

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 June 2026 16:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning App/38441 Hammond Ground Read

⚠ 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.

To whom it may concern at RVBC Planning

I write to object in the strongest terms to the latest application to build houses on Hammond Ground in Read.

I thought this matter had been resolved once and for all when the Planning Inspector concluded that development would cause "significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside".

Nothing has changed. Such an assessment would still be reached if it were done today. I believe the present application is an attempt to revisit this matter in the hope of eroding the policy position protecting the land to the point where the character is compromised along with that any arguments previously made to protect the area. A sort of stealth tactic to eventually get the house numbers previously proposed.

Please take a stand on this matter and Save Hammond Ground. Once it has gone, it has gone forever.



Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 June 2026 16:32
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.

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Application 3/2026/0356; Development address: Land at Hammond Ground Whalley Road Read BB12 7RP

Having carefully considered the application documents, I wish to register my strong objection to the above planning application.

Whilst I acknowledge the need for new housing across some of the Ribble Valley, I do not consider that this proposal represents sustainable development when assessed against the Development Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the particular characteristics of this site.

Planning requires balancing the need for housing against environmental harm, and in my view significant and irreversible landscape change would result if permission were granted, and the adverse impacts would significantly and noticeably outweigh the benefits. I therefore believe that permission should be refused.

1. The Previous Appeal Remains Highly Relevant

This site has already been the subject of detailed consideration through the dismissed 2018 appeal and many of the Government Planning Inspector's conclusions remain directly relevant i.e:

- the site lies beyond the settlement boundary
- it represents development within the open countryside
- the proposal conflicted with the Core Strategy's spatial strategy
- the landscape forms part of the distinctive parkland setting of Read
- development would result in harm to that landscape character
- there would be harm to the setting of Read Hall
- those harms were not outweighed by the public benefits.

Despite a revised landscape design by the developer/applicant and increased public open space, the fundamental characteristics of the site have not changed however. I consider the land remains open countryside and an important component of the rural setting of Read. Changing the layout of housing does not remove those fundamental considerations.

This larger scheme of 77 houses would create even greater harm than the 50-house scheme rejected by the Secretary of State's Planning Inspector in 2018.

2. Conflict with the Development Plan

The Development Plan continues to seek:

- sustainable patterns of development
- protection of the countryside
- high quality landscape design
- protection of local character
- development that respects settlement form.

This proposed development conflicts with those objectives - it projects significantly into open countryside and permanently alters the relationship between Read and its surrounding landscape.

3. Hammond Ground Landscape Character

Hammond Ground forms an important part of the landscape, transitioning between the built part of Read and the surrounding countryside. It contributes significantly to the rural setting of the village and to the historic landscape associated with Read Hall. Development of the site would permanently alter that transition by replacing the current open pastoral landscape, containing mature trees, grazing land and historic parkland features, with suburban housing, estate roads, domestic gardens, lighting, parking areas and parked vehicles, domestic activity and associated infrastructure. Development would significantly change the character of this part of Read from open pasture to an urban residential estate, and there would be a real risk of using this as a stepping stone for further large-scale development in future. It would fundamentally alter the way that Hammond Ground is experienced, even where open land is retained, and this permanent change in landscape character should not be underestimated.

Whilst the majority of housing has been concentrated on the eastern side of the site, it suggests an acknowledgement by the applicant that much of Hammond Ground possesses landscape and heritage sensitivity, and that development across the whole site would be unacceptable. The revised layout therefore reduces, but does not remove, the landscape harm previously identified by the Planning Inspector.

The permanent urbanisation of this landscape cannot be fully mitigated through new planting and landscaping to lessen visual harm, requiring many years to mature, and cannot replicate the contribution made by the already existing open landscape and agricultural land, mature trees and historic parkland character.

4. Community Parkland – Mitigation rather than Benefit

A key element of the applicant's Planning Statement is the assertion that the proposed community parkland represents a substantial public benefit. However, the proposed parkland is a necessary design response, intended to mitigate the harm arising from development in such a sensitive landscape. It cannot recreate the openness which would be permanently lost.

5. Traffic and Highway Considerations

Whilst the Transport Assessment concludes that the local highway network can safely accommodate the proposed development, local experience however indicates that Whalley Road (A671) already experiences severe congestion during peak commuting times and serves as the principal route into and out of Read towards both Whalley and Padiham/Burnley. As someone who [REDACTED] regularly uses Whalley Road, I know from experience that traffic can already be difficult during peak periods and residents regularly experience delays when joining the A671.

I would therefore suggest that the assumptions and conclusions within the Transport Assessment should be carefully scrutinised by Lancashire County Council as Highway Authority and by the Local Planning Authority before significant additional traffic impact (of potentially another 150 vehicles) is accepted.

Having considered all of the above, I believe this proposal/application would result in:

- permanent loss of open countryside
- unacceptable encroachment beyond the established settlement
- harm to landscape character
- erosion of the rural setting of Read
- harm to the setting of heritage assets
- conflict with the Development Plan's spatial strategy
- significant urbanisation of an important transitional landscape.

Whilst I acknowledge the benefits arising from affordable housing, biodiversity enhancements and public open space, these do not outweigh the permanent environmental harm arising from the proposal. I hope Ribble Valley Borough Council will give careful consideration to the lasting impact this development would have on the character of Read with the permanent loss of this important landscape, and refuse planning permission for this development.

Yours faithfully,



(I have also tried to upload my objection on the planning portal, but haven't had an acknowledgement, so hence this email, in case it didn't register).

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 June 2026 17:03
To: Planning
Subject: re Hammond field Read

 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 Planning Officer

Can I strongly object to the proposed planning application to build on fast evaporating green fields in the Ribble Valley!

The village of Read has already dramatically increased over a number of years and axiomatically traffic in, to, and from Read not to mention heavy volume of traffic passing through the village.

There has been NO increase in education places and medical facilities in all that time.

Further increase in need would merely exacerbate such a situation.

On ANY grounds any NEW building in any area should be on brownfield sites!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 June 2026 17:08
To: Planning
Subject: Hammond ground

 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.

We object to more houses being built in Read, the road is already busy, the schools are full, one has to wait weeks for a none urgent appointment at the the Doctor 's in Whalley and Padiham and people are on trolleys for days waiting for a bed at the hospitals. Too many houses have been built in Ribble Valley the last 10years. [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 June 2026 19:00
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application 3/2026/0356 – Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read Formal Policy-Based Objection Submission

⚠ 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.

Planning Department
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

Re: Planning Application 3/2026/0356 – Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read
Formal Policy-Based Objection Submission

Executive Summary

The proposed development of 77 dwellings at Hammond Ground is considered to give rise to significant adverse impacts that are not outweighed by identified benefits. In particular, the scheme conflicts with national and local planning policy relating to landscape protection, sustainable development, highway safety, and infrastructure capacity.

The site has previously been subject to an appeal decision dismissing residential development on the basis of “significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside”, which remains a key material consideration. The current proposal represents an increased scale of development without adequately addressing those findings.

Overall, the development is considered contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and is recommended for refusal on planning policy grounds.

Dear Planning Officer,

I write to formally object to planning application 3/2026/0356 for the erection of 77 dwellings and associated infrastructure at Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read.

This objection is made on the basis that the proposal is contrary to key provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014), and results in

significant and unresolved harm in respect of landscape character, highways safety, infrastructure capacity, and sustainable development principles.

1. Landscape character, historic environment and precedent (NPPF paras. 124, 130, 174, 176; RVCS Policies EN2, DME2, Key Statement EN1)

Hammond Ground forms part of a sensitive historic landscape setting that contributes materially to the rural character and visual identity of Read.

The importance of this site has previously been tested at appeal. In 2018, a Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State dismissed an appeal for 50 dwellings on the same site, concluding that the proposal would result in “significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside” and recognising the importance of the site’s historic parkland setting. This carries substantial weight as a material consideration.

The current proposal, at 77 dwellings, represents a materially greater level of development than that previously dismissed, without demonstrating that the identified harm has been overcome. It is therefore considered to conflict with:

- NPPF paragraph 124
- NPPF paragraph 130
- NPPF paragraph 174
- NPPF paragraph 176

and:

- RVCS Key Statement EN1
- RVCS Policy DME2
- RVCS Policy EN2

Furthermore, approval would likely establish a precedent for incremental and phased development across the wider Hammond Ground landholding, facilitating enabling infrastructure that could encourage further expansion into open countryside. This would conflict with NPPF paragraph 70 and undermine long-term countryside protection objectives.

2. Highway safety and sustainable transport (NPPF paras. 110–112; RVCS Policy DMI2)

Whalley Road (A671) is a strategic and heavily trafficked route already subject to peak-time congestion.

The introduction of 77 dwellings would materially increase vehicular movements and intensify pressure on an already constrained network. The proposed access arrangements would introduce additional conflict points onto a busy through-route.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 110–112 and RVCS Policy DMI2, and the applicant has not demonstrated that residual cumulative impacts would be acceptable.

3. Pressure on local infrastructure – education, health and dentistry (NPPF para. 93; RVCS Key Statement DMI1)

The proposal would significantly increase demand on local infrastructure.

School capacity in the wider area is already under pressure, and GP and dental services are operating under constrained availability. The application fails to demonstrate that this additional demand can be accommodated without adverse impacts on existing residents.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraph 93 and RVCS Key Statement DMI1.

4. Flood risk and drainage (NPPF paras. 167–169; RVCS Policy DME6)

The development raises concerns in relation to surface water management and flood risk.

It is not demonstrated that the proposed drainage strategy adequately addresses long-term capacity or resilience, contrary to NPPF paras. 167–169 and RVCS Policy DME6.

5. Ecological and biodiversity considerations (NPPF paras. 174–180; RVCS Policy EN4)

Concerns remain regarding habitat loss, ecological connectivity, and impact on mature vegetation.

The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate compliance with biodiversity protection and net gain principles under NPPF paragraphs 174–180 or RVCS Policy EN4.

6. Overdevelopment and settlement form (NPPF paras. 124, 130; RVCS Key Statement DS1)

The scale of development represents a significant intensification of the settlement edge.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs 124 and 130 and RVCS Key Statement DS1, and would materially alter the character of Read while setting an unsustainable precedent for further expansion.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal is considered to conflict with key national and local planning policies, particularly in relation to landscape character, highway safety, infrastructure capacity, and sustainable development principles.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that planning permission be refused. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the application, it is submitted that substantial redesign and reduction in scale would be required to render the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted title]

[Redacted address]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 June 2026 21:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851499421

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Land at Hammond Ground, Whalley Road Read

Comments: Dear Planning Officer

I wish to register my objection to planning application 3/2026/0356 for the proposed planning of 77 dwellings on land at Hammond Ground Whalley Road Read.

As a local resident, i believe this proposal conflicts with a number of policies within Ribble Valley Borough Councils adopted planning framework and the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

1. Harm to the rural landscape and countryside

This application would result in permanent loss of open agriculture land that forms part of the historic rural setting of Read.

The countryside surrounding Read is fundamental to the village identity. The development would introduce a substantial urban housing estate into open landscape eroding the clear distinction between the village and surrounding countryside

.

2,Impact on the heritage and the historic landscape

Although the application includes a Heritage statement,i remain concerned that insufficient weight has been given to the cumulative effect of developing land that forms part of the historic landscape surrounding Read.

The NPPF requires local planning authorities to give great weight to conserving heritage assets and their settings, even where harm is less than substantial.

Development should preserve not only designated heritage assets but also the wider landscape which contributed to their significance.

Once this historic landscape is developed the harm will be permanent and irreversible

3.Landscape character

The proposal would fundamentally alter views into and out of Read

Existing open fields provide an important visual break and contribute significantly to the attractive approach onto the village.

Replacing fields with housing, roads, lighting and associated infrastructure would urbanise the landscape and diminish the character that make Read a desirable rural community.

This conflicts

with planning policies that seek high quality design responding positively to landscape character and

local identity.

4. Biodiversity

Although ecological mitigation has been proposed, mitigation cannot fully replace established habitats.

The loss of mature hedgerows, grassland and wildlife corridors would reduce biodiversity and fragment habitats used by birds, mammals and insects.

The council should carefully examine whether biodiversity enhancement genuinely outweighs the permanent ecological loss.

5. Highway Safety

Whalley Road already experiences congestion particularly during school start and finish times.

Additional vehicle movements from 77 new dwellings are likely to:

Increase congestion

reduce highway safety

increase noise and pollution

create additional risks for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Transport Assessment should therefore be robustly scrutinised.

6. Pressure on Infrastructure.

The proposal would increase demand upon

.GP surgeries

.local schools

.drainage systems

.public transport

.utilities and other community services.

Unless adequate infrastructure improvements are secured the development risks placing unacceptable pressure on existing facilities.

7. Loss of agricultural land

The permanent loss of productive agricultural land should not be underestimated.

the countryside surrounding Read performs environmental ecological and landscape functions that cannot simply be recreated through landscaping proposals

Conclusion.

While I recognise that the council has an obligation to provide new housing, this must not come at the expense of the historic landscape and rural character that make Read unique.

The Proposal would :

permanently urbanise an important area of countryside

erode the historic setting of the village

adversely affect landscape character

place additional pressure on local infrastructure

increase traffic and

result in irreversible environmental harm.

For these reasons I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuses planning permission for application 3/2026/0356.

Your faithfully

██████████.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 June 2026 21:37
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851505697

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground,
Read,
Lancashire.

Comments: The roads in the area are already extremely busy with cars/vans/wagons ect. How does the planners expect a small village like Read and it's neighbour Simon stone to cope with more vehicles.

This could be at least 154 vehicles everyday.

Also the overrun of rainwater, will the river Calder be able to cope with it? Why does every small village need to be turned into a town?

Why doesn't the planners think of building, high quality apartments? That are fit for purpose.

I hope that the planning authority see sense and refuse this application.

Build on brownfield land before using all the green belt land.

We need green belt land for our future generations to enjoy.

How is our country going to produce food for everyone, if all the land is being built on? Are we going to import everything from abroad and rely on other countries for all our food?

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 08:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-851547886

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground

Comments: I object to this proposal for the following reasons-

- Loss of open countryside and historic parkland
- Impact on village identity and character
- Increased traffic and road safety concerns
- Pressure on schools, GPs and drainage
- Harm to wildlife and biodiversity
- Urbanisation of the village edge
- Risk of further large-scale development in future

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 08:25
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851548240

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Land at Hammond Ground Whalley Road Read BB12 7RP

Comments: The application to build more houses in Read is concerning due to the existing traffic issues through Read whilst will be exacerbated by these further houses.

Read connects people from great Harwood to Burnley General Hospital - to redirect this traffic through Clayton also would not be viable as this town also is backed up with traffic every morning already.

I travel this route [REDACTED] currently, I assure you the traffic here is already a problem.

There is only one road through Read, I work in [REDACTED] and furthering the traffic congestion through this route concerns me for women in Labour reaching the Lancashire Women and Newborns Centre when travelling through.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 June 2026 12:25
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-851730500

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground
Read

Comments: 1. A similar application, for 50 houses, was rejected by Ribble Borough Council several years ago, including the rejection of an appeal by the developers and owners. Nothing has changed for the better, so I believe that this application should also be refused.

2. Since that rejected appeal, traffic through the village has increased, partly due to huge development of Whalley, Barrow and Clitheroe, which increases the pollution from cars and particularly lorries that use the main road, affecting especially the residents living close to the road, children walking to school etc. Villagers have campaigned for more than 30 years to have another controlled crossing point - the often-heard comment is that it will take a death on the road for this to become a reality. 77 houses = 154 or more cars.

3. This application shows the houses crammed into a small part of the whole site. I worry that having built those ones, the remaining 'community open space' will be built on as well.

4. At present we have many bird species in the village, including kestrel, common buzzard, bull finch, chaffinch, gold finch, barn owl and tawny owl. Granting permission for this development - and consequent ones - will reduce the habitat of these and many other creatures in Read and Simonstone.

5. Will the two primary schools cope with a considerable number of extra pupils? Could the medical centres manage more and more new patients indefinitely?

What will your consciences feel like if you approve this planning application when the same arguments against still apply? I therefore urge you to reject this planning application. It was turned down before, there are no good reasons for you to change that decision.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 June 2026 12:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-851730910

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground Read

Comments:

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to object to the planning application for Hammond Ground, Read.

My objection is based on several planning concerns. The development would increase traffic on local roads, creating additional highway safety risks and congestion. It would also result in the loss of valuable green space, harming the rural character and appearance of Read. In addition, the proposal would place further pressure on local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare services and drainage. There are also concerns that increased hard surfacing could worsen surface water flooding, and that the loss of green space and habitats would have a detrimental impact on local wildlife and biodiversity.

I am also concerned that residents have seen plans suggesting the possibility of incremental development of the Hammond Ground site. This raises the prospect that the current application could be the first phase of a larger scheme, with the cumulative impacts on traffic, infrastructure, drainage and the character of the village not being fully considered.

Taken together, these impacts would be significant and cumulative, and the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the local community, environment and the character of Read. It would also risk setting a precedent for further development of the site without proper regard to the full planning consequences. I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuse this application on clear planning grounds.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 June 2026 13:28
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to new proposed development on Hammond Ground

⚠ 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 Planning Committee,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at Hammond Ground, Read. Having [REDACTED] in the village of Read, I am deeply concerned about the impact this development will have on the historic integrity, character, and visual identity of the village.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations:

1. **Loss of Historic and Heritage Significance** The site in question was historically part of the curtilage of Read Hall, a structure of significant local importance. Allowing development on land that is inextricably linked to such a prominent historic estate risks eroding the setting and character of the Hall itself. Development on this site fails to respect the local vernacular and the historical narrative of the village.
2. **Association with Local History (The Pendle Witch Trials)** This land carries profound cultural and historical weight due to its association with the Pendle Witch Trials of 1612. This site is not merely an empty plot; it is part of the broader, sensitive landscape that defines the historical identity of this region. Introducing modern residential or commercial construction on this specific site diminishes the historical context of the area and ignores the site's significance as a tangible link to our shared past.
3. **Impact on Village Character and "Gateway" Status** The site acts as a critical visual marker- a gateway that defines the transition between the surrounding countryside and the village of Read. This "sense of arrival" is a vital component of the village's character. Replacing this open, historic boundary with built development will result in an urbanizing effect that harms the aesthetic value of the village entrance and destroys the distinct rural identity that current residents and visitors rely upon.

4. **Cumulative Impact**

The scale and nature of the proposed development are incongruous with the surrounding landscape. The introduction of this build will create a precedent for the loss of historically significant green space in the village, leading to a cumulative degradation of the area's unique landscape character.

For the reasons outlined above, I believe this proposal is contrary to the preservation of local heritage and will cause demonstrable harm to the character of Read. I urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application to ensure that the historical and cultural significance of this land is protected for the future.

I would appreciate being kept informed of the progress of this application and any future meetings regarding this decision.

Yours faithfully,
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 June 2026 13:35
To: Planning
Subject: 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.

Dear Sir/Madam

I send this emailing as a objection to the proposed above application , for the following reasons :

Historical

This ground were the former ground of the battleground of Hammond Field , this is part of our village history and to some of use we see it as consecrated land where families past fell.

Park Land

This is part of the historical (Grade2 listed) Read Hall parkland and remained under ownership of the families that lived in the hall until the 70s . Visible of this are the manicured trees where together with acres are home to many species of wildlife , deers, foxes , birds etc .

Mining

[REDACTED] here in the villages and so have my parents and grandparents, I remember vividly my grandparent telling me about mine shafts being on Hammond Ground .

Infrastructure

Most morning (weekdays) getting out of the village is horrendous , everyday traffic is queued (west) way past the proposed site beyond to Port Field Bar at its worst . The same can be said eastwardly traffic reaching back to Dean bottom at Padiham traffic .

It is utter mayhem pulling out of side streets in traffic , children crossing for schools (there is only one crossing for two villages) . Children catching buses - traffic grinds to a standstill- totally Gridlocked!

Adding circa an extra 144 vehicles into the system from this potential development will just create more chaos to a very chaotic situation.

School runs for both villages are horrendous- roads to both Read & Simonstone schools are often dangerous and I fear children reaching schools safely,

The only feasible possibility purely on the grounds of safety, 'ONLY 'to our community is that if a BYPASS WAS BUILT AROUND THE VILLAGE. (this was planned years ago).

Not withstanding all the other reasons I've listed as objections .

Regards
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

[REDACTED]
28 June 2026 15:27

To:

Planning

Subject:

Objection to development on Hammond Ground 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.

I write to object to the proposed development on Hammond Ground. My [REDACTED] has covered many of the points that I would like to raise as to why I oppose the planned development. Nothing has materially changed since a planning application to build fewer houses on this land was denied in 2018.

Cause for concern should this development go ahead are:

Loss of historic parkland associated with Read Hall.

Ecological damage to existing wildlife.

Increased traffic on an already "saturated" road. As proposed access to the site is from Whalley road, it is difficult to understand how this would not only cope with the inevitable increase in volume of traffic but also the associated noise pollution and the effect on road safety. The proposal to widen the road as it passes Hammond Ground is simply not tenable.

I find the developer's own assessment to be contradictory. They concede in the heritage evidence that "the site remains essentially parkland and a habitat of principal importance". Which is "contrary to section 41 of the NERC Act to develop within parkland.

The developers state in the PGLA landscape report at page 18 that "The layout will be orientated so that the harsh settlement edge of the rear properties along George Lane will be improved by a softer transitional edge" and at page 21 they state that "it is the rear gardens that back onto the site and therefore unlikely that the proposed development will be visible from the principal rooms".

The developers should know that many houses on George Lane are "back to front" with the front aspect looking out onto Hammond Ground side and [REDACTED], and I believe in many others, the principal rooms are on this side of the house and the proposed development would be visible from them.

The proposed plan has many examples of the above- Inaccurate statements and insufficient consideration given to major concerns.

Should the proposed development be allowed the character and integrity of Read as a village will be lost and a piece of landscape history will be lost forever.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 June 2026 16:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851765554

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Land at Hammond Ground Whalley Road Read BB12 7RP

Comments: Dear Planning Team,

I am writing to object to planning application 3/2026/0356 for 77 houses on Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read.

[REDACTED] myself, but several members of my family still do, so I spend a lot of time in Read and I know Hammond Ground very well. It is not just an empty field waiting to be built on. It is an important part of the character of the village, especially on the western side of Read. To me, Hammond Ground feels like the south-eastern entry point into the Ribble Valley - an open, green landscape that marks the transition from the more built-up areas beyond into the countryside and villages of the valley.

My main concern is that this application does not overcome the reasons why development here was refused before and why the appeal was dismissed in 2018. The Planning Inspector looked carefully at Hammond Ground and concluded that housing on this land would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and to the setting of the village. That seems just as true now as it was then.

The new application is for 77 houses, whereas the previous scheme was for up to 50. That increase is concerning, but my objection is not simply about the exact number of houses. The more important point is that allowing residential development on Hammond Ground at all would set a very damaging precedent. Once the principle of housing on this land is accepted, it becomes much harder to resist further development, revised layouts, infill, or future applications on the remaining open parts of the site. The harm begins with accepting the principle of building here.

Hammond Ground is outside the settlement boundary and still forms part of the countryside around Read. It has an open, parkland character, with mature trees and long views across the land. This openness is what makes it special. Once houses, estate roads, driveways, parking, lighting and domestic boundaries are introduced, that character will be permanently changed. New planting may soften the development over time, but it cannot replace the open parkland landscape that would be lost forever.

I am also concerned about the way the proposed green space is being presented. The application appears to rely heavily on the idea of "community parkland" to make the scheme seem acceptable. I do not think this should be given too much weight. Leaving some areas open is not the same as preserving Hammond Ground. The scheme would still establish a large housing estate within the landscape, and once that principle is accepted, the remaining open areas may become more vulnerable to future pressure for development.

I also note that the applicant's own landscape material appears to accept that there would be adverse landscape effects, even if it argues these would reduce over time. To me, that confirms the obvious point - this development would cause real harm! The fact that planting may mature in future does not change the fact that the open field and parkland setting would be replaced by built development.

There are also drainage concerns. The site is known to be wet, and the submitted drainage information refers to waterlogged or saturated ground and suggests that infiltration is unlikely to be feasible. Surface water would therefore need to be managed and discharged elsewhere. Given the slope of the land and existing local concerns about runoff, I do not think this should be treated as a minor technical matter. Building over a large area of currently open land will inevitably change how water moves through the site.

For me, the key point is simple... Hammond Ground is part of the setting and identity of Read. The previous application refusal, and appeal decision recognised that. The new proposal may have a different layout and more open space on paper, but it still means putting a substantial housing estate on land whose open character is precisely what makes it valuable.

I therefore ask the Council to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,

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

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 June 2026 16:05
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851766686

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Land at Hammond Ground Whalley Road Read BB12 7RP

Comments: I am writing to object to the above planning application. My [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Read for [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] onto the proposed development site. [REDACTED] whose historic setting is directly affected by this proposal. I grew up in this village and spend a great deal of time here. I should note that I am a [REDACTED], and whilst this is a personal objection, I have sought to engage carefully with the legal and policy framework. I know Hammond Ground well and I understand what this open, historic landscape means to the people who live alongside it. My objection is based firmly on planning considerations, and in particular on the findings of a Government Planning Inspector who visited this site in 2018 and dismissed a previous application for a smaller number of homes.

1. A Government Inspector dismissed a 50-dwelling scheme here in 2018 - this proposal is 54% larger

Appeal reference APP/T2350/W/17/3185445 was dismissed by Inspector Philip Lewis on 14 November 2018. It concerned a previous outline application by the same landowners (the Trustees of Hammond Ground) for up to 50 dwellings on this same site. The Inspector dismissed the appeal, finding that the scheme would give rise to "substantial harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and the setting of the village," harm that "significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework when taken as a whole." This new application proposes 77 dwellings, 27 more homes than the scheme the Inspector rejected on the same land, with the same landowners promoting it. The applicant must demonstrate clearly why a materially larger development on the same sensitive site now causes less harm than what was found unacceptable before. This case has not been made adequately or at all.

2. The Inspector confirmed Hammond Ground has the character and appearance of parkland - the applicant is simply trying to reopen that finding

Inspector Lewis found in 2018 that "Hammond Ground has an open character, includes a number of mature trees and has the character and appearance of parkland. It provides an attractive setting to the western part of the village." He also concluded that "on the balance of probability, I am not convinced that Hammond Ground has developed the appearance of parkland 'accidentally'." He found this conclusion was supported by historic maps dating to the 1830s, the 1896 estate

particulars describing Hammond Ground as "a valuable enclosure of park land," and the Lancashire Historic Landscape Characterisation Programme, which places the parkland in the 'ancient and post-medieval ornamental' category covering only 0.5% of the Lancashire study area.

The current Planning Statement attempts to challenge and reopen this finding, arguing that the Inspector was wrong and that Hammond Ground is not parkland. Ribble Valley Borough Council should note that the Inspector's finding was made after a full Hearing with expert landscape evidence on both sides, a site visit and careful consideration. If the same landowners, who promoted both schemes and who argued against the parkland characterisation in 2018, could not persuade the Inspector then, their renewed argument in the Planning Statement should be scrutinised carefully.

I also invite the Council to note a striking internal inconsistency in the current application: whilst the Planning Statement argues the site is not parkland, the Biodiversity Net Gain metric adopts "wood pasture and parkland" as the habitat baseline, precisely because it generates a better BNG score. The same land is not parkland for heritage and landscape purposes but is parkland for biodiversity purposes. The Council is entitled to ask the applicant to reconcile this directly.

3. The Inspector identified significant adverse visual effects specifically for residents on George Lane and Hammond Drive

The Inspector did not deal in abstract generalities. He expressly found that "there would also be significant adverse visual effects for residents and pedestrians arising from the proposed development from and between properties on George Lane and Hammond Drive, due to the harm to the parkland character and openness of Hammond Ground." [REDACTED] is in the very category of properties the Inspector identified.

The applicant argues that the revised layout, placing houses rather than open space backing onto George Lane, is an improvement on the 2018 scheme. I do not accept this. Under the 2018 scheme, the rear of the open space faced George Lane. Under the new scheme, the rear of 77 houses faces George Lane. The harm to residents on George Lane of looking out onto the rear of a housing estate built on what is currently open countryside cannot credibly be described as an improvement. If anything, the harm is more direct and immediate.

4. The Inspector found that proposed mitigation would not prevent substantial harm and the same argument is being advanced again

One of the most important aspects of the 2018 decision for this new application is the Inspector's express rejection of the mitigation argument. He acknowledged that development could be set back from Whalley Road, that bungalows could be sited on higher ground, that trees could be retained and that landscaping and a green infrastructure plan could be implemented. He considered all of this and still concluded that "the proposed mitigation measures would not prevent the development from having substantial harmful effects on the character and appearance of the countryside."

The current application makes substantially the same mitigation arguments: set-back from Whalley Road, landscaping, retained trees, bungalows at the periphery. The Inspector already weighed these and found them insufficient. The applicant has not explained why the same mitigation measures should now be regarded as sufficient to prevent substantial harm, particularly when the scheme is a third larger.

5. The applicant's own landscape assessment concedes significant harm

The Landscape and Visual Appraisal submitted with this application describes the magnitude of change to the site as "major" and assesses the immediate landscape and visual effect as "moderate

major adverse." The LVA also confirms the development is visible from Whalley Road, with users in close proximity experiencing a moderate change in view, precisely the viewpoint the Inspector found most significant in 2018.

The applicant says this harm will reduce over time as landscaping matures. Inspector Lewis considered the same argument in 2018 and rejected it. Proposed planting does not yet exist and will take years to establish. The development itself, 77 permanent homes on open pasture at the edge of the village, is irreversible.

I would also draw the Council's attention to what appears to be a fundamental error within the LVA: the site area is given as approximately 3.93 hectares in one section and approximately 19 hectares in another. This is not a typographical error; the site area is foundational to all of the landscape sensitivity and magnitude of change assessments in the document, and the two figures cannot both be correct. This inconsistency should, at minimum, require the applicant to clarify and correct the document before any weight can be placed on its conclusions.

6. The harm to Read Hall's setting has not been resolved and I have a direct personal connection to this

Inspector Lewis found that "the appeal scheme would cause some modest harm to the setting of Read Hall, due to the loss of parkland" and applied great weight to the conservation of the Grade II* listed building, as required by section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF.

As I noted above, [REDACTED]. I visit regularly and I can speak to the way Hammond Ground forms an integral part of the Hall's setting and the sense of a historic estate landscape that has survived largely intact. The current Built Heritage Statement acknowledges that the development of the eastern portion of Hammond Ground would reduce the perceived spatial separation between the settlement of Read and Read Hall, and could dilute the Hall's sense of isolation as a high-status country seat. Even on the applicant's own analysis, some harm occurs. National planning policy requires this harm to be given considerable importance and weight, and the Inspector in 2018 treated it as a material consideration that added to the case against the scheme.

I am also concerned that the mitigation proposed to address heritage harm (keeping the western land undeveloped, limiting buildings to two storeys, retaining the central tree cluster) is expressed throughout the Built Heritage Statement in aspirational language ("should remain free," "a maximum of two storeys is recommended"). If these protections are not secured through hard conditions and enforceable parameter plans, they are of no value to Read Hall's setting or to the residents and visitors who experience that setting.

7. The tilted balance did not save the 2018 scheme and it is even less likely to save a larger one

The applicant's principal policy argument is that the tilted balance under NPPF paragraph 11(d) now applies, based on an alleged housing land supply of only 3.45 years. I note that Inspector Lewis applied the tilted balance in 2018, assuming the most pessimistic supply figure put to him of 3.86 years, and still dismissed the appeal because the substantial landscape harm significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits. The current supply figure of 3.45 years is only marginally lower than the 3.86 years assumed in 2018. The tilted balance does not override everything: the second limb of paragraph 11(d) still requires that adverse impacts must not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The Inspector found in 2018 that they did. A 54% larger scheme on the same land must at least give rise to the same level of concern.

8. Drainage documents contain internal contradictions that should concern the Council

The Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application contains a direct internal contradiction: it states throughout that the development area is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), but later, in the Exception Test section of the same document, states that "the proposed development area can be found within Flood Zone 2." These two positions are mutually exclusive, and the correct classification determines which sequential and exception tests apply to this application.

The Drainage Strategy also records a proposed discharge rate that appears to conflict with the greenfield rate set out in the Flood Risk Assessment, and references climate change allowances from the Wharfe and Lower Ouse management catchment, whilst the Flood Risk Assessment correctly uses the Ribble catchment. These are different catchments with different standards. If the wrong catchment's allowances have been applied, the drainage system may not be correctly sized.

██████████ directly onto this site. They already experience waterlogged and boggy conditions in parts of the garden during wet periods. The risk that inadequately designed drainage could worsen their situation, and that of other ██████████ residents, is a real one, and the technical documents as submitted cannot be relied upon to resolve it.

9. The Transport Assessment is too narrow and contains technical inconsistencies

The Transport Assessment models only the proposed site access junction on the A671 Whalley Road. All other junctions on the network are excluded from assessment on the basis that distributed additional flows fall below a threshold. No assessment has been carried out of the cumulative impact on the wider local road network that residents actually use day to day.

The TA also identifies the locally-surveyed PM peak as 16:00 to 17:00 but uses the 17:00 to 18:00 period for TRICS trip generation calculations, a discrepancy that may mean the busiest hour for local roads was not properly tested. In addition, the Junctions9 modelling outputs contain software warnings that heavy vehicle percentages have been set to zero across all movements, with no justification offered for this in a scheme that will involve significant construction traffic and ongoing servicing of 77 homes.

The community consultation carried out by the applicant before submission confirms that congestion on Whalley Road, particularly near local schools at peak hours, is one of the most consistent and persistent concerns raised by Read residents. This concern is not adequately addressed by an assessment limited to a single new junction.

10. The NHS is effectively objecting

The NHS Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board has formally confirmed that this development falls within the catchment of Whalley Medical Centre and has requested a Section 106 contribution of £75,492 towards expanding that practice's premises. The ICB's letter states explicitly that "failure to secure the contribution we have requested effectively means that we are objecting to the application." The ICB has also confirmed there is a 100% funding gap for the necessary works and that capacity must be created before the new population arrives. This is a live objection from a statutory consultee that must be addressed and resolved before any permission could lawfully be granted.

11. Lancashire County Council's archaeologists have challenged the desk-based assessment

Lancashire County Council's Planning Officer for Archaeology has submitted a substantive response

that challenges the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment's methodology, finding that it understates the potential for pre-medieval and medieval remains by treating an absence of recorded finds as equivalent to low potential for survival. The County Archaeologist draws attention to the significance of the nearby Anglo-Saxon settlement at Whalley, one of the oldest parishes in Lancashire, challenges the DBA's medieval ridge-and-furrow interpretation, and identifies undetermined features across the geophysical survey that suggest buried remains may survive across areas of the site where construction is proposed. A pre-commencement archaeological investigation condition has been recommended. I strongly support that recommendation.

12. The "community open space" does not address concerns about future development

The proposal to designate the majority of Hammond Ground as community open space managed by a residents' management company does not provide long-term protection from further planning applications. Management company structures can change; companies can be dissolved. Once development is established on part of Hammond Ground, with new access roads, infrastructure and a resident population, it becomes significantly harder to resist further proposals for the remainder of the land. Local residents who recall that the Trustees' early aspirations reportedly extended to 700 houses on this land are right to be sceptical about the permanence of this arrangement.

Conclusion

I ask Ribble Valley Borough Council to refuse this application. A Government Planning Inspector visited this site, heard expert evidence on both sides, and found in 2018 that a smaller scheme gave rise to "substantial harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and the setting of the village," harm that "significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits." This new application proposes 54% more homes on the same land. The applicant's response to the Inspector's central finding is essentially to argue that the Inspector was wrong, rather than demonstrating that the landscape harm has been resolved. The same mitigation arguments advanced in 2018 and expressly rejected by the Inspector are advanced again. The drainage and flood risk documents contain internal contradictions that undermine confidence in the technical assessment. The NHS is effectively objecting. The County Archaeologist has raised concerns. The community is overwhelmingly opposed. The site is the same sensitive, historic and irreplaceable landscape it was in 2018.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 June 2026 17:20
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-851779004

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground,Read

Comments: Previous application was turned down by the Secretary of States Planning Inspector in 2018.The only conditions that have changed since then are an increase in traffic levels.More housing will exaserbate the situation and lead to drivers using minor country lanes as "rat runs",making conditions more dangerous and inconvenient for farmers,cyclists,pedestrians and equestrians.Also,any future developments will result in the loss of historic parkland and destroy the attractive countryside setting of Read village,therefore I strongly object to this planning application.
Yours sincerely,[REDACTED].