

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 14:38
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852070048

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

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

Comments: I Totally & Utterly, object to any kind of building to take place on the Sacred Hammond Ground.

I have lived in this village for over [REDACTED], I chose this Village to live in because that is what it is. If I wanted to live in a town full of houses then I would have moved.

Traffic is appalling in the village & if you think building 77 more houses is going to ease congestion then you are fully mistaken.

Do any of these so called Trustees live in this village? Probably not!!!!

Where do they plan on extra children going to school? Do they plan on building one? Probably not!!!!

Residents that live in Read most definitely need some form of transport, walking to the supermarket isn't just down the road, or even going to a Doctors.

Do not let these Greedy individuals into our village. This is very Sacred Land.

Don't turn Read into looking a complete mess like Meadow View

SAVE HAMMOND GROUND !!!!!!!

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852094087

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond ground Read

Comments: The village of Read is already has a very busy road with so many pit holes due to traffic. Adding more homes means more traffic. The schools and Gp practices will not be able to cope with so many more people. The village needs greenspace for wildlife and building on it will reduce the population of the families of deer who live and breed on the ground.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:18
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852099280

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read

Comments: I wish to object to Planning Application 3/2026/0356 for the proposed development of 77 dwellings at Hammond Ground, Read.

My objections are based on the following planning grounds:

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Hammond Ground forms an important area of open land which contributes significantly to the rural setting and historic character of Read. Although the proposal includes public open space, the development of 77 houses would fundamentally alter the landscape and urbanise an area that currently provides an attractive transition between the village and the surrounding countryside.

2. Traffic and highway safety

The development would generate a substantial increase in vehicle movements onto Whalley Road and surrounding residential roads. Existing congestion, particularly during peak periods, would be worsened, with increased risks for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

3. Pressure on local infrastructure

The additional housing would increase demand on GP services, schools, dentists and other local facilities. It is not clear that the existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate this level of growth.

4. Flood risk and drainage

There are concerns that replacing greenfield land with housing and roads will increase surface water runoff. The Council should be satisfied that the proposed drainage strategy will not increase flood risk either on the site or elsewhere.

5. Ecology and biodiversity

The site provides habitat for wildlife and contributes to local biodiversity. The Council should carefully assess whether the proposed mitigation and Biodiversity Net Gain measures genuinely compensate for the loss of existing habitats.

6. Residential amenity

The proposal has the potential to affect the privacy, outlook and enjoyment of neighbouring properties through increased activity, noise and overlooking.

Given these concerns, I respectfully request that the Council refuses planning permission unless it is

clearly demonstrated that the proposal complies with both the development plan and national planning policy and that these impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:20
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852100424

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

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

Comments: I object to this development as it;

- 1)reduces the amenity of local open land availability
- 2)it will increase traffic through an already congested road A671
- 3)will increase pressure for local health services(nearest GP in Whalley)and primary schools.
- 4)is supposedly on an English Civil War battle /burial site
- 5)it doesn't provide what local residents have said via both Parish Plans;more affordable homes and /or bungalows NOT executive homes.

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:26
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852106892

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Proposed Phase 1 Residential Development of 77 Houses at Hammond Ground, Read, Lancashire

Comments: To: Development Management, Ribble Valley Borough Council, Church Walk, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 2RA

[REDACTED]

Date: June 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2026/0356

I write to object, in the strongest possible terms, to Planning Application 3/2026/0356 for the proposed Phase 1 residential development of 77 houses at Hammond Ground, Read. This is not a minor or marginal proposal. It is a proposal that would permanently transform historic parkland and open countryside into a suburban housing estate, immediately adjoining existing homes and fundamentally altering one of the most sensitive and valued landscapes in Read village and the Ribble Valley.

This is my personal objection written from the perspective of someone [REDACTED], understands its day-to-day contribution to the character of Read, and would experience the consequences of this development at first hand.

[REDACTED] would be directly and materially affected and would result in the irreversible urbanisation of historic parkland and open countryside. The claimed benefits from this misguided and misleading application do not come close to outweighing it.

This application should be refused, as have all prior applications.

1. My direct interest in the application

[REDACTED] is one of the properties most directly affected by the proposed development. The [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. That proximity is of particular concern because the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED].

The design choices of my home were deliberate; when this was [REDACTED] it was planned to take advantage of its [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], Hammond Ground is therefore not

merely land [REDACTED] It forms part of the lived character of our home and the way our family experiences the property every day.

My objection is not based on property value or resistance to change but is based on demonstrable planning harm: we will be overlooked, there will be a loss of privacy, the plans (whilst not detailed or specific) [REDACTED]. There will be construction disturbance and noise for many years and more crucially the permanent replacement of an open rural setting with a dense housing estate immediately beside our home.

The proposed development would fundamentally change the environment in which we live. Instead of looking over historic parkland, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] operation of a modern residential estate. That is a material and unacceptable deterioration in our day-to-day living.

2. Hammond Ground is not simply a development site

Hammond Ground is far more than an undeveloped parcel of land. It is one of the defining landscape features of Read. It provides a transition between the existing settlement, the countryside and the historic parkland associated with Read Hall. Its openness contributes to the rural character of the village, the quality of views into and out of Read, the appreciation of the wider historic landscape, biodiversity and the sense of place that makes this part of the village distinctive.

The significance of Hammond Ground cannot be reduced to a coloured plan, a landscape mitigation schedule or a calculation of biodiversity units. Its value lies in the fact that it remains open, legible and connected to the countryside. It allows the relationship between settlement, parkland, woodland and historic estate landscape to be understood. Once that land is developed, that relationship is not softened or adjusted. It is destroyed. Permanently.

The proposal would replace openness with roads, dwellings, driveways, parking courts, retaining structures, boundary treatments, lighting, domestic gardens and associated suburban infrastructure. Even if planting were introduced, the land would no longer read as open countryside or historic parkland. It would read as a housing estate.

3. Historic parkland and the setting of Read Hall

The historic relationship between Hammond Ground and Read Hall is central to this objection. Hammond Ground contributes to the appreciation of Read Hall within its wider landscape setting. The proposal would not physically demolish Read Hall, but that is not the relevant test. Heritage harm can arise through development within the setting of a heritage asset where that development erodes the ability to understand or appreciate its significance.

A Phase 1 development of 77 houses would materially erode that setting. It would introduce estate roads, cars and traffic, domestic activity, permanent lighting and built form into a landscape whose value lies substantially in its openness and historic continuity. That harm should carry significant weight in the planning balance.

The fact that this application is being positioned as Phase 1 also suggests that subsequent phases of development are under consideration. Material submitted alongside this application, which has now 'mysteriously' disappeared already defined the next phase of development of the parkland. The residents are not being fooled that this is an application for just 77 houses – its clearly not.

4. Previous planning history and the unchanged central question

The planning history of Hammond Ground is a highly material consideration. The principle of residential development on this land has been examined before, including through previous planning decisions and appeals. Those decisions recognised that Hammond Ground is not an ordinary parcel of land, but a sensitive landscape whose development would have serious consequences for the character of Read and the setting of Read Hall.

Although every application must be determined on its own merits, previous decisions do not become irrelevant simply because an applicant submits a revised layout. The fundamental question remains the same: should this important area of open countryside and historic parkland be permanently urbanised? In my view, the answer remains firmly no.

The present scheme does not overcome the underlying objections. It repackages them. The development is still substantial. The harm to landscape character remains. The impact on the historic setting remains. The effect on neighbouring amenity remains. The urbanising effect remains. A different arrangement of roads and plots does not remove the central planning harm.

5. Harm to landscape character and visual amenity

The proposal would introduce an extensive residential estate into a landscape whose defining characteristic is openness. Hammond Ground currently forms an important transition between the built settlement and the surrounding countryside. That transition would be replaced by a hard and engineered development edge. The use of landscape planting as mitigation does not alter the basic fact that built development would permanently replace open land.

The application describes the proposal as landscape-led. I do not accept that description. A genuinely landscape-led scheme would begin with the sensitivity of the land and allow that sensitivity to determine whether development is appropriate, where it should be located, how much should be built and how the relationship with neighbours and the wider countryside should be managed. This proposal appears to do the opposite. It places development close to existing boundaries, introduces three-storey dwellings in sensitive positions, relies on limited buffering and then seeks to mitigate the consequences through limited planting.

Landscape mitigation is not landscape preservation. Newly planted trees and open space within an estate cannot replicate the existing openness, maturity and historic character of Hammond Ground. Nor can they undo the suburbanising effect of roads, houses, lighting and daily domestic activity. Once this land is urbanised, it cannot continue to perform its existing landscape function.

6. Proximity to my property and unacceptable residential relationship

The relationship between the proposed northern dwellings and my property is unacceptable. The nearest dwelling appears to be approximately [REDACTED] from the rear elevation of my house. That distance must be assessed in the context of the particular circumstances of this site: the extensive glazing to my rear elevation, the [REDACTED], the [REDACTED] doors serving principal living accommodation, the existing open aspect, the proposed height of the new dwellings, the uncertainty over finished floor levels and the absence of adequate cross-sections in this planning application.

This is not a standard back-to-back relationship within an established urban area. It is the proposed insertion of a new housing estate into open countryside immediately beside a home that was deliberately designed around openness and natural light. The change would be dramatic. The principal rooms of my home would cease to face an open rural landscape and would instead face the windows, roofs, roads and activity of a new estate.

Upper-floor windows would have potential views towards my living spaces and into my garden which is a complete loss of privacy. The problem is intensified by the inclusion of three-storey or 2.5-storey dwellings. Second-floor accommodation creates elevated viewing positions and materially changes sightlines. It is not sufficient to treat those dwellings as though they were ordinary two-storey houses. Their height and relationship to existing homes require much greater scrutiny.

The applicant has not demonstrated that an acceptable relationship can be achieved. On the contrary, the submitted information appears insufficient to allow the Council to understand the true extent of overlooking, dominance and visual intrusion. Given this lack of clarity the Council should not grant permission.

7. Overlooking, privacy and loss of outlook

The proposed development would introduce [REDACTED] none currently exist. At present, Hammond Ground provides an open aspect. There are no homes [REDACTED]. The proposal would replace that with multiple dwellings, [REDACTED]

The impact would be both physical and psychological. Privacy is not only a question of whether someone is actively looking into a room at a particular moment. It is also about the reasonable perception of being overlooked, the loss of freedom to use living spaces and garden areas without

feeling exposed, and the cumulative effect of regular residential activity at such close quarters. The applicant may argue that acceptable separation distances are achieved. Even if that were claimed, separation distances should not be applied mechanically. They are guidance, not a substitute for planning judgement. The Council must consider the actual relationship: extensive glazing, balconies, open garden space, potential differences in ground level, elevated windows, three-storey dwellings and the transition from open countryside to dense estate development. Taken together, these factors create a level of harm that is unacceptable.

8. Insufficient information on levels, heights and sections

A significant deficiency in this application is the lack of clear and comprehensive information regarding existing ground levels, proposed ground levels, finished floor levels, building heights, retaining structures and cross-sections through to neighbouring dwellings. This is not a technical detail that can safely be left for later. It goes to the heart of whether the proposal is acceptable and in the absence of this detail the proposal isn't acceptable.

Hammond Ground is not a flat and neutral site. Even modest changes in finished floor levels can significantly affect overlooking, building dominance, the effectiveness of screening and the perceived relationship between new and existing homes. Without accurate cross-sections showing the proposed dwellings in relation to my property, including windows, balconies, garden levels and boundary treatments, the Council cannot properly assess the impact.

Where material uncertainty remains, the benefit of the doubt should not be given to the applicant at the expense of existing residents. The correct planning approach is either to require the necessary information before determination or to refuse permission because the application has failed to demonstrate acceptability.

9. Noise, disturbance, lighting and construction impacts

The development would introduce a permanent new source of activity immediately adjoining existing homes. That activity would include vehicle movements, deliveries, refuse collections, visitors, parking manoeuvres, garden activity, children playing, dogs, lighting, security lights and general domestic noise. None of those activities is inherently objectionable in the abstract, but they become material when introduced at this scale and proximity into a location currently characterised by openness and tranquillity.

External lighting is of particular concern. Hammond Ground currently contributes to a relatively dark and open edge between the village and countryside. Estate lighting, vehicle headlights, security lighting and domestic illumination would permanently alter that character. The effect would be experienced by neighbouring residents as well as by the wider landscape.

The construction phase would also be significant. A development of 77 houses would require prolonged construction activity: heavy goods vehicles, earthworks, excavation, construction traffic, dust, vibration, noise, temporary lighting and disruption to the local highway network. While construction impacts may be temporary, they are still material, especially where the development is immediately adjacent to existing homes.

10. Highway safety and the Whalley Road access

I recognise that the Local Highway Authority will provide technical comments, but I remain concerned that the proposed access arrangements have not been shown to operate safely under real-world conditions. Whalley Road experiences variable speeds, periods of congestion and a mix of local, school, commuter, pedestrian and cyclist movements. The safety of the proposed access should be assessed against that reality, not simply against idealised assumptions.

The proposed visibility splays require careful scrutiny. The Council should be satisfied that they are deliverable, maintainable in perpetuity and sufficient having regard to actual vehicle speeds, vegetation growth, the movement of larger vehicles and the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.

The proposed right-turn lane also raises serious questions. If the highway width is constrained, and if walls and hedges are said to remain, the Council must understand precisely how the additional lane can be provided safely and without creating new hazards. An inadequate right-turn facility could lead to queuing, overtaking manoeuvres, rear-end collision risk and general congestion. These matters

should be resolved before, not after, any decision is made. Pollution and air quality are also of concern.

11. Public open space, Section 106 and long-term stewardship

The applicant appears to rely significantly on proposed public open space as a benefit which is questionable.

This proposed open space should not be given substantial weight unless its ownership, management, maintenance, funding and legal protection are clear and enforceable. A promise of open space is not the same as a robust, long-term stewardship arrangement.

The Council should require clarity on who will own the land, who will manage it, how maintenance will be funded, how planting failures will be addressed, what inspection regimes will apply, what public access rights will be secured and how long the obligations will endure. Anti-social behaviour on this new proposed public open space remains a reality too.

If these matters are to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement, the terms should be sufficiently detailed and enforceable before permission is granted.

The same concern applies to drainage and biodiversity. SuDS, habitat creation and landscape enhancements require long-term management. Their effectiveness depends not on initial drawings, but on decades of inspection, repair, replacement planting, funding and governance. Without certainty, the claimed benefits remain speculative and minimal and should be given limited weight during the assessment process.

12. Future expansion and the risk of incremental development

I am deeply concerned that the current proposal may be only the first phase of a wider development strategy for Hammond Ground. Earlier material appears to have contemplated development beyond the current application boundary, and the present layout raises legitimate questions about whether roads, edges and pedestrian routes have been arranged in a way that could facilitate further expansion.

I do not suggest that the Council should determine an application that is not before it. However, it is plainly entitled to consider whether the layout now proposed creates infrastructure or a development edge that has implications beyond the red line boundary. Good planning should create a clear, defensible and permanent settlement edge. This proposal does not do so. The northern and eastern edges appear capable of continuation, and the limited landscape buffers reinforce that concern. The Council should not inadvertently approve a first step that makes later expansion into the remainder of Hammond Ground easier. The planning harm should be considered cumulatively and strategically, not merely parcel by parcel.

13. The proposal is not genuinely landscape-led

The applicant repeatedly presents the scheme as landscape-led. The submitted layout does not support that claim. If the landscape had genuinely led the design process, the most sensitive parts of the site would have remained undeveloped, the houses nearest existing residents would have been moved further away, generous buffers would have been retained, three-storey dwellings would not have been placed in sensitive locations, density would have reduced towards the countryside and the settlement edge would have been clear and permanent.

Instead, the scheme appears driven by the objective of maximising developable land, with landscape mitigation fitted around that objective afterwards. That is fundamentally different from a landscape-led approach. The road pattern, plot arrangement and proximity to boundaries resemble a conventional suburban estate rather than a bespoke response to historic parkland and open countryside in a sensitive village setting.

Read deserves better than a standard estate layout imposed on one of its most important landscapes. Hammond Ground deserves better. Existing residents deserve better.

14. Planning balance and cumulative harm

The applicant may point to housing delivery, public open space and biodiversity enhancement as public benefits. I acknowledge that these are material considerations. However, the planning balance cannot be undertaken by listing benefits in one column and treating the harms as isolated or

manageable. The full cumulative impact must be considered.

The harms include the permanent loss of open countryside, urbanisation of historic parkland, erosion of the setting of Read Hall, harm to the rural character of Read, unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenities, overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of outlook, visual intrusion, uncertainty over levels and heights, concerns over highway safety, inadequate landscape buffers, uncertain long-term stewardship, possible facilitation of future expansion and a design that fails to respond adequately to the site.

Viewed collectively, the harm is overwhelming. The whole is materially worse than the sum of the individual parts. This application would not merely add 77 houses to a village. It would alter the identity of one of Read's most sensitive landscapes and impose that change directly on existing residents who have lived with and cared for that landscape for many years.

15. Conclusion and request for refusal

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that Ribble Valley Borough Council refuses Planning Application 3/2026/0356. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposed Phase 1 development of 77 houses can be accommodated without unacceptable harm to landscape character, heritage significance, settlement form, residential amenity, highway safety and long-term environmental stewardship.

The proposal would permanently replace historic parkland and open countryside with built development. It would place new houses exceptionally close to my home,

It would

into a currently open and tranquil landscape. It would do so without providing the level of information necessary for the Council to understand the true impact on existing residents.

In planning terms, this is not a finely balanced judgement. The harm is structural, permanent and cumulative. Once Hammond Ground is developed, its openness cannot be restored. The historic relationship between Read, Read Hall and the surrounding countryside cannot be recreated. The residential amenity currently enjoyed by my family cannot be recovered through landscaping conditions or management plans. The damage would be done.

For the Council to approve this application in the face of these unresolved and far-reaching harms would be inconceivable. It would be utterly wrong: wrong for Hammond Ground, wrong for the historic setting of Read, wrong for neighbouring residents, wrong for the long-term character of the village and wrong as a matter of sound planning judgement.

I therefore respectfully urge the Council to refuse planning permission.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:29
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852085435

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

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

Comments: Dear Lyndsey Hayes,

I wish to make clear that I completely oppose the planned development to build 77 houses at Hammond Ground.

Such a development would create added pressure on the roads and further increase the flow of traffic throughout Read & Simonstone, which is already far too much. Our vehicles, which are parked on Simonstone Lane, have been damaged several times in the past 4 years since we moved to the village, by cars (that are driving too fast) swerving to avoid other cars driving too quickly down the lane. Furthermore, it is already impossible to enter/exit our driveway at morning/evening rush hour and get across Whalley Road to School Lane from Simonstone Lane, so we cannot afford to add to this by allowing this development to proceed. These roads were simply not designed to cope with this level of traffic, and the proposal to widen Whalley road at the entrance of Hammond Ground will not resolve any of the issues highlighted.

In terms of our local schools, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

reliably inform me that their schools are both already over capacity and there would not be any places at their schools for any children who were to live in the proposed homes at Hammond Ground. I cannot see a way around this issue.

In terms of local GP Surgeries, these are also overstretched - it is almost impossible to get a GP appointment as it is at the moment, let alone by added more people/houses to the local area. If you do miraculously manage to get an appointment, you usually have to wait 1-2 weeks, which is extremely poor for an area like the Ribble Valley. This demonstrates the current pressures we are facing and the lack of capacity to absorb a large influx of new residents.

The proposed development would also cause significant harm to the countryside and character of the villages of Read & Simonstone. I believe a previous development proposal in 2018 for 50 houses on the same plot of land was deemed unacceptable by the Secretary of State. Given the previous ruling for 50 houses, considering this proposal is for an additional 27 houses (77), and especially

considering that schools, roads and GP surgeries are all facing greater pressures now than they were in 2018, I must strongly oppose these plans.

Regards,

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

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:30
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852108143

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

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

Comments: Hello,

I would strongly like to oppose this development.

It would be an absolute tragedy for our beautiful village.

We live on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is already busy with cars using it as a race track...imagining this 10x worse with the launch of all these new houses does not bear thinking about. Read and Simonstone does not have enough amenities as it is we are already stretched and schools are already full / doctors.

Please we do not want this to go ahead, this will hugely affect country village life and cause us all great distress.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:39
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852112459

[REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Proposed Phase 1 Residential Development at Hammond Ground, Read

Comments: FORMAL LETTER OF OBJECTION

Planning Application 3/2026/0356

Proposed Phase 1 Residential Development at Hammond Ground, Read

To: Development Management, Ribble Valley Borough Council

Church Walk, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 2RA

Date: June 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 3/2026/0356

I write to object to the above application as a [REDACTED], a property that would be directly and significantly affected by the proposed development.

Although I do not reside in Read, I spend considerable time at this property and am therefore very familiar with the character of Hammond Ground and its contribution to the immediate setting. From this perspective, I am particularly concerned about the significant and harmful visual impact of the proposed development.

At present, the outlook from the property across Hammond Ground is defined by openness, uninterrupted views, and a clear transition between the built village and the surrounding countryside. The proposed development would replace this open landscape with a dense suburban form comprising housing, roads, lighting and associated infrastructure.

The proximity of the proposed dwellings would fundamentally alter the outlook from [REDACTED] and be a detriment to my [REDACTED].

I therefore respectfully urge the Council to refuse planning permission.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 15:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0356 FS-Case-852113799

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lancashire

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0356

Address of Development: Hammond Ground, Read

Comments: Please do not allow more building in the villages of Read and Slmonstone until a Bypass is built. The main road (A671) that passes through the centre of the village is very busy all the time and it's only a matter of time before people are killed on it. Money should be raised from new developments like this to pay for a bypass. I understand the cost of the bypass would be about £11 million. so a levy of £100k per new property allowed would pay for the bypass. This is only Phase 1 of the planning application so eventually over 100 homes would be built and this could pay for the bypass.