

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 June 2026 15:19
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-849745004

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground,
Read

Comments: I wish to oppose the proposed housing development on Hammond Ground in Read. Hammond Ground is a substantial area of countryside linked to the villages character, its loss would alter the attractive nature of the village, and historic parkland character of Hammond Ground. The village already sees a lot of through traffic, with the A671 (whalley road) at times being extremely busy, a housing development onto this road would put significantly more pressure onto this infrastructure. Read Hall is a significant local landmark, with historic grounds and open areas for wildlife, building on such precious land seems carefree to its historic past, and would be used as a stepping stone for further development on this type of land that is so valued by the local people.

I am writing to object to the proposed development. My grounds for objecting are outlined below and are also informed by my [REDACTED]

1. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA).

- a). The PEA makes various and contradictory references to the parkland value of this area. Whilst it acknowledges the importance and value of this parkland, it attempts to suggest that it is less valuable as it is not registered on Natural England's (NE) Wood Pasture Parkland Inventory. The NE Wood Pasture Parkland Inventory is NOT a statutory designation. It is an evidence database and is recognised as "provisional" and 'that not all sites have been identified. No weight should be afforded to the sites current absence from this inventory.
- b) Paragraph (Para) 1.1.8 of the PEA states that "pasture and parkland is a priority habitat as listed in UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP). The report continues "it is contrary to the recommendations outlined in Section 41 of the NERC Act to develop within parkland". The NERC Act places a statutory requirement on planning departments. On this basis RBVC Planning Department should refuse this planning application.
- c) Section 41 of NERC Act does provide for circumstances in which it could be possible to allow development in parkland. These exceptions are where "it can be proved that development proposal will enhance/benefit the ecosystem present and/or its development for wholly exceptional reasons that can be offset via a suitable compensation strategy". In neither the PEA or the Biodiversity Net Gain Report does the applicant meet any of these exceptions. As this development proposal does not meet any of these requirements RVBC should refuse this planning application.
- d). This development proposal would result in the loss of parkland as a result of the construction of 77 homes (and possibly a larger area if you consider the plan provided by the applicant in their Geo Env and Coal Mining Risk Report: Appendix A Concept Design Document Phase 1 Geo Env). The PEA does not accurately explain or assess the negative ecological and visual loss. Rather it states (without evidence) that the parkland is "degraded" and that this development proposal will enable a range of environmental enhancements that would culminate in a "net biodiversity net gain". Not only is the evidence base for these assertions not available, there is absolutely no substantiation in terms of time it would take to achieve environmental enhancements, or in a calculation of upfront and ongoing costs, necessary organisational structures, and mechanisms to secure benefits in perpetuity, to achieve what at best can be described as 'unfounded ecological projections'. Indeed the PEA also states that the public access part of these proposals would provide a threat to the parkland through 'trampling of grasses, damage to trees, and wildlife disturbance.
- f). The PEA makes clear the value and importance of parkland in terms ecological value.

2. Biodiversity Net Gain Report (BNG)

- a) As with the PEA this report also reinforces the importance of parkland and of this parkland. This is material to the refusal of the development proposal.
- b) This report suggest a range of measures that will, it claims, result in BNGs well in excess of the 10% target. The assessment is based on the difference between a survey of existing habitat, and "proposed habitat changes arising from future ecological enhancements based an illustrative landscape plan (post-construction) provided by the client". Whilst the report outlines an extensive range of environmental enhancements there is no assessment of costs

(initial and ongoing) to deliver these enhancements. Nor does the developer explain how these costs will be funded. Without a fully costed, funded and viable means of delivering these enhancements the delivery of these proposed benefits is at best speculative and more realistically unachievable. Without the certainty of a 106 agreement to fund, manage and secure this land in perpetuity this proposals worthless.

c). So not only are these proposed benefits undeliverable, the basis for BNG gains in excess of 10% is not adequately proven. This report does not provide sufficient evidence or granularity to substantiate these BNG claims.

d) Any environmental enhancements would take years to deliver benefits and in the intervening period there would be a reduction in biodiversity, and the uncertainty of sufficient future enhancements.

e). Most significantly the report does not explain how the loss of a large area of parkland can be compensated by environmental enhancements to the remaining parts.

Based on ecological and BNG grounds it is clear that this development proposal would have a significant negative impact and would be in contravention of Section 41 of NERC act.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 June 2026 19:42
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-849788040

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

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

Comments: Further to my objection made a few days ago, I have just noticed an 8ft fence will abut the [REDACTED] and I specifically object to this on the grounds that it will affect the natural [REDACTED] and spoil the entire [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 22 June 2026 12:12
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Objections 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.

Hello,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at Hammond Ground. REF no: 3/2026/0356

Our objections are based on the following material planning considerations:

1. Loss of Historic Parkland Character

The proposal would result in the permanent loss of the historic parkland character of Hammond Ground. This landscape forms an important part of the area's identity and heritage, and its erosion would represent an irreversible change.

2. Harm to the Countryside Setting of Read Village

The development would significantly damage the attractive rural setting of Read village. The open countryside surrounding the village is a defining feature, and its gradual erosion would undermine the village's distinct character.

3. Urbanisation of Open Landscape

The site currently contributes to an important open landscape. Introducing a substantial housing development would urbanise this space, fundamentally altering its visual and environmental quality.

4. Impact on the Historic Landscape of Read Hall

The proposal would harm the historic landscape associated with Read Hall. The relationship between the Hall and its surrounding landscape is an important heritage asset, and development within this setting would diminish its significance.

5. Increased Harm Compared to Previously Refused Scheme

It is important to note that a smaller scheme of 50 houses was rejected by the Secretary of State's Planning Inspector in 2018. The current proposal for 77 houses represents a significantly larger development and would therefore result in even greater harm, amplifying concerns already identified and upheld.

6. Questionable Role of Proposed Open Space

The inclusion of community open space appears to be primarily intended to make the scheme more acceptable in planning terms. There is concern that this could act as a precursor or stepping stone to further development

7. Strain on Local Infrastructure

Local infrastructure is already under considerable pressure. Additional housing would exacerbate existing issues, including increased traffic congestion, limited school capacity, and pressures on healthcare services. There is insufficient evidence that the necessary infrastructure improvements can be delivered to support this scale of development.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development is inappropriate for this location and would cause significant harm to the character, heritage, and infrastructure of the area. We therefore respectfully request that the application be refused.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted title]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 13:11
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-849983966

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground, Read

Comments: Both [REDACTED] I strongly oppose the proposed development plan on Hammond ground.

There will be a massive impact on on the existing infrastructure, roads and living quality.

The strain on local infrastructure will be excessive, placing demands and strains on schools, GP and healthcare services and adding to already busy local roads.

There are existing concerns regarding traffic safety and volume with the schools in both Read and Simonstone greatly concerned about children's safety on the A671 in both directions.

These will include-

Pressure on junctions, access points and safety

Construction traffic over several years

Noise, disruption and day-to-day inconvenience

We are not opposed to housing, we need more houses, particularly affordable houses and retirement houses that are not excessive in price. However this is the wrong development, in the wrong place.

We are also aware that this location has already been judged unsuitable and unacceptable by RVBC.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 13:27
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-850004229

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground

Comments: We object to the development due to the amount of traffic it will bring to the village on top of what we already deal with, with everyone using Read as a way to travel out of the Ribble Valley to the M65 & M55 of a morning and evening.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 June 2026 14:28
To: Planning
Subject: Objections - Planning Application No: 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 Planning Officer,

Re: Objection to the proposed residential development at Hammond Ground, Read. Planning Number 3/2026/0356

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 77 dwellings at Hammond Ground, Read. I ask that the Local Planning Authority gives full weight to the following planning concerns when determining the application.

Housing need and the scale of development

I have not seen evidence demonstrating that there is a specific housing need within the village of Read that would justify a development of this scale. Significant housing development has already taken place in nearby settlements, including Padiham, Whalley and Clitheroe, and I am concerned that the proposal would not reflect the character, size or infrastructure capacity of Read as a small village.

The proposed number of dwellings would represent a substantial change to the settlement and risks urbanising an area whose value lies in its semi-rural setting, openness and relationship with the surrounding countryside.

Impact on village character, landscape and heritage

Read is valued by residents for its village identity, historic character and countryside setting. Hammond Ground forms part of that wider landscape character and contributes to the sense of openness and separation that distinguishes the village from more urbanised settlements nearby.

Introducing a large residential estate on this site would cause permanent and irreversible harm to the appearance of the area. It would alter the landscape of Read in a way that is out of keeping with its existing scale, form and setting. The local authority should protect the countryside and the historic character of the village, rather than permit development that would fundamentally change them.

Ecology and biodiversity

The parkland and surrounding open land at Hammond Ground provide habitat for wildlife and contribute to the ecological value of the area. Development of the site is likely to disturb wildlife, reduce habitat, and weaken the natural character of the village edge. Any assessment of the application should therefore give careful consideration to biodiversity, habitat loss, and the long-term ecological impact of the scheme.

Proposed open space and risk of further development

I am concerned that the proposed community open space is being presented as a benefit without sufficient clarity about its long-term management, maintenance, security or impact on the village. If it

is intended to attract visitors from outside the immediate area, it could increase traffic and parking pressure on roads that are already used by local residents.

I am also concerned that the current proposal could create a precedent for further development in future years. The application should be assessed not only in isolation, but also in terms of the wider cumulative impact on the village and its countryside setting.

Traffic, highway safety and infrastructure

The main road through Read is already extremely busy, carrying heavy goods vehicles, commuter traffic and local traffic. A development of 77 predominantly family homes would generate a significant number of additional vehicle movements each day, including at peak times.

I do not consider that the village has the highway capacity or infrastructure to accommodate the additional traffic, parking demand and pressure on local services that would arise from this proposal. The impact on highway safety, congestion and residential amenity should weigh strongly against granting permission.

Planning history and consistency of decision-making

I understand that previous applications for smaller-scale development in this area have been refused, including at appeal. I cannot see what has materially changed to justify approval of a larger scheme now. If previous concerns related to the countryside location, landscape impact and conflict with the development plan remain unresolved, those same concerns should apply with even greater force to the current proposal.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the application is refused. In my view, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of Read, the surrounding countryside, local ecology, highway conditions and village infrastructure. It would also represent an inappropriate scale of development for this location.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

Sent from [Outlook](#)

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 14:32
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - Application 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-850031743

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: Application 3/2026/0356

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

Comments: I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the proposed development of 77 houses on the parkland at Hammond Ground, Read village. I appreciate that housing needs are a genuine consideration, but I strongly believe this is simply the wrong place to build, and I hope the planning committee will carefully consider the concerns shared by so many in our community.

The Loss of Historic Parkland Would Be Permanent

Hammond Ground is part of the historic parkland of Read Hall. A beautiful and irreplaceable landscape that defines the character of this village. Once built on, it is gone forever. This isn't greenfield land on the edge of a town; it is a heritage landscape with genuine historical significance, and it deserves to be protected as such.

This Site Was Already Refused and the New Proposal Is Even Larger

It is worth highlighting that a scheme of 50 houses on this very site was considered by the Secretary of State's Planning Inspector in 2018 and rejected. The current application proposes 77 houses which is a significantly larger development on the same land. If the principle of building here was found to be unacceptable then, it is difficult to see how a bigger scheme could now be considered appropriate?

The Setting of Read Hall Matters

The historic relationship between Read Hall and its surrounding parkland is part of what makes this corner of the Ribble Valley so special. Introducing a housing estate into that setting would cause lasting harm to a heritage landscape that belongs, in a very real sense, to all of us.

Our Local Infrastructure Is Already Stretched

Many residents will share concerns about the practical impact of 77 new homes on our roads, schools, and healthcare services. These pressures are already felt day to day, and it is reasonable to ask whether our infrastructure can genuinely absorb this level of growth without significant investment that, at present, does not appear to be in place.

The Open Space Inclusion Doesn't Tell the Whole Story

While the inclusion of community open space within the proposal may appear positive at first glance, it is worth noting that this space appears to be designed primarily to make the wider scheme more

acceptable and to act as a stepping stone for further development down the line rather than as a genuine, lasting community asset. Or are we looking to join Read right through to Clitheroe?

In Closing

I hope the planning committee will listen to the voices of those of us who live here and love this area. This is not about being resistant to change. It is about protecting something genuinely special that, once lost, cannot be recovered. I respectfully but firmly urge the committee to refuse this application.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 June 2026 15:02
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application no. 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.

Formal Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0356 land at Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read BB12 7RP

Dear Planning Officer

I wish to formally object to the planning application for the proposed development of 77 new dwellings at Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read BB12 7RP.

As a local resident, I have significant concerns regarding the impact this development would have on the village, its residents, the local environment, and existing infrastructure.

1. Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

The proposed development would generate a substantial increase in vehicle movements onto an already heavily trafficked main road. Traffic congestion is already a concern at peak times, and the addition of 77 dwellings is likely to exacerbate existing problems, resulting in increased delays, reduced road safety, and additional pressure on the local highway network.

Of particular concern is the likely increase in traffic using the surrounding rural lanes as shortcuts to avoid congestion. These lanes are frequently used by pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders, and other vulnerable road users. Vehicles already travel along these routes at excessive speeds and often without due regard for pedestrian safety. Additional traffic generated by the development would inevitably increase the risk of accidents and further diminish the safety and enjoyment of these rural routes.

2. Harm to the Character and Appearance of the Village

The village has a distinct semi-rural character which is highly valued by residents and contributes significantly to its identity. The scale of this development is out of keeping with the existing pattern of development and would represent a significant urbanisation of the area.

The proposal would erode the transition between the built settlement and the surrounding countryside, resulting in a development that would appear intrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the village. The loss of open views and rural setting would have a lasting adverse effect on the local landscape.

3. Loss of Countryside and Historic Parkland

The proposed development would result in the permanent loss of open countryside and historic parkland. Once developed, these valuable landscape assets cannot be replaced. Such land contributes to the setting, heritage, and visual amenity of the village and should be protected for future generations.

The irreversible loss of this open land would significantly alter the rural nature of the area and diminish the quality of the local environment.

4. Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity

The site currently provides habitat for a variety of wildlife and supports existing flora and fauna. Development of the land would inevitably lead to habitat loss, disturbance of wildlife, and a reduction in biodiversity.

Whilst mitigation measures may be proposed, they cannot fully compensate for the destruction of established habitats and ecosystems. The council has a responsibility to ensure that biodiversity is protected and enhanced wherever possible, and I do not believe this proposal adequately achieves that objective.

5. Questions Regarding Open Space Management

The application refers to areas of public open space, green corridors, and pedestrian walkways. However, it remains unclear who will be responsible for the long-term maintenance, management, and funding of these areas.

There is also insufficient information regarding how anti-social behaviour, vandalism, littering, and public safety concerns would be monitored and managed. Without robust and enforceable management arrangements, these areas risk becoming neglected and creating ongoing issues for both existing and future residents.

6. Lack of Demonstrated Local Housing Need

The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that this development would address a genuine local housing need. There are already a number of properties available for sale within the village, including homes marketed as affordable housing.

Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the proposed dwellings will be genuinely affordable to local people, first-time buyers, or young families seeking to remain within the community. As such, the claimed benefits of the development in meeting local housing demand appear questionable.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I believe this proposal would result in:

- Increased traffic congestion and highway safety risks;
- Harm to the character and appearance of the village;
- Permanent loss of open countryside and historic parkland;
- Adverse impacts on wildlife, biodiversity, and natural habitats;
- Uncertainty regarding the future management of open spaces and associated anti-social behaviour;

- Limited evidence that the scheme would provide genuinely affordable housing for local residents.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuses planning permission for this application.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 22 June 2026 16:24
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to 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.

Application Reference: 3/2026/0356

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

Proposal: Erection of 77 dwellings

To the Planning Officer,

I am writing to formally object to the planning application reference **3/2026/0356** for the proposed residential development at Hammond Ground, Read. As a local resident, I urge the planning committee to refuse this application based on the following material planning considerations:

- **Established Planning Precedent & Previous Appeal Dismissal:** This site has a clear history of refusal. In 2018, a Planning Inspector dismissed an appeal for a smaller development (50 homes) on Hammond Ground, explicitly concluding that development here would cause “*significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside*” and damage a valued landscape. Increasing the scale to 77 homes only intensifies the harmful impact previously rejected by the Planning Inspectorate.
- **Significant Harm to the Character of the Countryside:** The application site is outside the defined settlement boundary for Read and forms a valued, historic parkland landscape that provides an essential open buffer. Developing this site would result in severe urban creep and destroy the rural character and scenic quality that defines the western approach to the village. On your own local plan this area is shown as EN2 Open Countryside. The proposal directly conflicts with **Key Statement EN2** because it introduces large-scale, market-led residential development into the Open Countryside on a site that does not meet any rural exception criteria, thereby failing to protect and enhance the landscape value of Read.
- Furthermore, the proposal directly conflicts with **Policy DMG1 (General Considerations)** of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy on multiple fronts. Under the *Design and Local Distinctiveness* criteria, DMG1 requires development to be sympathetic to the character and visual amenity of the area. A high-density estate of 77 dwellings would entirely overwrite the historic, open parkland character of Hammond Ground, failing to protect the local distinctiveness of this rural approach to Read.
- **Infrastructure and Sustainability Capacity:** Under the *Amenity and Infrastructure* criteria, the development violates DMG1 by failing to demonstrate that local services—specifically primary education and healthcare provision—have the capacity to absorb the massive influx of residents. Of note is the letter from the **Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board** which describes a potential further 233 patient registrations at the nearest practice, Sabden and Whalley Medical Group to meet not only these demands but those of developments across Whalley, Billington and Barrow. The ICB explicitly states that any additional population

growth "**can only be addressed through extension and reconfiguration**" because the current space cannot cope as it stands. The location and building character of both the main and satellite practices would make expansion difficult and expensive, if not impossible. The main King Street Whalley Surgery in particular has had 3 expansions already over the years and has no remaining land for outward expansion.

- **Highway Safety and Traffic Volatility:** Finally, the creation of a major new access point onto the A671 Whalley Road directly conflicts with DMG1's strict requirements for safe highway access, introducing severe traffic volatility and safety risks to an already very congested thoroughfare, which is one of the main economic access points for commuters to/from the Ribble Valley.

•

Because the application fails to meet these fundamental safeguarding criteria, it represents unsustainable development and I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 16:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-850087468

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground

Comments: The current infrastructure is under extreme pressure without the threat of proposed 77 dwellings, which will increase the strain on schools, healthcare and traffic etc. This planning will only open the door for further development in the future and the proposed community open space will be swallowed up.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 June 2026 17:56
To: Planning
Subject: Proposed development Read village

 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.

Sent from my Galaxy
Ref no. 3/2026/0356

To whom it may concern

I am writing to object to the proposal to build 77 houses on the outskirts of Read. I'm sure 77 is just the thin end of the wedge. If the development gets the go ahead it won't be long before more permission is sought.

I don't live in the village therefore I cannot be accused of nimbyism. I do visit occasionally and drive through often. Traffic on this road is heavy presently.

More houses equals more cars so the village will become even more of a bottleneck.

As for infrastructure, G.P's, schools, etc. the village won't be able to cope.

Read is such a perfect, beautiful village this proposed development will rob it of it's identity and character.

I'm sure you will come to the correct decision.

Yours sincerely
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 19:09
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-850136678

[REDACTED] Miller

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground Read

Comments: Unbelievable that once again we have to fight this development. This development was rejected by the Secretary of States planning inspector in 2018.

Yet they come back with a proposal for even more housing.

We have seen all the devastation in Clitheroe and surrounding areas because of building on Green fields. There is hardly any land not being developed causing all our villages to be swallowed up.

This proposed development will make life pretty unpleasant. Already at peak times I'm unable to get out of my Avenue because of the weight of traffic. And we all know that promises to make a community open space, will in later years, also be built on.

We do not have the infrastructure to support this development. We have no secondary schools, two over subscribed primary schools. No doctors or dentist.

My main and overriding concern is traffic, we know that there is no chance of a bypass that we so desperately need. We are already living close to three industrial estates. This development will make the roads, and safely ten times worse than it already is. I therefore ask you to reject it out of hand

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 21:15
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-850165935

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground

Comments: I wish to object as the road through Read and Simonstone is already too busy due to access to the motorway. You cannot cross the road safely and if there are more residents, there will be more vehicles. We have lived here [REDACTED] and have seen increased traffic due to excessive house building in Barrow and Whalley, who use the road to Burnley and the motorway. The main road cannot cope with more and more traffic....the residents on the main road will be severely affected and neighbouring roads are also affected. Additionally, we often walk through Read Hall and Hammond Drive to take advantage of being so close to beautiful countryside.. this historic landscape will be no more if houses are built. It has already been rejected for a reason and that reason has not changed. Ribble Valley need to retain the open landscape and houses could be built elsewhere, on the outskirts of Clitheroe with better access roads.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 June 2026 21:49
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - planning application 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-850173862

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: planning application 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground

Comments: I strongly OBJECT to planning application 3/2026/0356 for the proposed 77 house development on Hammond Ground. I suspect if this application is granted then it would pave the way for further development on Hammond Ground and surrounding areas. We will lose wonderful open countryside, never to be seen or appreciated by future generations. We need to safeguard Hammond Ground.

I have been a resident of Read for [REDACTED] and have seen a significant increase in volume of traffic through the village over this time. I hope the council have considered the correlation between the increase in housing development, road traffic, cost of road repairs, road traffic accidents, and this would point towards refusing the application.

When roadworks are carried out on the A671 this pushes traffic to the country lanes and backroads of the village of Read which is dangerous to walkers, cyclists, horse riders, (Read Stables) dog walkers.

The proposed housing development would have a negative impact on our already strained infrastructure, School and nursery places, healthcare, Utilities, highways, social care, drainage systems. Again, this should point towards refusing the application.

Hammond Ground is an important area of historic parkland and open countryside that benefits the wellbeing of everybody, but unfortunately it is the will of a few who do not live here, and would not be subject to the loss of the wonderful countryside of Hammond Ground that wish to remove it from us. I cannot see what they would lose, but I suspect they would gain financially.

I would urge the Ribble Valley Borough Council to refuse the application.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 June 2026 15:09
To: Planning
Subject: f/a LYNDSEY HAYES RE Formal Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0356 – 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.

FROM:-

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], [REDACTED]
[Insert Your Postcode]

23rd June, 2026

TO:-

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

RE: Planning Application 3/2026/0356

Proposal: Erection of 77 no dwellings and creation of community parkland

Location: Land at Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read, BB12 7RP

Case Officer: Lyndsey Hayes

Dear Sirs,

We are writing to register our strong, formal objection to the planning application referenced above. We are deeply concerned that this application is being reconsidered yet again when the reasons for its refusal ten years ago remain entirely valid. In many respects, the situation in our village has since become considerably worse.

The proposal to build up to 77 houses on Hammond Ground goes against both local and national planning policies. A smaller scheme on this exact site was previously dismissed at appeal by the Government Planning Inspector. This larger proposal significantly worsens all of those previous issues.

We object to the development based on the following material planning considerations:

1. Severe Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Public Services

The villages of Read and neighbouring Simonstone are already struggling with overstretched infrastructure. Local schools and doctors' surgeries are operating at or near full capacity, with waiting lists already in place. Adding a further 77 homes would place an unsustainable and dangerous burden on these essential services.

2. Dangerous Road Safety, Traffic, and Highway Concerns

The single access point will dump significant extra traffic onto the A671 (Whalley Road). The condition of the A671 and surrounding roads is already poor, with potholes and inadequate

maintenance posing ongoing concerns. Increased traffic, together with heavy construction vehicles, would only worsen the situation. Traffic through Read is already regarded as highly dangerous. Many residents refer to the route as the “Read Racetrack” due to severe speeding and congestion. It is fortunate that there have not been more serious accidents in recent years.

3. Parking Crisis and Accessibility Problems

Parking within Read village is already extremely difficult. Many households now own two or more vehicles, resulting in cars being parked along main roads and partially on pavements. This creates serious accessibility issues for disabled residents, people using mobility aids, and parents with prams, who are often forced into the road to pass safely. Adding 77 more homes will push our village streets past breaking point.

4. Substantial Harm to an Important Historic and Cultural Landscape

Hammond Ground forms a critical part of the historic setting for the Grade II* listed Read Hall and its associated parkland, which has regional and county heritage significance. This land is historically linked to the English Civil War's Battle of Read Bridge. Building on what is understood to be a sacred burial ground would be a profound loss to the village and an act of irreversible damage to an area of important historical and cultural significance.

5. Loss of Valuable Farmland and Vital Wildlife Habitat

The proposed development would permanently remove precious pastureland currently used by local farmers at a time when agricultural land is already under increasing pressure. It would also completely destroy important wildlife habitat. This open greenfield site is regularly inhabited by deer and other local species that will be permanently displaced. [\[1\]](#)

6. Direct Damage and Urbanisation of the Countryside Setting

Hammond Ground is an important open landscape that sits strictly outside the defined settlement boundary of Read. Developing this land directly violates Core Strategy policies meant to protect the open countryside. It replaces highly valued, wide-open views with a dense suburban housing estate. This project constitutes an inappropriate and jarring urban encroachment that erodes the vital rural buffer keeping our local villages separate. [\[1, 2\]](#)

We sincerely hope this letter helps convey the depth of concern felt not just by us but also by the wider community of local residents who wish to protect the character, safety, and heritage of our beautiful village. The adverse impacts of this development clearly and significantly outweigh any perceived benefits. We strongly urge the planning committee to refuse this application. [\[1, 2, 3\]](#)

Please keep us informed of any updates, committee dates, or decisions regarding this application.

Yours faithfully,



23 J

20 June 2026

Planning Department
RVBC
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

23 JUN 2026

Re, **Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0356**
Hammond Ground, Read

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to formally object to the above Planning Application for housing on Hammond Ground because,

1. It conflicts with previous decisions which were carefully agreed and designed to preserve the biodiversity, open space and visual amenity of the parkland.
2. Historically, Hammond Ground is important when on the 30 April 1643 a battle took place there when a Parliamentary force under the command of Captain Ashton defeated The Earl of Derby. It is well documented that the slain were buried in Hammond Ground.
3. Access on to the A671, a very busy and narrow road, would be further compromised by this proposed development. Even now, emergency vehicles are sometimes delayed at peak periods due to volume of traffic.
4. Furthermore, this planning application, if approved, would almost certainly lead to further Planning Applications in the near future.

Yours faithfully