

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 August 2025 20:33
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application 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.

FAO Emily Pickup

I am writing to lodge an objection to the application to change the land behind Hammond View, George Lane, Read from Agricultural to Residential. I have just seen a notice to this effect on George Lane.

I was [REDACTED] during the planning application refusal by Ribble Valley Council in 2016 and also for the Appeal in 2018.

I am sure you are aware of the number of written objections from residents of both Read and Simonstone. Plus quite a number from outside the villages. Over 400 people signed a petition in objection to any development on Hammond Ground.

I feel that this application should be refused

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 August 2025 18:49
To: Planning
Subject: FAO of Emily Pickup

 **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.

Re Planning Application 3/2025/0460

Objection to Planning Application – Land at Hammond Ground

I wish to raise serious concerns regarding the current planning application, particularly in relation to:

1. Access to the Water Main

As others have already noted, United Utilities will require unrestricted access to the existing water main which crosses the site. While the plan refers to a proposed new main, there is no evidence of consultation or agreement with United Utilities regarding this change. Moreover, the proposal includes raising ground levels and constructing retaining walls, which will be backfilled over the main. This would appear to severely restrict future access for maintenance or emergency works, contrary to standard utility requirements. An electronic gate at the front of the property further restricts access when the owners are not at home.

2. Change of Use from Agricultural to Residential

The application seeks to change a parcel of land at the rear of the site from agricultural to residential use, despite this not being central to the main proposal. This parcel forms part of Hammond Ground, which has been subject to significant scrutiny and detailed applications over recent years. I am concerned that this proposed change represents **planning creep**, potentially setting a precedent for incremental residential development on land that is clearly separate from the core development area.

No justification has been given for changing the land use, and the land in question sits below the proposed retaining walls—reinforcing its separation from the main development. It should remain designated as agricultural in order to remain in keeping with the rest of Hammond Ground.

Considering the above, I respectfully request that the planning authority give serious consideration to these issues, and in particular question the necessity and appropriateness of changing the land use designation for the rear parcel of land.



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 August 2025 12:41
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application 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.

FAO Emily Pickup

Dear Ms Pickup

I write to support the objections lodged in relation to the change of use of the plot of land the subject of this application from Agricultural to Residential. I have seen the notice placed on George Lane dated 30th July 2025 giving a further 21 days to respond . I presume the notice was put up because of the conflict this application has with Core Strategy policies

I [REDACTED] who were fully involved in the successful resistance to the two planning applications in 2016 and the Appeal in 2018 by the landowners in relation to the proposed development of 50 house on Hammond Ground Read which is adjacent to this property. . For the second application leading to the Appeal we were able to obtain the support of 169 official letters of objection to the Council and a petition against development with 402 signatures. There was and remains very strong local objection to any form of development of Hammond Ground.

I have read the well argued objections to this present application published on the Council website and would specifically endorse the comments made in relation to Hammond Ground. I have also reviewed the documentation online for the application 3/2021/0011 relating to the whole property now known as Hammond View which granted permission for development. The Planning Officer's report on that application concludes *"appropriately worded conditions could ensure that an appropriate definitive boundary is created to distinguish the residential development along George Lane from the landscape of Hammond Ground. This will seek to assist in protecting the special characteristics of Hammond Ground for future generations in accordance with the overarching vision of the Borough"*. The impact of the development of the Hammond View property on Hammond Ground was clearly very much of concern to the Planning Officer.

It seems of significance that in the online documents for 3/2021/0011 there is a document under the heading online *"Proposed site plan"* which for ease of reference I have attached below being *"Plan D012"*. There is also a document under *"Amend Prop Date Plan 2221"* which again for ease of reference I attach below being Plan F012. The formal Planning Permission document dated 1/4/21 at paragraph 2 specifically lists the documents that the development had to be carried out in accordance with. Plan F012 is listed. Paragraph 2 then states *"Reason: for the avoidance of doubt since the proposal was the subject of agreed amendments and to clarify which plans are relevant to the consent"*. It appears therefore that by agreement with the applicants the boundary for residential development was limited to that set out in Plan F012 and the attempt to have the extended boundary

to where the applicants now wish to have it placed was abandoned. It seems reasonable to suggest that the boundary approved under Plan 012F was required by the Planning Officer as part of his desire as set out in his report to protect Hammond Ground.

Nothing appears to have changed since this decision save for what other objectors suggest is use of the plot of land concerned without permission. I appreciate that the plot of land is a small one but the principle seems clear and change of use from agricultural to residential should not be approved.

Regards



Original submitted Plan D012 on website documents



Plan F012 approved and referred to in final Planning Permission dated

