

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 June 2026 10:31
To: Planning
Subject: Planning number 3/2026/0356 at 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.

Dear Sir/madam

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the planning application 3/2026/0356 for a residential development at Hammond Ground .

I am a [REDACTED], part of [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. My residential [REDACTED] at the exact point where the road speed limit changes from 30 to 40 mph when leaving the village of Read.

According to the Planning assessments and department for transport data framework for Lancashire 10,000- 14,000 vehicles pass this A671 corridor on an average day. A high percentage of these are heavy large commercial vehicles such as lorries and agricultural vehicles etc. There are also many other emergency vehicles because of the proximity of the ambulance station at Altham. They and the lighter traffic constantly disrespect the speed limit and are travelling well over the higher limit as they enter it, just prior to the proposed entrance / exit to the Hammond Ground Development. Traffic would be travelling far too fast to get into lane and stop in the short distance between the limit and the proposed entrance/exit to Hammond Ground leading to more accidents.

The footpaths on either side are well used by walkers, dog walkers, joggers, people from the caravan park etc. The path on the Worthalls (south side) is very narrow, uneven and narrowed by the hedge which it is illegal to cut at this time of year because of nesting birds, with difficulty for pedestrians to pass each other.

The proposed 3rd lane would put pedestrians at great danger as heavy traffic was pushed over to nearer the kerb sides because of it and with little opportunity to cross over the busy road.

It would create a DEATH TRAP for vehicles turning right across 2 lanes of traffic for properties on the south side of the A671 from where the 3rd lane started .

As residents, the traffic is so heavy we restrict going onto the main road at peak traffic times , which are constantly increasing in length with heaviest flows towards Padiham in the morning and towards Clitheroe in the afternoon. There is already frequent congestion with traffic in the village which is often blocked and built up way back on the Clitheroe side which this development would exacerbate.

Hammond Ground is a vital component of the historic landscape buffer surrounding the Grade 2 listed Read Hall Estate. The urbanisation of this land permanently destroys a centuries old parkland setting introducing urban creep .

It directly conflicts with Core Strategy landscape protection policies of the nearby Forest of Bowland

(AONB) Hammond Ground not just an ordinary empty field, it holds documented historical value.

Under the National Planning Policy Framework and Ribble Valley Core Strategy(Policies DMG1, DMG2 and Key Statement EN5) development that fails to protect the historic environment or causes '' less than substantial harm'' without an overwhelming public benefit should be refused

Read is tier 1 settlement with only 1 primary school and one small pharmacy.
There is no GP in the village and Whalley GP is already heavily overloaded.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 10:36
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851567821

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground Read

Comments: I object to the building of these property's on the grounds of

1. Pressure increase on local infrastructure.
- 2 Loss again of local countryside and historic parkland
- 3 The disrespect for nature within the area
- 4 Increase in traffic on already congested roads.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 11:02
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-851572255

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

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

Comments: I wish to formally object to the proposed development of 77 dwellings within the village of Read.

While I recognise the importance of providing new housing, I believe this proposal represents an inappropriate scale of development for the village and would result in significant adverse impacts on local infrastructure, the environment, traffic conditions, and the character of the community.

My concerns are set out below.

Traffic and Highway Safety

The existing road network within and around Read is already under considerable pressure, particularly during peak commuting and school hours. The addition of 77 new dwellings would inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle movements.

Many local roads are narrow, constrained, and not designed to accommodate a significant rise in traffic volumes. Increased congestion would adversely affect highway safety for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists alike. Particular concern should be given to:

- increased traffic through the village centre;
- pedestrian safety near schools and residential areas;
- limited visibility and access points;
- additional parking pressures on surrounding roads.

Given the scale of the proposal, I do not believe sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the local highway infrastructure can safely and sustainably accommodate this level of development.

Pressure on Local Services and Infrastructure

Read is a relatively small village with limited public infrastructure. Existing local services, including GP surgeries, schools, and other community facilities, are already operating under strain.

The proposed development would place additional pressure on:

local primary and secondary school capacity;

GP and NHS services;

There appears to be insufficient clarity regarding how these services would be expanded or funded to meet the needs of a significantly larger population. Development should not proceed unless the necessary infrastructure improvements are secured and demonstrably deliverable.

Environmental Impact

The proposed site contributes to the rural setting and environmental character of Read. Development on this scale risks the unnecessary loss of green space and could negatively affect local biodiversity and wildlife habitats.

There is also concern regarding:

loss of natural landscape character;

increased pollution and surface water runoff;

The cumulative environmental impact should be carefully considered, particularly given growing national and local concerns regarding climate resilience and protection of green spaces.

Impact on Heritage and Village Character

Read possesses a distinct historic and rural character which contributes greatly to its identity and sense of place. A development of 77 dwellings risks urbanising the village and undermining its traditional appearance and setting.

The proposal does not appear to sufficiently respect:

the scale and character of the existing settlement;

important views and landscape features;

the historic nature of the village environment.

Incremental growth may be appropriate where it is proportionate and sympathetic, but this proposal represents a substantial expansion that could permanently alter the character of the community.

Scale and Sustainability of the Development

The scale of the development appears disproportionate relative to the size of Read itself. Sustainable development should be supported by adequate infrastructure, services, and transport links. In this instance, the proposal risks creating a level of growth that local facilities are unable to absorb.

I respectfully ask the Council to consider whether this proposal genuinely represents sustainable development in accordance with local planning policy and the wider public interest.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly urge the Council to refuse this application. While housing delivery is important, it must be balanced against the capacity of local infrastructure, environmental protection, highway safety, and the preservation of village character.

I ask that the concerns of local residents and the long-term wellbeing of the community are given full and proper consideration during determination of this application.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 12:03
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851576023

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground, Read, Lancashire

Comments: I am writing to provide additional points of objection to this proposed development. This development will have an immediate and irreversible negative impact to the landscape and visual value of Hammond Ground. The applicants own Landscape Appraisal states at paragraph 5.11 “The impact of the proposed development will cause long term effects on the landscape fabric...”. And at paragraph 5.14 “The magnitude of change is considered to be major due to the obvious change to the fabric and cover of the south eastern part of the Site by removal of the field and replacement with the residential dwellings”. In summary this parkland area would be permanently lost and can not be replaced.

The proposed development will have a dramatic and detrimental impact to the visual amenity from my own property. And whilst I understand this private view is not directly afforded any protection it is a requirement that the planning authority considers the overall impact upon residential amenity. My property is designed, built and orientated to face Hammond Ground. On my property, decking, conservatory/lounge, primary garden, bedrooms (3 of 4), bathroom, and dining room all face onto Hammond Ground. This development would have a permanent and deleterious impact, and there is little is any evidence of an attempt to mitigate these negative aspects.

Finally, I notice that the applicant makes great play of the benefits and mitigations afford by their proposal to provide public access to the remaining parts of the site. However, there is no evidence or analysis of how these benefits could be secured. For example if this site was to enable public access it is glaringly obvious that the proposed plans do NOT provide any parking for this proposed public access. Most concerning is that fact that none of these public benefits are afforded and guaranteed the essential requirements:

- A) protection in perpetuity of the remaining parts of the site against any further development (for example by gifting the land to a charity or local authority)
- B) assessment of capital and revenue costs to deliver these ecological and public access benefits. Given the weight the applicant gives to these benefits it is alarming that these costs have not been estimated,
- C) provision of capital and revenue funding to deliver the proposed benefits (for example by the applicant establishing and gifting a fund). The proposal to apply these costs to the new residents provides no indication of how this could be achieved or secured!

D) a permanent and viable means of managing these improvements and maintenance and operation of the public site (for example by gifting the land, and a fund to a wildlife or other relevant charity)
Given the above it would appear that no weight can be afforded to these 'proposed' benefits.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 13:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 38441 FS-Case-851590553

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 38441

Address of Development: Hammond Ground Read

Comments: The idea that this development will benefit the village of Read is preposterous. Aside from the already increase in traffic towards the M65, as a result of over development in Whalley Barrow and Clitheroe, something the planners didn't consider or care about when saturating that area.

Mire concerning is the local infrastructure regarding schools, dentists, doctors, all are grossly inadequate to accommodate further building. The lack of affordable housing is also alarming, The maintenance of the so called parkland area, has holes in it, and no or little consultation with residents has taken place. This government's promise was that, and to quote from the mouth of Angela Raynor, "no houses will be built without the full co operation and agreement of the local community". It appears not the case. It will be a travesty if this development is allowed to go ahead. Your planning department DOES NOT have a good record in our village. I refer to the disastrous Meadow View development.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 June 2026 16:38
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 planning officer,

I wish to strongly object to planning application 3/2026/035 (Whalley road, Read, BB127RP) , as it would fundamentally change and negatively impact the open countryside landscape of Hammond Ground if permission were granted. Once this open countryside protection is weakened, future applications would become more difficult to resist, turning a rural setting into an urban residential estate. I therefore feel that permission should be refused.

Hammond Ground is historic parkland, forming part of Read Hall estate, and contributes significantly to the countryside character and rural setting of the village.

The site is a valued, natural open landscape which is used as agricultural land for grazing cattle/sheep, with several mature and well-established trees. Development would cause permanent and irreversible harm to this setting, its wildlife and biodiversity, and its significance to the village.

The proposal would cause road safety concerns due to a significant increase in traffic on an already very busy road into and out of the village (Whalley Road/A671). As someone who uses Whalley Road regularly, I know from experience that traffic is very demanding and often at a standstill during peak commuting times and there are regular difficulties trying to join the road, which is the main access road from Whalley through to Padiham. The proposed development would place further strain on local infrastructure, including capacity at the local schools and healthcare facilities, and generally cause more noise, disruption and day-to-day inconvenience, with no clear evidence that these long-term impacts can be adequately mitigated. I do not believe the local highway network can safely accommodate the proposed development.

The majority of housing has been concentrated to the east side of the site, suggesting recognition by the applicant that Hammond Ground has landscape and heritage sensitivity, and that development across the whole site would be unacceptable. The revised layout, whilst lessening the harm to the landscape, does not remove it, and this harm to the character and appearance of this countryside setting was previously identified by the Planning Inspector in 2018 when rejecting that application. This scheme is even larger than that of 2018, with some 77 houses as opposed to the previous 50, so would create even greater harm. The dismissed 2018 scheme's findings still remain relevant and a changing of the layout of housing does not remove those fundamental considerations.

I believe this application would result in permanent loss of important, open countryside and lead to unacceptable encroachment beyond the established settlement of the village of Read. I think it would lead to urbanisation of an important historical and transitional landscape, and would have a damaging impact on the rural setting and character of Read. I would therefore request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuse planning permission for this development.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 16:57
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851621632

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground, Read, Lancashire

Comments: I am writing to strongly object to this application because this is the same parkland, the same harm, and substantially the same scheme that was refused and dismissed on appeal less than eight years ago. Nothing about the land has changed since then. The only thing that has changed is the developer's choice of words — and even those are contradicted by the developer's own experts. The application should be refused for the same reasons it failed in 2018.

1. This site has already been refused — and the refusal was upheld on appeal
In 2018, after a public inquiry, a Planning Inspector dismissed an appeal for residential development of this very site (appeal ref APP/T2350/W/17/3185445, Inspector Philip Lewis, 14 November 2018). He found that building houses here would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the countryside through the loss of parkland, and that this harm “significantly and demonstrably” outweighed the benefits; a conclusion he reached even under the tilted balance test that was most favourable to a developer.

That earlier scheme was for up to 50 dwellings, including bungalows and accommodation for older people. This one is for even more houses on the same land. It does not answer the Inspector's objection; it amplifies it.

A council is not free to set a recent appeal decision aside. Where an Inspector has assessed the very same site for the very same kind of development, the Council must engage with that decision and give cogent reasons before reaching a different view. There are no such reasons here, because nothing on the ground has changed. Setting the houses back from the road, keeping the bungalows on the higher ground, retaining trees, reorienting the homes to front onto the land, and adding a permissive footpath and landscaping are the very mitigations the 2018 Inspector already weighed and expressly held would not prevent the substantial harm.

2. The developer's escape route undermines its own evidence

The whole application rests on a single claim: that the site is not really parkland, so the 2018 finding can be put to one side. Yet the applicant's own consultants repeatedly say the opposite:

- the ecology report calls the site “a large area of parkland” and a “Habitat of Principal Importance”, and warns that it is “contrary to the recommendations outlined in section 41 of the NERC Act to

develop within parkland”;

- the developer’s own biodiversity calculation classifies the land in the very highest category - “Wood-pasture and parkland”, of “Very High distinctiveness”;
- the archaeology report identifies a rare “Ancient and Post-Medieval Ornamental” designed landscape - a type covering just 0.5% of Lancashire - which “retains vestiges of that designed landscape”;
- the landscape appraisal states that the site “consists of open parkland”; and
- even the heritage statement concedes that “the Site remained essentially parkland”, pointing to surviving banks, ditches, mature tree lines and ridge-and-furrow.

The Council’s own pre-application advice said the same: the site “has the character and appearance of parkland” and makes “a significant positive contribution to the open and rural character”. The applicant cannot escape the parkland finding by asserting the land is not parkland when every one of its own relevant reports - and the Council’s own officer - describes it as exactly that. And it cannot have it both ways: the scheme relies on this very parkland for its heritage buffer, its “open space” offer and its biodiversity gain, while asking you to treat the same land as ordinary countryside when it comes to the harm.

Nor is it any answer that the land carries no formal landscape designation. It carried none in 2018 either; the Inspector found the harm without one, because the harm is to the character of the countryside and the setting of the village - not to a label.

3. The housing shortage is not a reason to grant this

The developer’s strongest argument is that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, so the “tilted balance” applies. I accept that it does but it does not help them.

- In 2018 there was also a shortfall, and the same tilted balance was applied, yet the appeal still failed, because the harm was decisive. A shortage of supply is not a right to build on this particular field.
- As recently as February 2026 the Council refused another scheme - 77 affordable homes on open countryside elsewhere in the borough, at Whalley (ref 3/2025/0588) - with the shortage and the tilted balance fully in play, because it would be “an incongruous and discordant form of development within the Open Countryside”. If even a wholly affordable scheme could not overcome that kind of harm, this one should not overcome the loss of historic parkland.

The shortage is real, but it is not a developer’s blank cheque for building on parkland and certainly not for the one site an Inspector has already ruled out.

4. Heritage: the setting of Read Hall

Read Hall is a Grade II* listed building - a heritage asset of more than ordinary importance - and its setting is entitled to great weight and special protection by law. Its historic parkland setting is part of what gives the Hall its significance, and that is precisely what this scheme would erode. In 2018 the Inspector found that this development would cause real, if modest, harm to the Hall’s setting through the loss of that parkland, and gave great weight to conserving the asset. The applicant now tries to drive the harm down to “very low”, but only by leaning, once more, on the false claim that the land is not parkland. On the applicant’s own evidence it is, and the harm to the Hall’s setting is real.

5. The “community parkland” is worth far less than it looks

Much is made of the public “parkland” the scheme would create. On closer inspection it is far weaker than presented:

- the same retained land is counted three times over - as a heritage buffer, as public open space, and as biodiversity gain;

- it would be secured only through a residents' management company with no restrictive covenant against future development, no statutory-trust dedication, exposed to s.106A discharge and no permanent dedication as open space, so the public's continued access would depend entirely on that arrangement. Looking at similar company structures, there is likely to be no defined endpoint to the phrase "the lifetime of the Development" and a narrow definition of "Development". The company agreement risks preserving the Owner's right to apply for, secure and implement a wholly new planning permission over any retained land within the registered title without breaching section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Based on *Norfolk Homes Ltd v North Norfolk District Council* [2020] EWHC 2265 (TCC), there is a real risk that any such fresh permission would not be bound by the existing planning obligations at all unless the Council insists on a fresh deed.
- residents themselves, in the applicant's own consultation summary, identified this land as a likely next phase of development.

This is a benefit that could quietly disappear. It should carry little weight and risks leading to anti-social behaviour.

6. The application is not even complete

Finally, the application does not provide what the Council's own pre-application response required. There is no Arboricultural Impact Assessment; no ecological surveys carried out in the proper season (the surveys were done in late winter, when the Council had already advised that this was insufficient); and, as far as I can see, no flood-risk sequential test, despite part of the site being at surface-water flood risk. These are not technical quibbles - they are required pieces of information, and without them the application is not in a fit state to be determined, let alone approved.

Conclusion

This application asks the Council to reach the opposite conclusion to the one an Inspector reached, on the same land, less than eight years ago without anything on the ground having changed, and on the strength of a "not parkland" argument that the applicant's own experts flatly contradict. For the reasons above I urge the Council to refuse it: the substantial and irreversible harm to the parkland character of the countryside and the setting of the village significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits, exactly as it did in 2018.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 June 2026 18:07
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-851635889

[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 strongly object to planning application 3/2026/0356 for the proposed development of 77 houses on Hammond Ground.

I grew up in Read and spent my childhood enjoying this wonderful countryside setting. Hammond Ground has always been a valued part of the village landscape, contributing to the character, identity and sense of place that makes Read special. Although the land is currently used as farmland, its importance goes far beyond its agricultural use. It forms part of the historic landscape around the village and provides an important open setting between Read and the surrounding countryside.

The prospect of this landscape being permanently changed by housing development is deeply upsetting, not only to me but to many residents who have a long-standing connection with this place.

[REDACTED] along [REDACTED], directly [REDACTED]
Their homes and gardens were designed with this open countryside outlook as part of their setting, and the loss of that view would have a significant impact on their residential amenity. These properties were not designed with the expectation of having a built landscape directly behind them, and the change would be particularly damaging for those residents who have lived with and valued this outlook for many years.

My parents, alongside other members of the community, have already given an enormous amount of time and personal effort to protect this land from development. After successfully defending it through previous applications and appeals, they are now being forced to go through the same exhausting process again. It is incredibly frustrating that, after giving so much to their community over the years, their retirement is being overshadowed by continued uncertainty about the future of a landscape they care deeply about.

This objection is not about opposing housing. It is about whether this is the right development, in the right place. In my view, it is not.

Previous decisions regarding Hammond Ground recognised the importance and sensitivity of this site, including the significant harm development would cause to the character and appearance of the countryside. A larger scheme of 77 houses would only increase that harm. The proposal would permanently alter the historic parkland character of Hammond Ground and fundamentally change the relationship between the village, the countryside and the setting associated with Read Hall.

I recognise that the proposal includes public open space, but the value of Hammond Ground is not only about access. Its importance lies in the landscape itself, in terms of its openness, historic character and contribution to the identity of the village. Introducing housing, roads and infrastructure into this area would fundamentally change that landscape and could also weaken its long-term protection, creating pressure for further development in the future.

There are also serious concerns about the wider impact on the village, including additional pressure on roads, traffic, schools, healthcare provision and drainage. The impact on wildlife and biodiversity should also be carefully considered, as the loss of this open landscape would be irreversible.

Hammond Ground is an important part of Read's heritage and countryside setting. I respectfully ask Ribble Valley Council to refuse this application and protect this landscape for future generations.

Yours faithfully,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 June 2026 18:31
To: Planning
Subject: 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.

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 Objection Submission

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 fails to represent sustainable development and gives rise to significant and unresolved harms in relation to landscape character, highways safety, infrastructure capacity, and environmental impact. These matters are material considerations in the determination of the application.

1. Landscape character, historic context, cumulative development risk, and open space proposals

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

The significance 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.

The current proposal, at 77 dwellings, represents a materially greater scale of development than that previously dismissed, without demonstrably addressing the harm identified in that decision. The fundamental issues relating to settlement edge sensitivity, landscape impact, and visual intrusion therefore remain unresolved.

Developers also indicate that parts of the remaining land would be offered as public open space. While this is presented as a positive feature, there is concern among local residents that the introduction of managed open space, associated access points, and infrastructure could represent the first stage in a longer-term pattern of incremental development across the wider Hammond Ground landholding.

It is reasonable to anticipate that approval of the current scheme could facilitate enabling works (including access, servicing, and movement corridors) which may make future development proposals more viable on adjacent land parcels. There is therefore a legitimate concern that the current application could establish a precedent for further phased development, resulting in the gradual erosion of the surrounding countryside and settlement edge.

In addition, there are concerns regarding the long-term management of any public open space provision. Without robust and enforceable management arrangements, there is potential for issues including littering, dog fouling, antisocial behaviour, and ongoing security and maintenance challenges, all of which would impact on residential amenity and the character of the area.

Such a trajectory of incremental change would cumulatively erode the rural setting of Read, dilute its historic village character, and intensify impacts across landscape, highways, and infrastructure. This would be contrary to the established planning balance previously applied to this site and would fundamentally alter the settlement edge in an unsustainable manner.

2. Highway safety and traffic impact

Whalley Road (A671) is a strategic and heavily trafficked route through Read, already experiencing notable congestion during peak periods. Highway safety concerns associated with access to and from the Hammond Ground site are longstanding and well documented through previous planning proposals.

The introduction of 77 dwellings would generate a material increase in vehicular movements, intensifying pressure on an already constrained highway network. The proposed access arrangements would introduce additional turning movements onto a busy through-route, increasing conflict points and elevating risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicular traffic. On the basis of the evidence provided, the development has not demonstrated that its cumulative highway impacts can be safely or acceptably mitigated.

3. Pressure on local services and infrastructure (education, health and dentistry)

The proposed development would generate a significant uplift in demand for local services within Read and the wider catchment area.

Primary and secondary school capacity within the surrounding area is already under sustained pressure, and the application does not demonstrate with sufficient clarity that existing provision can accommodate the additional demand arising from the development without oversubscription effects.

Similarly, local GP and dental services are understood to be operating under high patient demand, with constrained appointment availability already experienced by residents. The additional population generated by the proposal would materially exacerbate existing service pressures. These impacts are not adequately addressed or mitigated within the application submission.

4. Flood risk and drainage

The site raises ongoing concerns in respect of surface water management and flood risk, particularly in the context of increasingly frequent extreme rainfall events.

The proposed development has the potential to increase surface water runoff and place additional burden on existing drainage infrastructure. It is not evident that the submitted drainage strategy adequately demonstrates long-term resilience or capacity within the receiving environment.

5. Ecological and biodiversity considerations

Whilst ecological assessments have been submitted, concerns remain regarding the loss of

habitat, disruption to established wildlife corridors, and impacts on mature vegetation within and surrounding the site.

The ecological function of the land, particularly within a wider rural context, warrants significant weight in the planning balance and does not appear to have been fully reflected in the design or mitigation strategy.

6. Overdevelopment and settlement form

The scale of the proposed development represents a significant intensification relative to the existing built form of Read. The quantum of development is considered excessive in relation to the size, character, and spatial structure of the settlement.

The cumulative effects of the proposal, when considered alongside traffic, infrastructure demand, and landscape harm, indicate a level of change that would materially alter the character of the village and risk setting an unsustainable precedent for further expansion.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal is considered to conflict with key planning principles relating to sustainable development, settlement character, and infrastructure capacity.

It is therefore respectfully requested that planning permission be refused. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to consider approval, it is submitted that the identified harms would require substantial redesign and reduction in scale in order to be made acceptable.

Yours faithfully,

