy and policies DM25 and DM29 of the Hyndburn Development Management Development Plan Document.
3. There has been insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that adequate car parking provision would be available across the wider site to accommodate the proposed use alongside any potential reoccupation of the remaining employment site. In the absence of this information, it cannot be concluded that the proposal would not result in overspill parking onto the surrounding highway network, which would be to the detriment of highway safety. Therefore, the proposal conflicts Policy DM32 of the Hyndburn Development Management Development Plan Document.

List of Background Papers

Copies of documents included in this list must be open to inspection and, in the case of reports to Cabinet, must be published on the website.

<https://planning.hyndburnbc.gov.uk/Northgate/ES/Presentation/Planning/OnlinePlanning/OnlinePlanningOverview?applicationNumber=11%2F25%2F0167&guid=5878708d-2bb8-467c-89d9-20e9b83ab22f>

HYNDBURN BOROUGH COUNCIL - COMMITTEE REPORT	
APPLICATION REF:	11/25/0343
APPLICATION ADDRESS:	7 Bluebell Way, Huncoat, Lancashire BB5 6TD
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Full: Change of use from a dwelling to a residence providing care for one child
DATE REPORT WRITTEN:	3 November 2025

Description of the Site and the Proposed Development

This application relates to 7 Bluebell Way, a detached dwelling occupying a corner plot at the junction of Bluebell Way and Sedum Gardens. It is a two and a half storey building, containing four bedrooms (one with ensuite facilities), a kitchen, dining room, living room and a lounge. The property includes an integral garage and an external car parking space for one vehicle.

7 Way Bluebell forms part of a modern housing estate developed since year 2005, with other similarly designed dwellings that have small front gardens, narrow plot widths and typically one plot car parking space. Bluebell Way is a privately maintained street and does not form part of the adopted highway network.

This proposal is for the change of use of the existing dwelling to a residence providing care for one child. According to the information submitted with this application, care will be provided by two carers who will be present in the home on a rolling basis. The proposed development will not result in external alteration to the existing building.

Consultation Responses/Representations

Public Consultation: Neighbour notification letters have been sent and a site notice posted adjacent to the application site. The Local Planning Authority have received a total of 16 objections. The comments are summaries as follows:

- The proposal will add to traffic and cars on the estate, which may increase the likelihood of accident.
- The potential on-street parking as result of the proposed development would compromise the access of emergency vehicles to Sedum Gardens.

- The applicant has made multiple applications and there are another two properties on the estate owned by the same business owner, one of which was operating illegally before planning was approved (sic).
- The proposal would result in three children's homes in this estate, which is disproportionate.
- The proposal would result in the loss of housing,
- The noise and disturbance associated with the proposed use and shift changes, including frequent coming/going of shift workers and cars at unsocial hours.
- The proposal would detract the residential character of the local community.

Lancashire County Council (LCC) Children's Services: Objection to the application for the reasons as follows:

- The provider has not consulted Lancashire Children's Services about the proposed home to establish whether there is a local need for this provision.
- As the LCC Market Position Statement for Children's Homes (April 2025) suggested, there is not considered to be a local need for solo children's home. Lancashire Children's Services has limited demand for such provision and for the small number of Lancashire children who do require a solo home, there is already considered to be enough provision in our local area to meet this demand.
- There is already another children's home (operated by the same provider within the same postcode/on the same street) and there is another Ofsted Registered children's home within 0.33 from the proposed home. Having too many children's homes close together can have an impact on the effective running of both new and existing homes. Having too many children's homes in a particular area is something that should be considered from a local community perspective.
- Prosperity Children's Services already operate seven Ofsted registered children's homes in Lancashire but has never cared for a Lancashire child. The provider has chosen not to be part of Lancashire County Council's children's care commissioning arrangements for considering the steps they could take to increase the likelihood of caring for a Lancashire child. If this planning application is approved, it is highly likely that the home would not be used for a Lancashire child and would, like all their other homes, be used for care for children from outside Lancashire, some of whom may be a long distance from home, which is not in line with best practice of children in care living close to their local community, friends and school.

LCC Highways: No objection subject to the following conditions:

1. Construction of vehicle cross-over across the footway fronting the site; and
2. Construction of car parking spaces.

Relevant Planning History

- 11/23/0068 – Full: Change of use of dwelling (use class C3a) to residential care home (use class C2) for a mother and baby (or for 2 children) supported by up to three carers. Refused: 7 July 2025 due to the impact on the living conditions of nearby occupants and harm to highway safety due to a lack of off-street parking provision. Redetermined appeal APP/R2330/W/23/3335566 dismissed on 23 December 2024 due to harm to highway safety (no harm was found to the living conditions of nearby occupants)
- 11/23/0069 – Application for Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed) for a change of a residential dwelling (C3a) to a household comprising of a resident Mother and Baby or up to two children. Refused: 16 March 2023

Relevant Policies

Hyndburn Core Strategy (CS)

Policy Env6 High Quality Design

Policy Env7 Environmental Amenity

Policy T1 Improving Connectivity

Hyndburn Development Management Development Plan Document (DMDPD)

Policy EM26 Design Quality and Materials

Policy DM29 Environmental Amenity

Policy DM32 Sustainable Transport, Traffic Management and Highway Safety (including GN8: Car Parking Standards)

Hyndburn Local Plan 2040 (Emerging Local Plan)

The Council's Local Plan 2040 underwent an independent examination between 16 and 25 September 2025 to determine if it is 'sound' and legally compliant, conducted by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. The Local Planning Authority is expecting a post examination letter from the Inspector within a couple of weeks. Until then, limited weight is generally afforded to the Emerging Local Plan

Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance

Hyndburn Borough Council Parking and Access Standards (2010)

Children's Residential & Supported Accommodations Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (Children's Home SPG)

Observations

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration (NPPF paragraph 2). NPPF defines sustainable development (paragraph 8), sets a presumption in favour of such development, requiring that: proposals in accordance with an up-to-date development plan be approved without delay (paragraph 11); and, that decisions should be approached in a positive and creative way (paragraph 39). NPPF (paragraph 61) says it is important that [...] the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed; and that (paragraph 63) the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community, including housing for looked-after children, should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

The development plan sets out general policies regarding character, appearance and residential amenity. Additionally, the Council has prepared and published a Supplementary Planning Guidance for Children's Home SPD in June 2025 to provide guidance on applications for children's homes. The SPG is a material consideration. It makes the following policies as guidance for new proposals:

Policy 1: Meeting the care needs of local communities

The development of a children's care home will be supported if it can be demonstrated that the care home will support local communities. However, planning permission will not be granted for development of a children's care home if Lancashire County Council object to the development on the grounds that it will not contribute to meeting the needs of local communities.

Policy 2: Site Specific Requirement for Care Homes

The development of a children's care home will be supported provided the following criteria are satisfied:

- i. That the general location of the care home is considered to be suitable and appropriate;
- ii. That the application property is suitable for the number of children and carers proposed;
- iii. That there is sufficient off-street car parking for carers and visitors and that the development will not impact on highway safety, and
- iv. That the development will not result in a concentration or cluster of children's care home in that area.

Considerations

Principle of development

The application proposes the change of use of a detached dwelling to a care Home for one child (with 2 carers). The property is set in a large established residential estate composed of similar detached /semi-detached dwelling houses.

Paragraph 63 of the NPPF particularly requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community (including looked after children) should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. Footnote 26 of the NPPF suggests that evidence of need for looked after children can be found in the relevant Local authority's Children's Social Care Sufficiency Strategy.

In recent years, Hyndburn has experienced significant growth of children's homes operated by agency providers, which has resulted in many children being moved to the Borough from their home community. The council has witnessed a steady increase since year 2020 in the

number of planning applications and applications for certificates of lawful development for the change of use of dwellings to children's care homes.

Unfortunately, according to the consultation response provided by LCC Children's Services, there is limited demand for such type of provision, and for the small number of Lancashire children who do require a solo home, there is already sufficient provision in our local area to meet this demand. The applicant has chosen not to be part of Lancashire County Council's children's home commissioning arrangements for consider the steps they could take to increase the likelihood of caring for a Lancashire child. If this planning application is approved, it is highly likely that the home would not be used for a Lancashire child and would, like all other homes operated by the applicant, be used for care for children from outside Lancashire.

The Framework seeks to ensure that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements should be addressed, but that the overall aims should be to meet an area's identified housing needs. In this context, the applicant has not convincingly demonstrated there is an identified need for the type of accommodation proposed in this location. Furthermore, at the time when this planning application is considered, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, and the proposed development would result in the loss of a market dwelling. Thus, alongside the fact that there is no identified needs for the solo home in Lancashire and the potential that the proposed home would not be occupied by a child of Hyndburn or Lancashire, officers are of the opinion that the harm associated with the loss of a four-bed market dwelling at the time when the Council fails to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply would outweigh the benefit of provision of a solo children's home.

In conclusion, it is considered that there is no evidence suggesting that the proposed development would help meet the care needs of local communities. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Policy 1 of the Children's Home SPG.

Site-Specific Assessment

To ensure the proposed children's homes are being appropriately located and not giving rise to any harms at the local level, Policy 2 (Site Specific Requirements for Care Homes) of the Children's Home SPG sets out four criteria and states that such proposals would not be supported unless all four criteria are satisfied. In this section, the proposed development is to be assessed against the criteria contained within Policy 2 of the Hyndburn Residential & Supported Accommodation SPG.

i. General location

The application site is located within an established residential area within the defined settlement boundary of Hyndburn Borough. There is no identified environmental and

planning policy constraints associated with this site to prohibit the provision of a children's home in such location.

ii. Suitability of the application property for the number of children (with carers) proposed

7 Bluebell Way is a detached dwelling at the junction of Bluebell Way and Sedum Gardens. The properties immediately adjacent to the application site are predominately detached residential dwellings with off-street parking provision. In this instance, no changes are proposed to the external scale and appearance of the building. There may, however, be minor additions in the nature of alarms, door key pads and the like, that would have little, if any, impact on the visual character of the building. The forecourt of the property would be altered to provide an additional car parking space (as illustrated in 25-025 Transport and Parking Statement). This application proposes the change of use of this detached four-bed dwelling to a care home for one child (with two carers present at any one time). Given the scale of the existing dwelling, officers are of the opinion that the proposed development complies with the criterion ii of Policy 2 of the Children's Home SPG.

iii. Parking provision and highway safety

GN8 of the Hyndburn Development Management DPD sets out the parking standards for development in each use class including the Class C2 use, which requires the provision of one parking space per 5 beds plus one space per 10 beds for visitors/staff.

In the consultation response, LCC Highways note that the three car parking spaces should have been provided for a 4-bed dwelling (Use Class C3) according to the Hyndburn car parking standards. However, the existing integral garage is substandard internally to count towards parking provision, so that there is only one adequately sized off-road car parking space. There is therefore a current under-provision of off-road parking. The proposed change of use to a C2 care home for one child would require two off-street car parking spaces to be provided. The proposed provision of two side-by-side car off-street parking spaces following the reconstruction of a footway to a vehicle crossing specification is considered acceptable subject to the recommended conditions.

iv. Whether the proposal would result in concentration or cluster of children's care home in the area

According to the consultation response provided by LCC Children's Services, there is already a children's home (operated by the same provider within the same postcode/on the same street) approximately 220 metres (m) from the application site, and there is another Ofsted Registered children's home within 0.33m from the proposed home.

Having too many children's homes close together can have an impact on the effective running of both new and existing homes, and their cumulative impacts should be considered from a local community perspective.

Officers are of the opinion that having a cluster of children's home in a particular residential area is likely to present a challenge to sustain mixed, balanced and sustainable communities, and to affect the residential character and amenity of the neighbourhood. Supporting text of Policy 2 (Paragraph 6.18 and 6.19) of the Children's Home SPG particularly notes that it is important that groups of two or more children's care homes do not have a cumulative adverse impact on a residential area, and new care home should not be closer than 400m from an existing children's care home. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Policy 2 of the Children's Home SPG.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy 1 and 2 of the Children's Home SPG, as Lancashire County Council raised an objection on the ground that it would not contribute to meeting the needs of local communities, and the proposed development would result in a concentration of children's care home in the local area.

Residential Amenity Impact

Hyndburn Core Strategy Policy Env7 and DMDPD Policy DM29, taken together, require that development protects the amenity of neighbouring residents.

In this instance, the proposed children's home would provide accommodation for one child, to be cared for by staff (two per shift) on rota. The Design & Assessment Statement accompanying this application suggests that *'the property will function as a home, not a facility. It will not generate noise, activity, or comings and goings beyond what would be expected in a typical family dwelling.'* This is an understandable and achievable aspiration, particularly for a detached property. Therefore, officers do not dispute that the building itself, would likely continue to have a character consistent with that of a dwellinghouse, and is unlikely to result in undue amenity impact by virtue of overlooking, overshadowing, or loss of privacy of the dwellinghouses within its immediate vicinity.

Therefore, the question for the present purpose is to consider how a small children's care home differs from a dwellinghouse in terms of planning impacts, noting, in particular, that it would be a staff workplace with routine comings and goings of staff, with additional professional visitors, in addition to being a home. With multiple children's home in an area would potentially erode the residential character/nature of the area. The wider impact of the proposed development on the local community has been assessed in part iv of the Site Specific Assessment section above.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed development to be injurious to the residential character of the area when considered cumulatively alongside existing children's care facilities in the neighbourhood. Whilst the scheme does not propose any physical alterations to the building's exterior, the introduction of multiple children's homes in the same neighbourhood may result in the loss of social cohesion and erosion of established residential character.

Other Considerations

The LCC Children's Home Market Position Statement raises concerns relating to the already challenging staff recruitment and retention issues being faced by children's home providers in Lancashire. The provision of further agency children's homes in Lancashire risks affecting quality across both new and existing homes and impacts upon local services including schools, healthcare and police services.

The proposed use would arguably fall within Use Class C2 identified in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). The C2 class includes a wide range of residential institution uses (such as hospitals, nursing homes, residential school, training centre) for which the property would not be suited. Should the planning permission be granted, a condition would be recommended to restrict the use to that proposed.

Conclusions

In conclusion, providing accommodation and care for looked-after children is worthy and necessary. However, according to comments of the LCC Children's Services, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the proposed care home for one child would meet the need for Lancashire children, and in fact most solo homes in our area are caring for children from other local authority areas. As such, the proposed development would place additional demands on public services. Furthermore, the proposed development would result in the loss of a market dwelling at the time when the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, which is considered to be contrary to the Policy GC1 of the Hyndburn Development Management DPD.

Having assessed the proposed scheme against the relevant policies, it is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of its location, concentration of similar facilities in its vicinity, and the lacking of demonstrable needs of such type of care accommodation in the Borough, is likely to be injurious to the residential character of the area when considered cumulatively alongside the existing care facilities in the neighbouring area. Whilst the proposal does not propose any physical alteration to the exterior of the building (other than formation of an

additional car parking space with re-located footway), the proposed development may result in the loss cohesion and further erosion of established residential character.

On this basis, the application is recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the report.

Recommendation

That the application be Refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its failure to demonstrate a local need and its nature and scale failing to align with Lancashire Children's Services commissioning strategies, is contrary to Policy 1 of Hyndburn Children's Residential & Supported Accommodations Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development, by virtue of the presence of existing children's home in its vicinity, and the resultant loss of a market dwelling, would adversely affect the established resident character of the area, and potentially resulting into the loss of social cohesion. This would be contrary to Policy 2 (iv) of the Hyndburn Children's Residential & Supported Accommodations Supplementary Planning Guidance, Policy GC1 of the Hyndburn Development Management Development Management Development Plan Document and Policy ENV7 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy.