

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 July 2026 20:50
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0356

⚠ 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.

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to object to planning application **3/2026/0356** for the proposed development of 77 dwellings at Hammond Ground, Read.

My objection is based on one central point.

This site has already been considered through the planning process. Following a detailed assessment, a Planning Inspector upheld Ribble Valley Borough Council's refusal of planning permission.

The current application therefore needs to demonstrate why a different planning decision should now be reached.

In my opinion, it does not.

The previous appeal remains the starting point

The Planning Inspector considered this site in detail and concluded that the harm caused by development outweighed the benefits.

The applicant's own Landscape and Visual Appraisal confirms that this application has been prepared specifically to address the reasons for refusal identified in the previous appeal.

That is the key issue for this application.

The question is not whether the layout has changed.

The question is whether the planning harm identified by the Inspector has been overcome.

I do not believe the submitted documents demonstrate that this has happened.

Although the proposed layout differs from the previous scheme, the development remains on the same site, affects the same landscape and introduces an even greater level of development, increasing the number of dwellings from 50 to 77.

The applicant has changed the design of the proposal, but not the characteristics of the site.

Landscape

The previous appeal recognised the importance of Hammond Ground as part of the open setting of Read.

That role has not changed.

The site continues to provide an open approach to the village and contributes to the transition between the built-up area and the surrounding countryside.

The proposal would replace much of that open land with housing, roads and associated development.

While additional planting and community parkland are proposed, these features do not preserve the existing landscape. Open countryside and public open space within a housing development are not the same.

The planning harm identified previously therefore remains.

Heritage

The current application is accompanied by additional heritage evidence, but this does not weaken the case against development.

In fact, independent heritage specialists acting on behalf of local residents conclude that Hammond Ground contributes to the significance of Read Hall and forms part of the historic landscape associated with Read Park.

Lancashire Gardens Trust reaches the same conclusion and continues to object. It states that Hammond Ground remains part of the historic designed landscape of Read Park and that development would result in the loss of part of that landscape.

These are independent professional assessments which support, rather than undermine, the concerns identified during the previous appeal.

Why should the decision now be different?

The Planning Inspector previously found that development of Hammond Ground would cause unacceptable planning harm.

The current application proposes more housing on the same site.

The submitted reports explain how the layout has been revised, but they do not clearly demonstrate that the key planning issues identified by the Inspector have been resolved.

If the landscape role of the site remains the same, if its contribution to the setting of Read Hall remains the same, and if independent heritage specialists continue to identify the same concerns, then there is no clear justification for reaching a different planning conclusion.

A revised layout alone should not outweigh the findings of a previous Planning Inspector unless it can be shown that the planning balance has materially changed.

In my view, that has not been demonstrated.

Conclusion

This application should be determined on its planning merits, but those merits must be considered in the context of the previous appeal.

The Planning Inspector has already considered the principle of housing on this site and concluded that the harm outweighed the benefits.

The current application has not demonstrated that the material planning considerations have changed sufficiently to justify a different outcome.

For that reason, I respectfully ask Ribble Valley Borough Council to refuse planning application **3/2026/0356**.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.