

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2024 16:23
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Number 3/2024/0076 Land Off Hammond Drive, BB12 7RERead, BB12
Attachments: Photograph 1.jpg; Photograph 2.jpg; Photograph 3.jpg



This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

FAO Kathryn Hughes – Planning Officer RVBC

[REDACTED] please accept this communication as confirmation of our objection to planning application number 3/2024/0076 – resubmission of planning application number 3/2023/0447 Land off Hammond Drive, Read, BB12 7RE.

We have reviewed the new application, but apart from the reduction in length of the eastern and western aspects from 9.3 metres to 8.3 metres and the removal of the stone patio, no doubt both undertaken to comply with the requirements of the Root Protection Area but which still actually intrudes in to this area as per the “Proposed Site Plan 1” document, the inclusion of a hedge on the southern and western aspects and an increase in the height of the proposed building, we can see no other changes to the original planning application.

Before going in to our objections in more detail, it would appear to us that the recommendations and reasons for refusal of the initial application given in the report to the Planning and Development Committee dated 24th August 2023 still stand. Unless the National Planning Policy Framework, the policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 and any other relevant legislation have changed subsequently, then nothing in the revised application addresses and, by association, should change the decision to refuse planning permission given by Ribble Valley Borough Council.

Our main concerns revolve around:

1. the loss of privacy [REDACTED] would suffer as a result of the planned development and which we will detail later.
2. the impact the planned development would have on the landscape, as the Read Hall estate and park is defined as open countryside and has previously been identified as being of regional and county significance.
3. the precedence that the granting of planning permission in this instance could set for other parts of the Read Hall estate and park, as well as the remainder of the Ribble Valley area that comes under the jurisdiction of Ribble Valley Borough Council and other neighbouring authorities.
4. the potential for subsidence and subsequent damage [REDACTED] to the removal of significant amounts of earth required to build the proposed new dwelling.

You will be aware that all of the current residential dwellings in the nearby area to the proposed development, excluding Read Hall itself, were converted from existing structures, principally disused farm buildings, which have undoubtedly been beneficial to the appearance of the Read Hall estate.

The most recent of these was planning application number 3/2018/0024 [REDACTED] as it is now known, is a significant distance from the other existing dwellings and is relatively isolated in its setting and, therefore, has less visual impact on the surrounding landscape.

This 2018 application has been referenced as justification for the approval of the new application. If you refer to the notes from the planning and development committee on 8th March 2018, you will see that the original plans were rejected – although later approved with constraints – and the report highlighted, in particular section 1.6, the

history of the estate, the grade 2* listed Read Hall and the significance of the surrounding historical parkland. The comments and observations raised by this committee are as relevant today as they were then.

Both the applicants' architect and planning consultant have stated that the proposed development will be constructed on a "vacant" or "infill" plot. It is our understanding that this area has never been designated as such and it is most definitely not an "infill" plot. Indeed, we are advised that the land has been used for the grazing of sheep and cattle from the nearby farm, and that no application has ever been submitted to obtain planning approval for the construction of a building. Unlike the other previously mentioned dwellings that were all conversions from existing structures, and by their association to the grade 2* listed Read Hall are considered to be non-designated heritage assets, this proposed dwelling, if approved, would be a new build built on virgin farm or park land using modern materials and giving an appearance detrimental to and not in keeping with the existing properties.

This point was clearly referenced in section 5.3, sub-section 8 of the report to the Planning and Development committee refusing the initial application, where it says that *"the scale/size and modern design of the proposed dwelling would have an urbanising impact upon this countryside location as well as result in less than substantial harm to the setting of Read Hall and the Ice House as well as the non-designated heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DMH4, DMG1, DME2 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, as well as national guidance contained within the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990."*

The current application also refers to the granting of planning permission for a new dwelling – 3/2021/0011 – in George Lane, Read, with the conclusion that the new application should be approved on the same basis. It is said that the development on George Lane is in open countryside. In fact, it was built on a residential street in Read just off the main A671, between existing properties and with properties directly opposite. In the conclusion to the granting of planning permission, it said

"it is considered that the site is well related to the settlement boundary of Read and would represent an infill plot resulting in the creation of a more logical, definitive boundary with Hammond Ground without any significant outward expansion of the settlement."

This is unquestionably different to the proposal to build a new dwelling in open countryside within the setting of a significant, historical parkland that is the Read Hall estate. Furthermore, in section 1, sub-section 4 of the report to the Planning and Development Committee referenced above, it is mentioned that *"the proposed dwelling house would be located some distance (over 600m) outside of the settlement of Read, on land defined as open countryside."*

In addition to the above, we trust that you will refer to other elements of Ribble Valley Borough Council's Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 Development Plan in arriving at your decision. The document is very comprehensive and you will be far better qualified than us in interpreting all that is relevant in this document to the planning application in question. In particular we believe that non-compliance of the criteria in policies DME1, DMG2, DMH3 and Key Statements DS1 and DS2 would strongly support our objection to the proposed planning application.

Finally, we would like to return to one of our main concerns; that of the loss of privacy should the planning application be granted.

Within the planning consultant's report, he states in section 5.3 that *"in terms of siting/massing /footprint, the dwelling is proportionate, will be inconspicuous and entirely appropriate in terms of its design, external appearance and site orientation."*

To say that the dwelling will be inconspicuous is almost laughable. We are not topography experts, but it is plain to see from the proposed site plan and the topographical survey that the dwelling will be quite clearly conspicuous from both Hammond Drive [REDACTED]

According to the site plan, the proposed new dwelling will be built at a ground level of 136.94 metres above sea level, with the roof topping out at 139.74 metres above sea level. For reference, please be aware that the height of the proposed new dwelling has increased from the original application according to the "Proposed Elevations" document.

The car parking on Hammond Drive [REDACTED] is at a level of circa 134 metres above sea level, which means that the dwelling will be approximately 3 metres above the road level at its lowest point and 5.8

metres at its highest and would be in full view to any passing vehicles or pedestrians. Please note that although Hammond Drive is a private road, the public has a right of access – footpath reference FP 0334002 - to walk along it and enjoy the surrounding park land views of the Read Hall estate which this dwelling would impact upon. To further emphasise this, photograph 1 is attached showing the existing view afforded looking in a westerly direction from Hammond Drive towards Whalley Nab and Longridge Fell that would be lost to the community and visitors alike if the proposed application is approved.

Potentially more poignantly [REDACTED] is the even greater discrepancy in the height between the proposed new dwelling [REDACTED] which would, if built, remove any privacy that currently exists. As previously stated, the proposed new dwelling will be at its highest 139.74 metres above sea level. The topographical survey shows [REDACTED] above sea level at threshold level (TL) a difference of 8+ metres. Furthermore, the topographical survey shows the eaves height (EH) [REDACTED] above sea level, which is still below the ground level height and almost 5 metres below the upper height of the proposed new dwelling. This height issue is clearly evidenced in the “Whole Site Elevation” drawing in the “Proposed Sections” document of the application.

This, in simple terms, means that the two bedrooms and a downstairs room at [REDACTED] would definitely be overlooked from outside of the proposed new dwelling and quite possibly from the inside of the kitchen/lounge/dining room.

[REDACTED] This is completely incorrect. The banking offers [REDACTED] as already mentioned, the proposed dwelling is planned to be built [REDACTED] Furthermore, the garage only offers concealment to anybody less than 1 metre tall! Photographs 2 and 3 provided confirm this.

To compound the removal / loss of privacy, due to the height issue of the outside, [REDACTED] Whilst we acknowledge the removal of the stone patio area in the revised application, principally due to the requirement of the Root Protection Area, the fact remains that the ground that it was to be built on will still be there to accommodate the courtyard garden, which would allow [REDACTED]

Reference is made in the revised application statement – section 5.6 – to “a landscaping scheme is included with the application....” but this landscaping does not extend along the full length of the western side of the plot, thereby [REDACTED] Presumably this is being done to facilitate “a courtyard garden area providing opportunity to the distant views to the west” as mentioned in section 2, sub-section 4 of the Design and Access statement for the applicants’ benefit but with little or no consideration [REDACTED] Again, to emphasise this concern, attached photographs 2 and 3 taken from the west elevation and north west corner of the proposed plot [REDACTED] Furthermore, we feel that the screening would be as incongruous on the landscape as much as the proposed house would be and, as also mentioned earlier, would remove the wonderful views of the park land and countryside that are currently afforded to the residents and community alike from the footpath on Hammond Drive.

In addition to this loss of privacy, [REDACTED] currently afforded to them should the proposed dwelling be built. Should there not be a requirement to consider the detrimental impact the development would have of the amenity on immediate neighbours?

In conclusion we would urge Ribble Valley Borough Council’s Planning and Development Committee to take on board our significant concerns with the planning application before them, and together with the application of the relevant elements of the Council’s Core Strategy Development Plan and other tools available to them, ultimately refuse the application once again.

Regards

[REDACTED]



