

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 11 APRIL 2013  
title: CORE STRATEGY – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO REGULATION 22  
CONSULTATION  
submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT – CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

## 1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide Members with information on the responses received to the consultation on amendments proposed to the Core Strategy at submission.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
  - Community Objectives – The information relates to the objective of conserving our countryside and enhancing the local environment.
  - Corporate Priorities – This information is relevant to the Local Development Framework.
  - Other Considerations – None.

## 2 INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that as part of the process of submitting the Core Strategy in September 2012 a number of proposed amendments to the draft Strategy were agreed and these proposed amendments were the subject of a period of public consultation to help inform the Inspector's considerations.
- 2.2 The proposed changes were formally published for consultation, a process that included making copies of the documents available at public libraries, on the web and notifying contacts on the Local Development Framework database as a consultation. Press releases were also issued.
- 2.3 The Schedule at Appendix 1 contains a summary of the responses received, all responses have been available for reference at the Council Offices. Copies of the responses will be sent to the Inspector in due course as the Examination in Public commences. At this stage the Council is not providing any comments on the responses as these will be looked at in the Examination process when it is anticipated the Inspector will determine what issues he wishes to address.

COLIN HIRST  
HEAD OF REGENERATION & HOUSING

MARSHAL SCOTT  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Regulation 22 Response file.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

CH/CMS/P&D/110413

## APPENDIX 1

### Responses to consultation on Proposed Changes to Core Strategy (Consultation period October - November 2012)

NB: Responses with a REF NO. have previously responded and are already in the LDF Database Record System

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
6024	1.	Save Whalley Village	15	DS2	Not stated	Consider the policy will accelerate rush of proposals in Whalley and Ribble Valley; will not secure sustainable development
			43	DMG2	Not stated	Would like to see settlement boundaries indicated in local plan or at least, the methodology of how these will be defined
			-	-	-	Reg 22(1)(c)(v) statement states there were 9 responses from private individuals in Whalley. Response to Core Strategy as a whole has been extremely high (several hundred responses) Figure is misleading; especially as points raised previously have not been addressed.
			-			<p>Previous points raised have not been addressed in the changes. Points raised at Reg 19 resubmitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whalley is not a suitable location for continued growth and designation as Key Service Centre; implicit assumption that it is necessarily and automatically suitable for growth is incorrect;</li> <li>• The proportion of borough's housing allocated to the Whalley should not exceed the proportion of the Borough's population that live there;</li> <li>• An upper limit should be placed on the number of houses to be built in Whalley until the end of the plan period;</li> <li>• That significant improvements are made to the road network and other infrastructure to accommodate planned growth in advance of the growth.</li> </ul>
			-			<p>Additional points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given that RSS is still in force and authorities have adopted Core Strategies with housing targets which</li> </ul>

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						<p>(as a proportion of current stock) are lower, the adoption of a higher figure for Ribble Valley is unjustified. RV should revert to RSS target (161 dpa) as Councillors adopted a higher figure on the basis of misinformation that RSS was to be revoked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to express deep concerns over traffic congestion in Whalley. The Group commissioned detailed evidence from a traffic consultant which was submitted to Lancashire County Council. Correspondence between the Group and LCC on this matter has been included in the response.</li> </ul>
TBA	2.	J Wilson	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Would comment that any further development in Clitheroe or in the UK would not help in preventing the UK population from reaching 70 million and indeed would help to prevent the world population from increasing.
8540	3.	Mrs V Parkes	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	A letter of objection in relation to a planning application for housing at Henthorn Road, Clitheroe and the wider issue of more housing in Clitheroe in relation to impacts on schools, car parking, health facilities, traffic , character of town etc.
7359	4.	Steven Abbott Associate on behalf of Trustees of Standen Estate	Modified text	Para 4.11		<p>Relates to amended figures in text box at 4.11 which show the incorrect total figure of 1,494 residual dwellings, which could be misleading.</p> <p>Suggest that a subtotal is inserted in the table before the "Standen" line to demonstrate the sub-total of 1494. A gross total should be inserted of 2534.</p> <p><i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is legally compliant and sound</i></p>
			Not stated	H1		Raise issues in relation to overall housing requirement and refer to response made at Publication stage. Since then, appeal/Secretary of State decisions have demonstrate weight to be given to para 47 of NPPF. In addition view has been taken that it is wrong to blame the current economic slump and difficult housing market for underperformance with housing delivery. It follows that it would not be right to seek to use those economic circumstances as a justification for the

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						LDF/local plan/DPD. SHLAA evidence points out that there are ample potential sites for housing to meet the full objectively assessed needs. <i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is legally compliant but not sound</i>
			-	H3		Responder states that change resolves objection made at Reg 19 stage. Welcome additional wording at H3 but consider that the words are vague. Suggest word "particularly" is deleted so that open book viability assessments are not required where thresholds are being met. <i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is legally compliant and sound</i>
			34	Strategic site at Standen		Responder states that change resolves objection made at Reg 19 stage. Revised wording in relation to strategic site does not take account of alternate policy wording suggested by responder at Reg 19 stage. <i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is legally compliant and sound</i>
			43	DMG2 Para 10.5		Responder states that change resolves objection made at Reg 19 stage. The change does not incorporate additional text requested at Reg 19 stage. <i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is not legally compliant and not sound</i>
			52	DME2 10.13		Responder states that change resolves objection made at Reg 19 stage. The changes do not take account of alternative policy wording suggested by the responder at the Reg 19 stage <i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is not legally compliant and not sound</i>
			N/A	DMH1 10.18		Responder states that change resolves objection made at Reg 19 stage. Provides further comments which question the reasonableness or practicality of the criteria, including the whether it is sound to restrict the eligibility to those in the parish or adjoining parish

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						or elderly or first time buyers.  <i>As consequence considers change to Core Strategy is not legally compliant and not sound</i>
7554	5.	Mr and Mrs Orchard	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Raises issues of existing congestion in Clitheroe and suggests further development with more vehicles would spoil the town. Express further view in relation to developer of Henthorn site and poor record of workmanship (as seen on BBC Watchdog programme)
TBA	6.	M Legg	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Considers consultation documents overwhelming, no summary available therefore unable to offer comments on the amendments; feel it is a "box ticking exercise".
8138	7.	B Roberts	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Express strong feelings about further new wide scale housing development in Clitheroe, on green belt land. Housing not justified on basis of affordable housing – they will not be reserved just for Clitheroe people. Infrastructure cannot cope with massive increase in houses (health, schools, transport, roads and police). Keep Clitheroe a small market town.
6067	8.	Dickman Associates (on behalf of Donelan Trading Ltd)	Not stated	Para 1.9	Not stated	Para refers to opportunity to submit potential housing sites. No sites other than the Standen site have been considered, there is no site allocation document only the SHLAA in which Standen did not appear.
			Not stated	Para 2.12	Not stated	Core Strategy does not explain/address the causes of out-commuting so cannot address it. Strategic Site will add to out commuting.
			Not stated	Para 2.32	Not stated	Settlement hierarchy should include next levels below main settlements. Wilpshire/Langho have seen high population increase and this should be recognised in the strategy. A new settlement on the A59 will add to out- commuting. The core strategy is therefore unsound.
			Not Stated	Para 4.2 DS1, Para 4.7	Not Stated	The statement gives no certainty in the short to medium term on the delivery of new housing. There is a risk that the spatial principle of ensuring housing supply meets housing demand will not be met. The development strategy should refer to sustainable development not just population size. Policy DS1 will not create economic, social and environmental opportunities and well being for the existing settlement and

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						such facilities
			Not stated	Para. 4.11	Not stated	The population figures in appendix 2 refer to the 2001 census not 2011. This does not reflect popn growth in Wilpshire and Langho adequately. These settlements should be separately identified
			Not stated	Para 4.12 and KS DS2	support	Welcome the addition of this policy and that it is implemented without delay
			Not stated	Key Statement H3	Not stated	There is a need for consistency in terminology used with reference to older persons to assist clear understanding of the policy intent
			Not Stated	P60/61	Not stated	Queries reference to SHLAA and the way it has been used. Considers the evidence used to support the hybrid option is unsound. The SHLAA is out of date, the RSS figures are queried and it is commented that no site allocations document has been consulted on as yet.
			Not stated	P82 Strategic site	Not Stated	Allocation of the strategic site fails to achieve NPPF or address RV housing requirements. As proposed the site does not add to Clitheroe. Infrastructure will not be adequately delivered. The sustainability criteria for Standen are poor. Delays in the delivery of the Strategic site will compound housing supply and be problematic. The housing problem in the borough has been created by the Council as a result of imposing the housing moratorium. Allocating a strategic site will not address housing supply in the short term.
			Not stated	Para 10.4/Policy DMG1	Object	Object to references to CABE/English Heritage principles being applied across the board as unduly onerous and prescriptive. Also object to the provisions that all development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting
			Not stated	Policy DMG2	Not stated	Concerns raised regarding how settlements are defined. A more detailed settlement hierarchy is required.
			Not stated	Policy DMH1	Not stated	There is a need for consistency in terminology used with reference to older persons to assist clear understanding of the policy intent
			Not stated	Para 10.27	Object	The policy wording is too open and should only seek equivalent provision not better
			Not stated	Glossary	Not stated	Glossary needs to be updated

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
	9.	Dickman Associates (on behalf of The Huntroyde Estate/Clitheroe Auction Mart Co Ltd/Mr J Taylor; Ms Sarah Howard and Ms Samantha Howard	Not stated	Para 2.12	Not stated	Core Strategy does not explain/address the causes of out-commuting so cannot address it. Strategic Site will add to out commuting.
			Not Stated	Para 4.2 DS1, Para 4.7	Not Stated	The statement gives no certainty in the short to medium term on the delivery of new housing. There is a risk that the spatial principle of ensuring housing supply meets housing demand will not be met. The development strategy should refer to sustainable development not just population size. Policy DS1 will not create economic, social and environmental opportunities and well being for the existing settlement and such facilities
			Not stated	Para 4.12 and KS DS2	support	Welcome the addition of this policy and that it is implemented without delay
			Not stated	Key Statement H3	Not stated	There is a need for consistency in terminology used with reference to older persons to assist clear understanding of the policy intent
			Not Stated	P60/61	Not stated	Queries reference to SHLAA and the way it has been used. Considers the evidence used to support the hybrid option is unsound. The SHLAA is out of date, the RSS figures are queried and it is commented that no site allocations document has been consulted on as yet.
			Not stated	P82 Strategic site	Not Stated	Allocation of the strategic site fails to achieve NPPF or address RV housing requirements. As proposed the site does not add to Clitheroe. Infrastructure will not be adequately delivered. The sustainability criteria for Standen are poor. Delays in the delivery of the Strategic site will compound housing supply and

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						be problematic. The housing problem in the borough has been created by the Council as a result of imposing the housing moratorium. Allocating a strategic site will not address housing supply in the short term.
			Not stated	Para 10.4/Policy DMG1	Object	Object to references to CABE/English Heritage principles being applied across the board as unduly onerous and prescriptive. Also object to the provisions that all development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting
			Not stated	Policy DMG2	Not stated	Concerns raised regarding how settlements are defined. A more detailed settlement hierarchy is required.
			Not stated	Policy DME4	Not Stated	Identifies the importance of protecting Standen Hall and its setting including the views of and approaches to it by the proximity of unsympathetic development.
			Not stated	Policy DMH1	Not stated	There is a need for consistency in terminology used with reference to older persons to assist clear understanding of the policy intent
			Not stated	Para 10.27	Object	The policy wording is too open and should only seek equivalent provision not better
			Not stated	Glossary	Not stated	Glossary needs to be updated and the definition of 5 year supply positised.
8532	10.	Liz Hardy of David Lock Associates			object	The Core Strategy requires significant amendments and can only be made sound by a radical increase in housing provision and by naming Barrow as a sustainable and suitable location or receptor for significant housing growth to support the Barrow Enterprise Park, the Borough's principal employment and economic base and land resource. Feel that previous representations at previous consultation stages have not been adequately addressed.
			4			This is unnecessary and should be deleted as there is sufficient land available outside flood risk zones, including sites at Barrow.
			26			Barrow should be identified as a key centre in the settlement hierarchy.
			10			The strategic site at Standen is not deliverable due to infrastructure constraints and places too much burden of housing delivery in the Borough onto one site.



REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
			11			Suggests change to table para 4.11 to include Standen dwellings.
			14			Sustainability Appraisal evidence is flawed and fails to adequately appreciate the benefits of the Barrow site.
			15			Welcome key statement DS2 and feel that this supports Barrow as a strategic housing site.
			25	H2		Concerned about this – this statement, to accord with NPPF, should be set out mix of housing types
			26			Support addition to para 7.4 but note recent criticism at planning appeal over the robustness of the employment evidence base that supports the Core Strategy, including the overall employment potential in and around Barrow. Evidence base needs to be reviewed.
			28	EC1		Query how the 9 ha of additional land for B1, B2 and B8 uses has been derived and whether this can still be justified given the comments made in relation to proposed change 26 above.
			34			Note United Utilities comments on water and waste water improvements needed at Standen and its likely impact on timing and phasing of development there.
5918	11.	Indigo Sarah Williams	not stated	DS1	not stated	Development should be focused into the key service centres with a greater apportionment to Whalley. The overall forward housing prediction is too low. It has been demonstrated that Whalley is both a suitable and highly sustainable location for growth and Lawsonsteads site can make a significant contribution to meeting this requirement with two key benefits ie. reduction in traffic flow and a site for a new primary school. It would help address the wider needs of the borough.
			14	DS1	object	Object to approach within key statement DS1 including recent amendments (changes 12 and 14) as it has not been demonstrated that Standen strategic site is suitable and deliverable in the plan period.
477	12.	North Yorks Co. Council Carl Bunnage	not stated	not stated	not stated	The proposed amendments don't appear to present any cross-boundary issues for North Yorks and have no further comments to make.

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
7693	13.	The Coal Authority R A Bust	17, 18	EN3		Supports the inclusion of the two proposed new cross-referencing paragraphs to the need to take into account Mineral Safeguarding Areas set out by LCC.
5821	14.	English Heritage Judith Nelson	3,7,9,	not stated	support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>para 3</u> – supported</li> <li>- <u>para 7</u> – wording is a little confusing and does not set any objective and should recognise heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, acknowledging that not all heritage assets are designated or even fully identified at the current time.</li> <li>- <u>para 9</u> – change the amended text from ‘built environment’ to ‘historic environment’ as defined in glossary to the NPPF.</li> </ul>
			23,24,	EN5	support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>para 23</u> - to retain the sentence crossed out ie. <i>'there will be a presumption .....</i></li> <li>- EN5 should retain the wording ‘viable uses’ and <u>not</u> ‘economic viability’ as in the NPPF.</li> <li>- support keeping conservation area appraisals under review</li> <li>- development proposals can have beneficial as well as adverse effects and the aim should therefore be ‘to secure benefits, and to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspects of the proposals going beyond “carefully considering”. The Key Statement should adopt this wording.</li> <li><u>para 24</u> - support</li> </ul>
			34	not stated		Due to recent submission of an outline planning permission for the Standen strategic site and the concerns English Heritage have about the level of information about the historic environment we query the references in the Core Strategy to more detail being provided in subsequent DPD's and SPD's.
			34			welcome inclusion of heritage assets in the text and would add ‘and their setting’ to wording. Clarity on what ‘take account of’ means would also be welcomed.
			35,	not stated	support	welcome the changes
			37,41	DMG1	support	

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
			54,55	DME4	support	English Heritage guidance on <i>The Setting of Heritage Assets</i> provides more detail and could usefully be referenced in a footnote.
			56			NPPF detail on justification needed for loss or harm to heritage assets should be followed and there will be circumstances where development cannot proceed as proposed demolition is unacceptable. Such circumstances are not covered in the Core Strategy text. As NPPF states substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance should be wholly exceptional.  In relation to change 56 we support the text and also suggest that the wording should include reference to the authority's approach to local listing for identifying non-designated heritage assets.
			73, 83	not stated	support	
8500	15.	Wyre Council Neil Macfarlane		DS1, EC1, H4	not stated	reiterate desire for collaborative working in relation to:- i- the distribution of development and associated transport matters; ii- Gypsy and Traveller needs in relation to key statement DS1, EC1 and H4
66	16.	Sustainable Places Philip Carter	not stated	not stated	support	
8202	17.	LCC Marcus Hudson	not stated	not stated	not stated	welcomes the Core Strategy
5920	18.	Natural England	not stated	not stated	not stated	referring to Local Plan they welcome the revisions made to their last response but although development numbers have been revised there does not appear to be site specific assessment of the landscape on the AONB and without such evidence in relation to the strategic site they maintain that the strategic site would not be justified and the strategy would be unsound.

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
				DME2		Policy should list the Forest of Bowland AONB as a landscape feature which should be protected from significant harm caused by development proposals.
				DME3		Potential to make this section clearer by stressing the importance of applicants submitting precautionary measures and mitigation measures at pre-decision stage.
				EN4		Would like to see more explanation in the 'Development and Land Use Change and Potential Effects' section about what it is that could give rise to disturbance to European sites eg. increase in recreational visits.  ..... to take account of potential indirect effects of proposals on sites of environmental and ecological importance.
89	19.	Clitheroe Town Council  Ian Woolstencroft	not stated	not stated	object	the need for small discreet housing developments has not been taken into account; G6 land has not been protected apart from in one or two places; the term 'elderly' should be replaced with 'older people' and if over 55 use definition from NPPF
8530	20	Vernon & Co.  Peter Vernon	not stated	not stated	object	evidence based on SHLAA published in 2009 out of date and fundamentally affects the Strategy; sites should be available now with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and be viable as there is no longer a demand for long term phasing plans. A SHLAA that is out of date makes this unachievable, making the Core Strategy flawed.
7532	21	Jodie Middleton	not stated	not stated	object	concerned re the number of proposed houses to be built ie:- Standen Estate – contractors should be legally obliged to build the promised primary school to avoid children travelling; how will infrastructure cope ie. medical practices, dentists, traffic and how will it all be resourced; what protection has been given to protect the landscape and wildlife;

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						How will Clitheroe Town Centre benefit from the proposed Standens strategic site. Feels unsold houses will devalue existing properties. Uncertain what is meant by an affordable house. Fundamentally feels proposed development will undermine the quality of the area.
412	22	Clitheroe Civic Society Pauline Wood	7	not stated	not stated	include a restriction along all riverbanks to enable a corridor to be left for wildlife habitats to reinforce the Ribble Valley's reputation for beautiful and unspoiled countryside.
5724	23	Cath Lee	not stated	not stated	object	scale of Standen development too excessive, will alter the character of Clitheroe and doesn't fully comply with the national planning policy framework. Concerned there is no firm proposal to include a new School at the Standen Farm site and the current infrastructure of Clitheroe will be over-stretched.  More specifically the local road system will be overloaded, parking is inadequate, health and leisure facilities are already in short supply.
6070	24	St Wilfrids Linda Ainsworth	20	EN4	object	change the wording in the text from 'should' to 'must' or 'have to'
			23	EN5		3 <sup>RD</sup> bullet point ' <i>Carefully considering</i> ' lessens the effect of other statements.
			26			the 'potential' for economic growth is an inappropriate strategy when businesses are closing and existing employment areas have still not been filled.
			39	DMG1		add an additional bullet point
			46	DMG3		add further supporting text " <i>In using this policy reference will be made to the Guidance on Transport Assessments. This should also include an assessment of the impacts on existing bus and rail infrastructure, including level crossings.</i> "
			62	DMH2		Proposals should not place undue pressure on local infrastructure.
			22	EN4		add additional para about Clitheroe's infrastructure
			46	DMG3		suggest spread the development thinly throughout the RV where its impact on public transport provision and other infrastructure will be diluted

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
			47	DME1		text to be added to be reworded <i>"The Council encourages successional tree planting"</i> is unlikely to be effective, as it contains no sense of requirement.
			49, 55	DME2, DME4		As this development will spoil important landscape the following provision must be implemented. <i>"Any proposals involving the partial or full demolition of important historic fabric from listed buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that this is unavoidable"</i>
8552	25	JWPC	not stated	not stated	support	The respondent wishes to reserve the right to comment during the examination process in due course. They generally support the clarification of the term Key Statements in the CS but still concerned about the level of justification give to the policies with the CS as they still significantly lack necessary justification in certain key areas.
			34			Concerned about bringing forward the Standen site and lack of information on whether the site is actually deliverable, making the document unsound. Also concerned the submission of the site as an application prior to the examination of the CS is seeking to effectively bypass the proper planning policy process, having been subject to significant local objection and substantial representation by the respondent and other planning agents and feel there are more sustainable and deliverable sites identified through the SHLAA which don't require infrastructure improvements.
			78			unclear in the document how this definition of settlement will be used on the context of future DPD's and drawing of defined settlement boundaries.
5534	26	Carter Jones Paul Leeming				agree with Inspectors concerns about clarity of the document eg. key statement / policies and absence of a settlement hierarchy relating to the areas smaller settlements and wider matters such as employment growth along with retail and town centre policy which are not addressed. Irrespective of the comments listed below there remain substantive issues of soundness which remains to be resolved and have not been addressed in the proposed amendments.

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
			1		support	should make reference that certain Good Practice Guidance relating to pre NPPF policy documents remains valid for the time being.
			3	2.9		should make reference to " <i>scheduled monuments</i> " in para 2.9
			10	4.11	object	table below para 4.11 should be deleted from CS and subsumed into the AMR
			14, 15	DS2	support	
			23	EN5	support	
8577	27	JASP Planning Consultancy  Simon Pemberton	not stated	not stated		generally support the vision and objectives of the CS but uncertain as to whether they address merely current needs or future additional growth. It fails to demonstrate a strategy which includes sufficient housing land and doesn't address the shortfall in supply in any meaningful way and conclude insufficient land has been identified. A strategic site should be made in Longridge ie. land at Dilworth Lane, Longridge. Page 9 still refers to 'draft' CS
				3.12, 3.13 3.8		There is uncertainty as to the role of market housing in strategic objectives in para 3.12 & 3.13. The proposed changes do not add clarity here. Para 3.8 also needs to make it clear that housing refers to market housing.
						Also, in relation to housing distribution, do not consider it necessary to reappportion some development from Longridge to 'other settlements'. Feel amount of total development to Clitheroe is unbalanced. Also concerns over some aspects of infrastructure provision at the Standen strategic site and that it is unlikely that all proposed development will be delivered at the Standen site during the plan period.
5590	28	The Theatres Trust  Rose Freeman	not stated	not stated	not stated	the CS does not include a development management policy to protect and enhance its existing community facilities as recommended in item 70 of the NPPF on page 17
	29	St Augustine's RC High School, Billington  Mr Wright	not stated	not stated	not stated	consideration should be given to the capacity of the education system in general before increasing the housing stock. An increase in population / housing will bring additional pressure on existing education facilities.

REF NO.	Response Number	Respondent	Change No.	Policy or part of plan	Object or support	Issues raised (summarised)
						Ribble Valley does not have sufficient sporting facilities for young people and the wider community. Additional housing will bring additional pressures. St Augustine's School would be happy to work with the Council to improve facilities at our site for school and wider community use.
335	30	Ribchester PC Alan Ormand	not stated	not stated	support	