

Emily Pickup
Council Offices
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Formal Objection to Planning Application for Change of Land Use at 38 George Lane, Read, BB12 7RH. Hammond Ground 3/2025/0460

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed change of land use from agricultural to residential for domestic garden purposes concerning the above-referenced planning application.

For the purpose of this objection, I'm considering the current applicant and the former applicants for this address being one and the same. The current applicant is Katie Holt and the previous applications for this address were made by Readstone Construction Limited - a company in which the [REDACTED] The property was originally built for Katie from the outset. It is therefore reasonable to believe that the current applicant and property occupier is aware of the planning history and restrictions regarding the land at the rear of the property and has knowingly disregarded the previous planning application notes:

"The applicant is advised that should there be any deviation from the approved plan the Local Planning Authority must be informed. It is therefore vital that any future Building Regulation application must comply with the approved planning application".

The current application is, in essence, a resubmission of a previously declined application 3/2021/0011. The only difference is that the applicant has split up the planning application process in a bid to circumvent the original decision given. Since the original decision was made, there have been no significant changes to local or national planning rules which would justify a reversal. The applicant has also failed to demonstrate any clear reason within their application as to why the original declined planning permission should be changed, which is likely because there are minimal justifications for the change of use of the land.

The applicant has not submitted this application as retrospective, despite the land having already been converted, which further demonstrates disregard for local planning rules and decisions. This attempt to push the change through without proper justification also shows a lack of consideration for planning policies, local neighbours and generally an attempt to circumvent previous planning decisions.

If the above is not already sufficient justification for rejection, then the following should also be taken into consideration:

Additional grounds for objection:

- The land in question lies outside the existing settlement boundary and on land characterised as having significant importance to conserving the appearance on the countryside as mentioned by the national appeals inspector, on previous planning refusals on the land at Hammond Ground. To allow a change of use on such weak grounds would be in conflict of local and national policies.
- National and local policy discourages the unjustified loss of productive agricultural land. Changing it to garden land for a private dwelling is not considered a justified use.
- The plot already has ample outdoor space and further expansion into protected land is unwarranted and unjustified.
- The development would negatively impact the character and openness of the area. It generally harms the appeal of the site that forms part of Hammond Ground, an area of land in agricultural use, situated to the west of Read. Hammond Ground has an open character, includes a number of mature trees and has the character and appearance of parkland. Changing this to garden land for a private dwelling would introduce fencing, ornamental planting and structures which would alter this character.
- This land falls within a larger parcel of land that has been targeted for large scale development and has been previously refused at local level and at appeal (3/2016/1192). Any decision made should be made with the potential for larger scale development in mind and that the application should not be marginalised or its significance be underestimated. Should larger scale development plans be reignited it would have significant impact on the local environment, wildlife and township.

Wider issues to note in relation to the planning compliance at this address

The applicant(s) compliance with planning instructions does bring into question the other objections noted that the property may have been built over United Utilities main pipework which could significantly affect the village as a whole if the pipe was to fail. A further planning refusal within application 3/2021/0011 states that United Utilities must have 24/7 unrestricted access to the site which is again unclear how this is achieved given that the premises has secured gated access.

Overall, this 'retrospective' planning application has potential for a significant negative impact for the village and countryside as outlined above. I recommend the council to refuse this application carefully taking into account previous planning applications and reasons for refusal and further refuse this application. As this property appears to have multiple issues with compliance with planning instructions it may be reasonable for a full inspection to be carried out at the property to confirm all other aspects of the planning conditions have been adhered to.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 July 2025 16:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application No:3/2025/0460 - change of use from agricultural to residential to extend the domestic curtilage of the property and associated engineering operations

 **External Email**

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.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We wish to OBJECT to the above planning application which is made in relation to land adjacent to Hammond View, 38 George Lane, being land which comprises part of Hammond Ground, which has a long planning history attaching to it. Having regard to previous refusals of planning applications relating to Hammond Ground we are concerned that the applicant is seeking to create a new boundary to the field that has already been through full discussion, has strong local opposition and repeated rejections of planning up to the highest level.

The officer's report for Outline Consent 3/2019/0927 (which related to the land which now comprises Hammond View but which did not include the land which is now the subject of this application) recommended that "conditions could ensure that an appropriate definitive boundary is created to distinguish the residential development ...from the landscape of Hammond Ground...to assist in protecting the special characteristics of Hammond Ground for future generations".

The decision notice 3/2019/0927 contains the following condition: "the landscape and boundary treatment details shall provide for a comprehensive landscaped boundary between the application site and Hammond Ground".

To permit the proposed change of use and associated development of this part of Hammond Ground would impinge upon and have a negative impact on the historic parkland of Read Hall and would set a dangerous precedent for the future of Hammond Ground.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]