

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 July 2025 16:21
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application No. 3/2025/0460

 **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.

Emily Pickup
Council Offices
Church Walk, Clitheroe
Lancs, 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.

The previous 2016 application for residential development on Hammond Ground, to which the land on this application refers to, was rightly rejected many times by the council and at appeal with the referral to the Secretary of State (APP/T2350/W/17/3185445 in October 2018) it concluded that residential development in this field would adversely affect the parkland character and the setting of the village in the countryside. I believe any residential development within the Hammond Ground boundary should be declined as it sets a precedent for future development as discussed below.

I also note that this permission is not identified as retrospective, which is concerning as despite a previous rejection for a change of use from agricultural land, the garden has, in all intents and purposes, been used as a domestic garden with the introduction of a lawn, ornamental planting, hardscaping with terrace and steps and the introduction of football posts. This is in direct contravention of the planning rules and undermines confidence in your processes unless corrective action is enforced.

Specific Grounds for Objection:

1. Impact on the Open Countryside and Visual Amenity

The land in question lies within an area characterised by its open, rural nature. Converting agricultural land to residential garden use introduces domestic features such as fencing, ornamental planting, and structures, which fundamentally alter the landscape and diminish its rural character.

2. Loss of Agricultural Land

The proposal results in the incremental loss of agricultural land, which is contrary to national

and local policies that seek to protect such land for food production and rural economy purposes. This change undermines the long-term sustainability of agricultural use in the area.

3. Precedent for Future Development

Allowing this change sets a concerning precedent for further residential encroachment beyond defined settlement boundaries. Such incremental development risks cumulative impacts that conflict with policies designed to protect the countryside from inappropriate development.

4. Conflict with Local Planning Policies

The proposal appears contrary to policies within the Local Plan and any applicable Neighbourhood Plan that seek to prevent urban encroachment, protect the countryside, and maintain the distinct separation between built-up areas and open land.

5. Outside the normal boundaries as set with all other houses

The location map misinterprets the adjacent housing showing it aligning the garden with other houses to the north of George Lane. These houses do not back onto the field of Hammond Ground. If the map showed all the other many houses running south further down the lane you would see that all the gardens do not extend into Hammond Ground. My understanding is these current boundaries mark the parish boundary.

6. Water supply access as a condition of the original planning application

Original planning for the property was approved on the grounds that United Utilities, in supplying the main feed of water for the village through the plot, would always have free and immediate access. I fail to see how this could be achieved with hard landscaping built above the pipe itself. I am also concerned that you have not identified United Utilities as part of the consultation process given the importance of the supply to the village and any potential impacts as it runs directly through the plot.

7. The application includes ‘Associated engineering operations’

The application makes no reference to ‘associated engineering operations’ and makes no proposals for them. Could you be more explicit as to what we are being asked to comment on?

In conclusion, I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this application to preserve the character of the area, prevent the loss of agricultural land, and uphold the integrity of established planning policies.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address line 1]

[Redacted address line 2]

