

Ribble Valley Borough Council



Core Strategy 2008-2028

A Local Plan for Ribble Valley

Regulation 22 (1) (c) (v) Statement

**Regulation 22 (1) (c) (v) statement
SEPTEMBER 2012**

**Summary of the main
issues raised at
Publication Stage**



RibbleValley
Local Development Framework

Core Strategy - Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) summary of main issues
September 2012

1. Involving Stakeholders in the consultation on the Regulation 19 Core Strategy

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to fulfil Regulation 22 (1) (c) (v) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012, by providing a summary the main issues raised in representations made pursuant to Regulation 20 (i.e. those made at the Publication Stage).
- 1.2 Prior to submission , documents were made available and any interested parties including consultation bodies invited to make representations in accordance with The Regulations.
- 1.3 Ribble Valley Borough Council provided the opportunity for any organisations or persons in or out of the borough to submit representations into the Core Strategy process by:
- opening an 6 week consultation response period between 4th May and 15th June 2012,
 - making the Core Strategy report and response forms available at all libraries in the borough, the Council Offices, the Station Buildings in Longridge and available for loan from Parish Councils
 - publishing the report and both a downloadable response form and electronic submission form on the Council's website and the Pennine Lancashire wide Feedback website
 - running planning drop in days on the following occasions advertised on the Ribble Valley website which offered the opportunity for all interested parties to speak one on one with members of the Forward Planning team, and ask questions,
 - Tuesday 22nd May 2012 between 1.00pm and 7.00pm in Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber, Church Street, Clitheroe;
 - Monday 28th May 2012 between 10.00am and 6:30pm at the Station Buildings, Berry Lane, Longridge;
 - Thursday 31st May 2012 between 1.00pm and 7:00pm in Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber Clitheroe; and
 - Thursday 7th June 2012 between 1.00pm and 6.00pm in Slaidburn Village Hall.
 - publishing numerous press releases in the local press, including the Clitheroe Advertiser and Times, the Longridge News and the Lancashire Telegraph. Subsequent news articles also appeared in these newspapers at various stages throughout the consultation, which aided in ensuring the consultation remained in the public eye.

- The Ribble Valley website was also kept up to date and contained links to all the relevant consultation documents via the homepage and the Planning Policy pages.
- Individual letters were also sent to groups, bodies and individuals on the LDF consultation database (which includes specific and general consultation bodies as set out in the Regulations), providing information of the publication in accordance with Regulation 19. Around 3,000 such letters were sent.

2. Outcome of the consultation process

- 2.1 The consultation on the Publication Core Strategy (Regulation 19) was held for a six week period between 4th May 2012 and 15th June 2012. The Council received 315 responses to the publication Core Strategy from a variety of individuals, specific consultees, special interest groups, developers and agents, in accordance with Regulation 20. This includes 13 submitted after the close of the consultation. These responses were received by email, letter, response form and online submissions.
- 2.2 Section three of this report identifies and summarises the main issues raised in the representations from Specific Consultees, Interest Groups and Other Organisations and Developers and Agents. Section four summarises the responses from Individuals/residents.
- 2.3 The final part of this report (appendix 1) is made up of documentary evidence of the consultation illustrating that the document was made publicly available, together with details of how representations on the Core Strategy could be made.

3. Issues from Specific Consultees, Interest Groups/ Other Organisations and Developers and Agents

- 3.1 The following section sets out a summary table of the main issues raised in the representations received from specific consultees, special interest groups, developers and agents. This table is not intended to give a detailed summary of the issues or Ribble Valley's response to this, but is instead intended to show the general areas of the plan where issues were highlighted.
- 3.2 In preparing the Core Strategy the Council has been mindful of the "Duty to Co-operate" which was introduced in the Localism Act 2011. This is particularly relevant to the preparation of a strategic policy document such as the Core Strategy to ensure it properly addresses issues which may affect a wider area. The Council has sought to work collaboratively with relevant bodies (including the County Council, neighbouring authorities and public bodies) throughout the preparation of the Core

Strategy to ensure that it is sound. Many of these bodies are also “specific consultation” bodies as defined in the regulations. In addition, the Council has worked at a subregional level with the County Council and in the Pennine Lancashire context to ensure relevant issues are addressed. Any issues raised by such partners at Regulation 19 stage are included in the following summary table.

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Wyre BC | Cumulative impacts of development in Ribble Valley, Wyre and Preston on highway infrastructure, especially M6, M55 and A6 at Broughton |
| | Matters related to Gypsy and traveller policies |
| Pendle BC | Matters related to Gypsy and traveller policies |
| CPRE | Matters related to landscape character and protection |
| | Protection of farmland |
| | Housing numbers |
| | Need for policy to reflect presumption in favour of sustainable development |
| Network Rail | Rail infrastructure and level crossings |
| English Heritage | Adequacy of policies in relation to heritage assets (generically and in relation to Standen) |
| | Clarity of the plan (distinction between policy and reasoned justifications) |
| Simonstone PC | Need to protect potential cycle route for completion of NCN6 |
| Longridge TC | Need to undertake strategic review of plan in view of economic situation |
| | Housing matters: Annual housing provision too high; provision for Longridge too high; housing mix |
| | Unique situation of Longridge not recognised |
| | Need or cross boundary working |
| | Matters related to former policy G6 |
| | policy for listed buildings should be strengthened |
| | Possibility of Neighbourhood Plan |
| Environment Agency | Recognise need for SFRA level 2 (generically and possibly in relation to Strategic Site at Standen) |
| | Need for strategic objectives to include reference to climate change |
| | Matters relating to Water Framework Directive |
| Theatres Trust | Plan does not adequately assess social and cultural wellbeing; social role of planning |
| | Plan not clear on how area will change |
| | Plan not robust in respect of protecting and enhancing social, community and cultural facilities |
| | Lack of policies to guide leisure infrastructure |
| | Lack of guidance for range of town centre uses |
| Save Whalley Village | Inappropriate designation of Whalley as Key Service centre |
| | Level of housing requirement for Whalley |
| | Traffic and congestion issues in Whalley (including provision of commissioned report) |
| | Consideration of community views |
| | Challenge education forecasts/education infrastructure |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--|---|
| | Impact on sustainability matters (housing need, transport, public transport, land use, economic growth) |
| | Impact conservation area and tourism |
| | Views of community gathered in a survey |
| Blackburn with Darwen BC | Support for housing matters |
| Natural England | Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter. |
| | Incorrect conservation objectives used for SPA and SAC in relation to the HRA |
| | Infrastructure Plan comment in relation to natural environment sections compliance with NPPF. |
| Lancashire County Council (Environment Directive) | Supports the Core strategy in principle and welcomes the plan. |
| | Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter |
| | States commitment to work with District on Infrastructure/CIL |
| | Stress importance of phasing the strategic site. |
| | Request for updates regarding Enterprise zone to be included. |
| | Delete DM policy reference to Minerals and Waste Developments (not a s106 issue). |
| | Clarify Key Statement EC2 relating to public sector property. |
| | Include reference to travel plans and sustainable provision. |
| | Implications of development on both designated and undesignated heritage assets and amend DME4 to reflect final NPPF. |
| | Include reference to upland landscapes and associated habitats |
| | Include reference to BHSs |
| | Clarify open space contributions on smaller sites |
| | Amend source for monitoring indicator |
| | Reference Forest of Bowland AONB renewable Energy Position Statement |
| | Amend SSSI, BHS and priority habitats and species figures. |
| Forest of Bowland AONB | Welcomes the Core Strategy |
| | Provide sufficient reference to wider landscape and visual impact of development on landscape character of AONB. |
| | Reference botanically-rich roadside verges |
| | Reference AONB Landscape Character Assessment 2010 |
| | Highlight ecosystem services offered by blanket bog habitat |
| | Reference Forest of Bowland AONB renewable Energy Position Statement |
| Clitheroe Residents Action Group | Matters relating to infrastructure, leisure provision |
| | Considers Infrastructure Plan does not meet DMG1 points. |
| | Matters relating to housing distribution calculations |
| Hyndburn BC | Requests further detail of DM policies |
| The Woodland Trust | Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter (specifically ancient woodland other irreplaceable |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|---|---|
| | semi natural habitats) |
| Lancashire Fire and Rescue | Core Strategy does not have the potential to increase the risk profile of the area from a fire and rescue perspective. |
| Clitheroe Civic Society | Matters relating to housing distribution calculations |
| | Matters relating to infrastructure |
| | Matters relating to affordable housing provision- request for clarification |
| Read PC | Matters relating to housing distribution calculations |
| Whalley PC | Matters relating to housing distribution calculations |
| | Matters relating to infrastructure |
| Whittingham PC | Matters relating to housing distribution calculations- considers it not clear why development is needed in the area. |
| | Development on boundary not acceptable |
| | Request for option D- consider that this would make plan sound. |
| | Matters relating to infrastructure |
| Preston City Council | Notes the identification of Longridge as a KSC |
| | Considers the focus on Longridge contributes to a sustainable pattern of development |
| | Acknowledges meetings proceeding the duty to cooperate have taken place at officer and Member level to discuss impact on the highway network towards Broughton and Grimsargh |
| | Notes protection of AONB and is consistent with Central Lancs. Core Strategy and Preston Site Allocations DPD |
| | Affordable housing percentages consistent with requirements in Central Lancs. |
| Grimsargh PC | Matters relating to infrastructure |
| Lancashire County Council (Adult and Community Services) | Welcomes changes/additional inclusions that have been made to the Core Strategy at DMG2. |
| | Welcomes changes/additional inclusions that have been made to the Core Strategy at DMH1: Affordable Housing: |
| | Welcomes changes/additional inclusions that have been made to the Core Strategy at DMG3: Transport and Mobility: |
| The Coal Authority | Welcomes the inclusion of the supporting text associated with Key Statement EN3 drawing attention to the fact that reference should also be made to relevant policies within the Lancashire Minerals and Waste development Framework. |
| | Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter. |
| The Wildlife Trust | Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF. |
| | Amend SSSI, BHS and priority habitats and species figures. |
| | Consider ANGSt |
| | Suggest RVBC should have an Environmental Strategy |
| | Define wider local environment |
| | Further reference SUDSs |
| | Clarify text relating to 'local sites' |
| | Request clarification in relation to monitoring |
| | Update Phase 1 habitat survey |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | Sustainability appraisal to any potential ecological impact of EN4. |
| | Matters relating to planning obligations |
| | Request for statement regarding the need to protect any retained trees / adjoining habitats during the construction process. |
| | Reference to a presumption against development, which has an adverse effect on protected areas etc |
| | Supports DME1, DME2, DME6 and DMH2 |
| | Further reference to bats |
| | Reference potential impact on biodiversity |
| | Include reference to any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure being properly surveyed, then any loss adequately mitigated. |
| | Highlights significant potential for open spaces to contribute towards the enhancement of biodiversity. |
| | Include additional monitoring indicator |
| | Amend BHS definition in glossary |
| | Amend evidence base author of an evidence base document |
| | Request further detail of having worked with neighbouring authorities to develop the policies |
| Clitheroe Town Council | Housing distribution comments/requests |
| | Requests Infrastructure clarifications and environmental policy detail |
| | Request involvement in future Clitheroe development (as a technology hub and in Town Centre Masterplan work) |
| Sport England | Compliance of evidence base in relation to NPPF in terms of an open space assessment. |
| Stonyhurst Carter Jonas | Acknowledges that the Core strategy has been positively prepared. Principle concern relates to the soundness of the Strategy and subsequent legal compliance of the approach as a result of publication of NPPF. In order to address deficiencies the strategy needs to be extensively reviewed together with the SA/HRA and the evidence base to ensure consistency with NPPF. Promotes the inclusion of the "model "policy to reflect the Presumption in favour of sustainable development. |
| | Concern that text does not reflect NPPF and that the approach in the document to include detailed policies may not be appropriate and would be best delivered through an allocations DPD |
| | Suggests as appropriate a reference to Stonyhurst college be included as a significant employer and unique collection of heritage assets in the borough. The section would benefit from some clarification of definitions and meanings and to a more consistent approach to the referencing of the evidence base with relevance to the Core Strategy explained and findings summarised. |
| | Concern that the objectives are not consistent with NPPF and some clarification is needed. Absence of NPPF core principles relating to High quality design and health and well being should be addressed. |
| | Concern that the derivation of the spatial principles is not referenced |
| | The general approach of policies that seek to protect the high quality environment is viewed as unsound as it policy should also reflect the need to both conserve and enhance in line with NPPF |
| | Does not think that green Belt policy is a relevant environment policy but would be better located within the spatial/strategic element of the |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|-----------------|--|
| | Core Strategy. |
| | A reference to the AONB management plan would assist with clarity |
| | Considers that the policy would be better re titled Sustainable Construction Standards but that a balance is maintained between standards and viability |
| | Broadly support the policy however suggest reference should be made to linkage and the creation of a network of sites |
| | Broadly support the policy however consider it could be more positively phrased by replacing preservation with conserve and enhance |
| | Support for an uplift of housing requirements above RSS provision. |
| | For consistency suggest that wording is amended to refer to "at least 4000" dwellings The policy wording needs to reflect viability and economic return in order to comply with NPPF. Concern is expressed about the focus upon SHMA which may not reflect prevailing market conditions |
| | Broadly supported but need to take account of market conditions and the constraints of SHMA assumptions |
| | Reference is sought to importance of Stonyhurst to the local economy |
| | Policies in the Core Strategy should support housing growth in rural settlements where it will underpin community facilities and services. |
| | Core Strategy should give regard to viability and costs. |
| | Core Strategy should give regard to the need to recognise competitive economic returns. |
| | No need seen for the policy nor should it refer to retention of specific sites rather it should be done by way of site allocations DPD |
| | Not clear what the purpose of the policy is and therefore should be deleted |
| | General question around the need for many of the policies, concern regarding repetition and the impact the inclusion of the suggested model policy would have by removing need for duplication |
| | Does not consider the provisions of the policy to add significantly to national policy and that the drafting could be clarified |
| | General concern re iterated about the format and clarity of the policies and unnecessary duplication |
| | Policy needs to be updated to reflect NPPF |
| | Concern that the policy contradicts itself in terms of application of the policy and there is a need to recognise viability |
| | Seeks amended policy wording to enable consideration to be given to there being "no greater impact upon the landscape" rather than no adverse impact. The restriction on change of use for holiday accommodation is viewed as contrary to policy. |
| | Considers the policy to be contrary to national policy provisions consequently the 1 st bullet should be deleted. The requirement for genuine history is meaningless and unnecessary. |
| | Provision 2 of the policy is meaningless and should be deleted |
| | The narrative to the first part of the policy is unclear and provides no guidance or certainty |
| Mike Gee | Supports the housing distribution set out in Development Strategy. Concerned about deliverability and certainty for developers. |
| | Object to proposed review of housing requirements identified in the |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|---------------------------|---|
| | policy. |
| | Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments |
| | Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments |
| | <p>Concerned that the DM policies do not provide adequate clarity guidance and certainty. The policies need to be fully justified and written in a more positive manner.</p> <p>The intention to refuse the removal of holiday let conditions is seen as inappropriately negative and a criteria based approach setting out when applications would be approved is suggested.</p> |
| | Objects to the presumption against the conversion of isolated buildings to residential use. |
| | Concerned that the Core Strategy should be accompanied with a comprehensive proposals map and that the intentions are not clear. |
| Dickman Associates | Objects to references to NLP report as being out of date and does not reflect NPPF. |
| | Paragraph needs to be updated to reflect NPPF |
| | The vision is not achievable as highways and background documents do not categorise the accessibility of different locations and weigh them to provide a comparison. |
| | <p>Allocation of a Strategic site will not address housing requirements. Other sites should be identified. Standen will create an isolated development that will not relate to Clitheroe. The need for Infrastructure will not enable the site to be sustainable or contribute to supply in the first 5 years. The distribution of development in the strategy to smaller settlements is not justified.</p> |
| | This policy is supported. Clients site is highlighted as the most sustainable site in Clitheroe |
| | Concerned that paragraph makes a confusing reference to RSS and does not reflect the proposed housing requirement or the NPPF consideration for supply buffering |
| | The policy does not address the need for a mix of housing by type and tenure across all sectors of society and overemphasises elderly needs. Any elderly provision needs to be reflected in education requirements |
| | Comment expressing the suitability of Standen as an employment site |
| | Object to continued recognition of long standing employment site contrary to NPPF |
| | Considers the wording needs revising to say "others should be involved in the implementation" |
| | Objects to the extent of list of potential contributions and considers the wording should reflect economic circumstances and not be optimistic |
| | Considers the requirements too onerous and reference should not be made to CIL |
| | Concerned that the policy implies a priority for rail and should be worded so that no grading or priority to transport modes is given |
| | <p>Concerned that the options have not been adequately tested. The strategic site will fail to achieve the objectives of NPPF or address housing requirements in RVBC. Other sites should be identified. Standen will create an isolated development that will not relate to Clitheroe. The need for Infrastructure will not enable the site to be sustainable or contribute to supply in the first 5 years. The council will be unable to meet its 5 year requirement. The strategic site may be better suited to employment use. The reality of the connectivity the site</p> |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | is questioned. |
| | Support the wording of the paragraph. Identifies a lack of physical features at Standen and highlights the view that the clients site is better defined, closer to town centre and the transport interchange. |
| | The considerations listed need to be prioritised and weighted to help interpretation |
| | The policy is too restrictive |
| | Glossary needs to reflect relevant strategic housing requirement |
| | The appendix needs to be updated to show current housing land supply figures and should not be based on RSS |
| Steven Abbott Associates | The representation highlights a range of factors in relation to the Strategic site that demonstrate the proposals consistency with NPPF. These are set out in an associated supporting statement and overview to which reference should be made. |
| | Supports the Key diagram and the identification of the Standen Strategic Site. Suggests as good practice the inclusion of a separate OS based plan. |
| | Identifies the need to show the boundary of the Strategic Site on an OS base and highlights that the boundary is in fact shown in the document. The paragraph therefore needs to be updated. |
| | Want to see the word "necessitate" replaced with "secure" |
| | The policy is supported with the proviso that reference to the strategic allocation is incorporated. Concerns are raised regarding some of the supporting text and views expressed in paragraphs 4.3 – 4.5 Clarification is sought on paragraph 4.11, namely to ensure the context of the site is not misunderstood. |
| | Want to see the word "necessitate" replaced with "secure". |
| | Support for the policy expressed. DS1 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. EN2 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. EN3 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. EN5 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. H1 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. H2 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. Concern raised about need to clarify when viability assessments are required and a need to define elderly provision |
| | Support for the policy expressed. EC1 |
| | Support for the policy expressed. DM2 |
| | Support expressed for the policy. DMG1 |
| | Support expressed for the policy. DMG2 |
| | The policy needs to be clarified to avoid ambiguity. |
| | Concerned about the implementation of the policy, particularly if applicants are required to undertake Need surveys |
| | Support expressed for the policy DME1 |
| | Consider the policy exceeds what is necessary given other controls and that the policy should be written in the positive. |
| | Supports the policy although considers that there are no such features on the strategic site |
| | Supports the policy. DME6 |
| | Supports the policy. DMB5 |
| The Co-operative | Considers the Strategy is unsound as the distribution of housing |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|---|---|
| | development is not justified and that more development should be directed towards the main settlements. |
| | Supports the proposed housing provision but promotes the inclusion of the NPPF based supply buffer |
| Tom Croft | Supports the housing distribution set out in Development Strategy. Concerned about deliverability and certainty. |
| | Object to proposed review of housing requirements identified in the policy. |
| | Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments |
| | Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments |
| | Concerned that the DM policies do not provide adequate clarity guidance and certainty. The policies need to be fully justified and written in a more positive manner. |
| | The intention to refuse the removal of holiday let conditions is seen as inappropriately negative and a criteria based approach setting out when applications would be approved is suggested. |
| | Objects to the presumption against the conversion of isolated buildings to residential use. |
| | Concerned that the Core Strategy should be accompanied with a comprehensive proposals map and that the intentions are not clear. |
| SAINSBURY's Supermarkets Turley Associates | Vision and supporting text should be expanded to acknowledge the importance of retail for local employment opportunities. |
| | Objectives and supportive text should be expanded to acknowledge the importance of retail for local employment opportunities. |
| | Objective should be expanded to make provision for future expansion of existing large scale retailers. |
| | Policy should acknowledge non B class uses as important employment generators and act as buffers between employment uses and residential |
| | Seeks the expansion of the policy to recognise that additional convenience retail floorspace may be allowed to serve community needs in sustainable locations. In addition that non B class uses can promote sustainable development in Greenfield locations |
| | The policy is not consistent with NPPF in ensuring the vitality of retail centres by supporting sustainable economic growth. |
| Mr and Mrs Hartley De Pol Associates | The policy should be more explicit regarding the role of the existing Barrow Enterprise Park to remove uncertainty and clarify if its expansion would be acceptable. Clarification is sought with regard to the role of Samlesbury Enterprise Zone in contributing towards the identified employment land requirements. |
| Duchy of Lancaster Smith Gore | Objects to the use of a strategic site at Clitheroe. A broader distribution is promoted to support smaller settlements. The ability for Dunsop Bridge to accommodate additional sustainable development is identified. |
| | Considers that the opportunity should be taken to review Green Belt boundaries |
| | Supports the protection of the AONB and the principles of policy EN2 |
| | Considers that the housing numbers proposed should be uplifted to circa 220 – 260, although notes that some flexibility is included in the policy |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--|--|
| | Supports the approach in policy H2 however promotes the importance of recognising the viability of schemes |
| | Supports the approach in policy H3 with regard to affordable housing thresholds but highlights the need to recognise viability |
| | Supports the proposals in policy EC1 however would prefer to see the importance of Greenfield sites recognised |
| | Need to consider residential conversions as alternatives to tourism or economic use in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development |
| | Supports the approach to planning obligations and the recognition of viability |
| | Policies do not adequately reflect NPPF with regard to re use of rural buildings for residential use and needs to be amended |
| Adlington | Promotes the need to include a specific policy in the Core Strategy for Specialist older persons accommodation |
| Trustees of the Standen Estate Steven Abbott Associates | Supports the approach in the Development Strategy and highlights a clients site in Sabden that would help address issues relating to car parking community infrastructure and affordable housing |
| Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Turley Associates | Policy H2 is not positively worded and needs to recognise flexibility in determining housing mix. There is duplication with other policies and it should be part of the DM policy section |
| | Definition of affordable housing in policy H3 does not match that of annex 2 of NPPF |
| | Clarification is needed in DS1 to explain how development will be accommodated. Concerns about the approach to establishing the distribution. Deliverability and over-reliance upon a single strategic site, need to demonstrate why Whalley should not accommodate larger share of development |
| | Does not accept the proposed housing requirement as it has not been fully justified why it was selected in preference to other scenarios and that it fails to address the requirements of NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing. |
| | Needs to be made clear that settlement boundaries will need to be reviewed and clarification given on how the new development will be accommodated. |
| | Strategic site is not justified, is too inflexible to rely on a single site and there is a need to evidence the deliverability of the site. There is a risk of the site preventing other sustainable development coming forward. |
| Hawthorne Farm Ltd ARUP | Suggests additional housing land will need to be identified. Account needs to be taken of NPPF supply buffering. Clarification on delivery of the Strategic site proposal needs to be given and phasing in relation to other sites. Limited information is available on-line regarding the Standen Proposal. |
| Vernon & Co. | The responder states that the Core Strategy needs to be updated to take into account the new requirements of the NPPF, particularly with regards to housing numbers and the need for supply buffering as per paragraph 47 of NPPF |
| Gladman Developments | The Core Strategy provides for insufficient Housing development and is not adequately evidenced. This will have an impact upon affordable |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | housing delivery and deprives the community of an adequate supply of market housing and housing opportunity to live and work in Ribble Valley. Need will be displaced outside the borough. There is no evidence under the duty to co-operate that any co-operation agreement is in place with neighbouring authorities to support displacement. The CS vision will not be achieved. The Cs needs to provide for a total of around 330 to 350 dwellings per year. |
| | The Development Strategy fails to recognise the scale of population growth and the need for additional development that is much higher than the proposed 200 dwellings per annum. The use of a Strategic Site is not supported, as it will not provide sufficient housing within the plan period. |
| BAE SYSTEMS BNP PARIBAS | Supports the approach to the recognition of Bae Samlesbury as a key strategic employment location. |
| | Supports the recognition of Bae Samlesbury in policy EC1, however considers that the policy should more closely reflect South Ribble Borough Council's strategy as this would demonstrate collaborative working and would support the duty to co-operate. It would also wish to see wider operations and opportunities at the site supported directly in the policy. |
| | Supports the recognition of the Enterprise Zone in policy DMG2 . |
| | Policy DMB 1 is not consistent with NPPF as it will not accommodate development expected at the EZ and could restrict future expansion of activities at Bae Samlesbury. Similarly it could restrict expansion of other firms that would contribute to the local economy. |
| W MONKS JWPC | Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out. |
| | Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations.. |
| | The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised. |
| | Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed. |
| | Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate. |
| | Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications |
| | The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--|--|
| | and may prevent a site coming forward. |
| | Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception. |
| The Clitheroe RGS Foundation JWPC | Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out. |
| | Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations.. |
| | The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised. |
| | Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed. |
| | Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate. |
| | Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications |
| | The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward. |
| | Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception |
| Beck Developments JWPC | Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out. |
| | Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations.. |
| | The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised. |
| | Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed. |
| | Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--|--|
| | provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate. |
| | Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications |
| | The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward. |
| | Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception |
| Clitheroe Royal Grammar School JWPC | Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out. |
| | Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations.. |
| | The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised. |
| | Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed. |
| | Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate. |
| | Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications |
| | The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward. |
| | Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception |
| Fort Vale Engineering JWPC | Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out. |
| | Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations.. |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised. |
| | Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed. |
| | Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate. |
| | Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications |
| | The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward. |
| | Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception |
| Leehand Properties JWPC | Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out. |
| | Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations.. |
| | The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised. |
| | Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed. |
| | Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate. |
| | Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications |
| | The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward. |
| | Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|--|--|
| | Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception |
| Commercial Estates Group INDIGO Planning | The draft Core Strategy is neither legally compliant nor sound as it does not reflect the Council's evidence base in a number of ways, in particular, with regards its approach to housing delivery. |
| | The draft Core Strategy does not appear to plan for economic growth which is contrary to the principles underpinning the NPPF. |
| | With regards housing provision, the Council's evidence suggests a requirement of 220 dwellings per annum (NLP) but our own independent research identifies that there is actually scope for in the order of 310 dwellings per annum. Therefore, the overall residential requirement over the plan period should be a minimum of 4,200 dwellings, but if the Council is planning for economic growth (in line with NPPF) then the housing requirement should be more in the order of 6,200 dwellings over the plan period. |
| | The Council's evidence base points to apportionment based around existing key service centres, namely Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge, i.e. to benefit from, sustain and potentially improve access to existing services, facilities and public transport. This points to even apportionment in key centres but the Council's approach is to suppress growth outside of Clitheroe with 50% of new development being focused into Clitheroe. There is a significant lack of evidence that supports this approach which will result in an unsustainable pattern of development and will undermine delivery of growth in other key centres, to the detriment of meeting inter alia local housing needs. On this basis, we can only conclude the approach is politically motivated rather than based on a sound evidence. |
| | Overall, the Council should plan to deliver between 4,200 and 6,200 dwellings over the next 20 years, with 25%-30% of this growth apportioned to the key service centre of Whalley. In order to demonstrate deliverability of this approach, strategic sites should be identified to ensure development in the most appropriate locations comes forward. In this regard, the Lawsonsteads site represents a suitable and sustainable location for meeting planned growth in Whalley. |
| Edward Hine LPA receiver for Papillion Properties Avalon Town Planning (Late Representation) | Concerned at a mis-match between aim of the policy and distribution of development. Deliverability of employment land at the Strategic site is questioned, as is the principle of the proposal for growth at the site at Standen. The amount of employment land at Barrow is too great for the size of the village. There is a need to direct a larger proportion of housing provision to Barrow and acknowledge that it can no longer be a small village. Given the constraints elsewhere it is appropriate to allow development in areas like Barrow. |
| | The housing requirement is not high enough |
| | No definition of elderly is provided in the glossary and there is inadequate controls relating to elderly provision |
| | The policy EC1 does not make reference to Barrow Enterprise Site and the policy should be more closely linked with DS1 |
| Barrow Lands Company Ltd (David Lock Associates) | Consider that the housing requirement is far too low and will not meet identified need or address affordability issues and the under-provision of housing experienced in the recent years. The requirement is not justified or consistent with National Policy and is fundamentally |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|------|---|
| | unsound. |
| | Policy H3 will not address identified need given the scale of housing requirement proposed. |
| | The development strategy does not represent the most appropriate strategy and is unjustified. It is too reliant on the Strategic site and ignores the potential of Barrow as a receptor for housing growth given the relationship with strategic employment land. |
| | The strategic site to the exclusion of Barrow is unjustified. Deliverability is not evidenced and there is inadequate assessment of its impacts upon heritage assets. The site has poor connectivity to Clitheroe and insufficient jobs to serve the population within Standen. |
| | Querying size of strategic site- believe that the site has increased from previously published location plan. |
| | SHLAA shows the Barrow site as not available immediately but the site now is. Considers SHLAA should be re-written. |
| | Approach to affordable housing is a narrow approach with no justification as to why. |
| | Considers that Barrow has not been given adequate weight in choosing where to locate new housing growth and that housing should not be distributed on basis of existing population. |
| | Barrow should be named as not just 'other settlements' with an allocation for a minimum of 500 homes. |
| | Wording of policy EN5 should be amended to remove "a presumption in favour" |
| | Believes the housing figures are lower than national projection and are not justified by any evidence and should be increased to at least 330dpa. |
| | Phased approach to the release of land should not be the approach due to the scale of housing shortage in the borough. |
| | Photographs used to separate sections of the plan are misleading |
| | Omission of Barrow from Borough overview is not justified |
| | Use of inflammatory language in relation to effects of "in migrants" on house prices; misrepresents causes of high house prices. Need to explain role of shortage of housing on house prices; need for more homes and affordable homes in particular |
| | Need to amend reference to A59 as a key to strategic employment development in the Borough |
| | Housing requirement should be increased to reflect affordable needs |
| | Adequacy of Settlement Hierarchy |
| | An up to date Vision is required |
| | Distribution of housing |
| | Absence of timetable for Site Allocations DPD |
| | Consider there is an error in the justification to DS1 regarding Sustainability Appraisal and explanation of Preferred Option |
| | Lack of clarity on detailed distribution of remaining housing development |
| | Preferred Option does not address issues in SA Options report |
| | Distribution of employment sites within Borough only to key settlements re DS1 |
| | Effect on status of Barrow employment sites of recent housing |

| NAME | ISSUES RAISED |
|---|--|
| | permissions re EC1 |
| | Status of Barrow as in relation to transport accessibility re DMI2 |
| | Evidence of Infrastructure capability of Standen site re P 76 |
| | Evidence of boundaries, capacity and viability of Standen site as marked on images P77 |
| | Implications of development of Standen on heritage assets DMG1 |
| | Appropriateness of Barrow site for a railway station re SA re 10.6 |
| | Development at Standen re settings of listed buildings re 10.15 |
| | Justification and evidence underlying overall housing requirement figure re 15.1 |
| | Graphic acknowledgement of Barrow Enterprise Zone on Key Diagram p 139 |
| Bowsall Limited (Strategic Land Group) | Raise issues in relation to the housing requirement and distribution. Assert that a site south of Henthorn Road, Clitheroe could accommodate housing and be sustainable, absorbing some of numbers envisaged for the Standen Strategic site. |

4. Issues from Individuals/ Residents

Over 80% of the submitted responses were received from individuals, mainly residents of the borough. As many of these raised very similar issues, this section provides a summary, broken down by location.

Summary of public response by area

The overwhelming number of private individuals who responded to the Core Strategy did not relate their comments to individual specific parts, paragraphs or policies of the plan but instead made descriptive statements of their feelings about a variety of issues. The remainder did relate their comments to specific parts of the document. Also in should be remembered that some respondents made more than one point. Both these sets of comments are summarised below by settlement.

CLITHEROE

Of the responses made by 145 private individuals relating to Clitheroe many revolved around similar general concerns about development in the town and especially the implications of the strategic housing site at Standen, rather than specific policies or statements within the Core Strategy document. In detail these points concerned the following:

1. Proportion of Total New Development for Clitheroe

Some thought that Clitheroe is being required to accept an inappropriately large amount of the new development in the Borough during the plan period. They felt that it should only accept new development in line with its proportion of the Borough's total population, which most respondents felt equated to 25% of total new development.

2. Infrastructure Issues

Many thought that the local infrastructure would not be able to accept the additional pressures that the new development would produce. Some felt that aspects of local infrastructure were already operating at or close to capacity and did not find that the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) that accompanied the Core Strategy gave them the assurances and guarantees they sought that infrastructure would be upgraded to the necessary standard to accommodate new development. There were several specific infrastructure issues regularly quoted:

2A. School Provision

Concern was expressed that local primary and secondary schools would not be able to cope with the new pupils generated by new development. Some went on to express a view that, should a school site be provided at the strategic housing site at Standen, no school would actually be built, and that or others would not be upgraded due to lack of funding at either a local or national level. In addition some felt that the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) implied that there would be provision made for new pupils by bussing them out of the Borough to schools elsewhere.

2B. Roads and Traffic

Many also expressed concerns that the local road network would be unable to cope with the additional traffic and that this had congestion and safety implications. Some went on to say that those living in the new strategic site would not walk or cycle into town but continue to use their car adding to town centre congestion, while others felt that the Standen development would lead to more commuting for jobs outside the town and also extra car use would also be made to shop elsewhere rather than in Clitheroe. Some connected this latter point to a perceived lack of forward public car park provision in Clitheroe. Some went on to detail concerns over traffic and congestion in relation to specific roads that could serve the strategic housing site at Standen, such as Pendle and Whalley Roads. Some added that this would add to local pollution. Again some noted from the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) that the Local Transport Plan does not indicate any significant upgrading of local roads.

2C. Health Services

There was also concern that local health facilities would not be able to accommodate the additional need from new development. Many felt that the local facilities were at or near capacity and that there was no physical room to expand the local Health Centre. Other mentioned the recent withdrawal of plans to develop a new hospital in the town as further evidence of the unlikelihood of new health investment. Some stated that there was no confirmed national health investment funding beyond 2014, and that therefore new facilities would not be put in place and that this would lead to longer waiting lists and other problems.

2D. Utilities (including water and waste water and sewerage)

Some felt that there were already problems with water supply and drainage in the area and that the Standen strategic site, by virtue of its size, would create more problems. Again there was a perception that local facilities are at or close to capacity and that the LIP did not contain guarantees that this would be addressed.

2E. Car Parking

Some noted that the LIP did not contain a commitment to increase public car parking to deal with the extra traffic that the town and its centre would experience and were concerned about this.

2F. Leisure and Recreation Provision

Some felt that new development should require an increased provision of leisure facilities and noted that the LIP did not indicate this.

2G. Refuse Collection

Some felt that the new development would cause problems with the provision of this service

In addition to the above the following none infrastructure related points were raised:

3. Effect on local environment and wildlife and recreational opportunities

Some objected to the loss of countryside and associated biodiversity and wildlife should the strategic site be developed. Also some objected to the perceived loss of footpaths and informal recreation development of the site would entail.

4. Loss of Farmland and Greenfield Land

Allied to the loss of countryside and wild life was the concern that the strategic site would use up valuable farmland and a Greenfield site when planning should be concentrating on developing on brownfield sites in smaller locations in the area. No such individual brownfield alternative sites were quoted.

5. Loss of Local Character of Clitheroe and Locality

Also many felt that the new development would change the character of the town for the worse. Some added to this that the strategic site would be of such a scale as to produce this effect and make the area more urban in character.

6. Lack of Associated Employment

Some were concerned that in the current economic climate there would not be the local jobs for the residents of future new development, some adding that therefore this would only add to current perceived high levels of commuting.

7. Overall Housing Figure and Current Dwellings For Sale

Some felt that the overall housing requirement for the Borough was too high and added that the many house for sale in the area and in Clitheroe proved that there was not the need for so many new houses.

8. Build More New Development in Other Parts of the Borough or in Adjacent Boroughs

Some felt that it would be better to place more new development either elsewhere in the Borough, such as in local villages, or in adjoining towns such as Accrington where they felt development would help support struggling communities and services such as shops and schools.

9. Effect on Tourism

Some felt that the level of new development proposed for Clitheroe would affect the local tourist trade, such as through appearance of increased urbanisation and increased traffic.

BARROW and WISWELL

50 individual residents, 48 from Barrow, (including 36 residents responding in identical format) stated their concerns regarding the traffic and noise implications of development at Barrow Enterprise Zone for both Barrow and Wiswell.

In addition they expressed concerns over the lack of infrastructure in relation to traffic, waste water, excessive school class sizes and some felt that this meant that the settlement should not receive any further development. Several also stated that they wished to see development permitted within the area since 2008 taken into account in any further apportionments.

LONGRIDGE

In Longridge there were 29 responses in total. They fell into two main categories.

The first related to the general feeling that the proposed levels of development were excessive and that account should be taken of developments proposed nearby within the Preston City Council area. The need for greater liaison with Preston Council was also mentioned. In addition some mentioned that they were concerned that elements of local infrastructure would not be able to cope.

The second issue related to the issue of Open Space as defined in Core Strategy policy DMB4 "Open Space Provision" (P97 para 10.26). 21 of the Longridge responses related to this matter with 9 supporting the Core Strategy text and 12 feeling that the policy undermined the protection given to some local sites under the current Local Plan policy G6. These latter respondents cited a recent local planning appeal decision on a G6 local site in support of their position and suggested an alternative wording to the DMB4 policy that sought to include reference to "private open space" within the policy.

WHALLEY

There were 9 responses from private individuals from Whalley. In general they questioned whether the local infrastructure could sustain the levels of proposed development, which was felt to be excessive given Whalley's size and infrastructure and cited traffic congestion, drainage, water supply and inadequate school places as examples of this problem. Some felt that Whalley should not be classed as a key service centre.

OTHER SETTLEMENTS

There were 10 responses from 10 individuals who did not live in the above places. These came from Sabden, West Bradford, Hurst Green, Downham, Chatburn, Langho and Mellor. While some deal with issues particular to a place

a general view was that no more development was required in these settlements and that also, for some, infrastructure was a limiting factor.

OTHER COMMENTS

In addition to the comments above 15 responses mentioned concerns over a variety of issues relating to the process of the consultation. Some felt that various consultation documents were not written in an accessible way; others that they had insufficient knowledge to make a judgement on some technical points; others felt that their comments would be ignored and that the results of the process were pre-determined by government policy.

CORE STRATEGY: APPENDIX ONE

EVIDENCE OF REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION/ INVITATION FOR COMMENT

Following the relevant guidance within current Regulations, relevant parts of the adopted Statement of Community Involvement and incorporating experience gained through the several previous consultations that the Council have held on both the Core Strategy document itself at its previous Issues and Options stages and on individual evidence related documents the Authority has endeavoured to promote the Regulation 19 consultation as widely as possible through a variety of means which are described briefly below.

A notification letter or email was sent to all current members of the LDF database, at the time amounting to nearly 3000 entries, and including all specific and general consultees as specified in the current regulations.

Sets of hard copy documents and disc sets were also sent to relevant consultees under separate Environmental regulatory requirements.

The Council advertised the consultation throughout the period on its website home page and, in linked web pages, pointed interested parties to the various locations of hard and CD copies of the documentation and also informed enquirers about the various response formats including the bespoke Response Form and its associated guidance notes, the Council's online Feedback system and a dedicated email address (Core 19).

Hard copies of the Consultation documents (ie the Core Strategy, full Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report, Non-Technical Summary of the SA, Habitats Regulation Screening Report, Local Infrastructure Plan, Statement of Representations Procedure, an Availability of Documents Statement, Regulation 17 Consultation Statement and a statement of how the Core Strategy would affect the current Local Plan Proposals Map) plus consultation forms, were made available at all local libraries for the duration of the consultation. These locations were:

Chatburn Library, Sawley Road, Chatburn
Clitheroe Library, Church Street, Clitheroe
Longridge Library, Berry Lane, Longridge
Mellor Library, St Marys Gardens, Mellor
Read Library, 41, Whalley Road, Read
Whalley Library, Abbey Road, Whalley

In addition all the above documents and all supporting evidence base documents were supplied to all above locations in CD format.

All the above was also made available at the Council Planning Department Reception during normal office hours

The Authority also held a series of drop in sessions relating to the Core Strategy in which planning officers were available to meet the public and answer individual queries about the document and related matters. Local Councillors also attended these meetings.

These sessions were held at different locations across the Borough to provide as wide an opportunity for public discussion. The venues were as follows:

May 22nd, Clitheroe Council Chamber 1 to 7 pm

May 28th, Longridge Station Buildings 10am to 630 pm

May 31st, Clitheroe Council Chamber 1 to 7 pm

June 7th, Slaidburn Village Hall 1 to 6 pm

In addition the matter was discussed in an interview piece with the Head of Housing and Regeneration on the Graham Liver Breakfast Show on Radio Lancashire on 4th May.

Also the Council sent press releases to local press outlets during the consultation and various local newspapers ran articles describing the consultation.

The Council also promoted the Core Strategy and mentioned the forthcoming consultation in its free newspaper "Ribble Valley News" which was circulated to every household in the Borough.

In addition posters promoting the consultation were sent to all local libraries, Parish Councils for inclusion in local notice boards and were also placed in the Council's main offices.

Copies of the various letters, posters, website page, consultation form and associated guidance notes, press releases, newspaper articles promoting the consultation and the article in the Ribble Valley News are shown below.

Letters sent to LDF Database Members and Parish Councillors



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: **FORWARD PLANNING TEAM**
direct line: 01200 425111
e-mail: core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: CH/EL
your ref:
date: 3 May 2012

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire B87 2RA

Switchboard 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488
DX: Clitheroe 15157
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

RIBBLE VALLEY CORE STRATEGY 2008-2028. A LOCAL PLAN FOR RIBBLE VALLEY PUBLICATION OF PLAN FOR CONSULTATION

I am writing to inform you that the Council's Core Strategy – Publication Version has been published for consultation along with accompanying reports during the six week period 4 May 2012 until 15 June 2012. The attached Statement of Representations Procedure and information on Availability of Documents set out the details of the consultation.

This is an important stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy. The consultation document represents the Council's preferred planning strategy for the Borough to guide development up to 2028 and comments are now being sought in advance of submission of the document to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

You may have made comments at previous stages leading up to this latest document. These comments have informed the development of the Core Strategy. A Regulation 17 Statement is available which sets out how issues raised at previous stages have been addressed in the Core Strategy.

It is important that you make your comments now on the Publication version of the Core Strategy, as it is the comments made at this stage that will be considered by the Independent Inspector, who will be appointed to examine the Core Strategy. The Inspector will assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with:

- The Duty to Co-operate;
- Legal and procedural requirements; and
- whether it is "sound".

Further details on these issues, including "soundness" are provided in the Guidance Notes setting out how you should make your response and are available on the Council's website at www.ribblevalley.gov.uk (follow the link to Core Strategy). It would be helpful if you used the form provided on the website to make your comments on the Core Strategy.

Chief Executive: Marjolein Scott CIPFA
Director: John Neal B.Eng. C.Eng. NICE. Jane Pearson CIPFA

CH-05



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: Forward Planning Team
direct line: 01200 425111
e-mail: core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk
date: 9 May 2012

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488
DX: Clitheroe 15157
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

RIBBLE VALLEY CORE STRATEGY 2008-2028: A LOCAL PLAN FOR RIBBLE VALLEY PUBLICATION OF PLAN FOR CONSULTATION

Further to my letter of last week in connection with the above, I now enclose copies of the main consultation documents to assist the Parish Council in the consultation process.

The main documents are also replicated on the enclosed disc 1 and further supporting documents are on discs 2 and 3.

These documents are also available at other locations throughout the borough and on the Council's website as per the details included with the letter of 3 May (copy enclosed).

I have also enclosed a poster of various sizes to publicise the consultation, which I would be grateful if you would display at appropriate locations. If you need any further copies please let me know.

If you require any further details of the consultation, please see our website www.ribblevalley.gov.uk (and follow the link to the Core Strategy) or contact us on 01200 425111 and ask for the Forward Planning Section. Please note that the deadline for any response is **5pm on Friday, 15 June 2012**. Representations received after that date will not be considered.

I hope this information is helpful.

Yours faithfully

COLIN HIRST
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

To: All Parish Council Clerks

Example of Letter to Specific Consultees and Consultees under Environmental regulatory requirements

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: FORWARD PLANNING SECTION
direct line: 01200 414551
e-mail: joanne.machok@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: CHJ/M/CMS
your ref:
date: 1 May 2012

Council Office
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414485
DX: Clitheroe 15157
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Mr Carter

RE: RIBBLE VALLEY CORE STRATEGY 2008-2028:
A LOCAL PLAN FOR RIBBLE VALLEY
PUBLICATION OF PLAN FOR CONSULTATION

I am writing to inform you that the Council's Core Strategy – Publication Version has been published for consultation along with accompanying reports during the six week period 4 May 2012 until 15 June 2012. The attached Statement of Representations Procedure and information on Availability of Documents set out the details of the consultation. In addition the Core Strategy Publication version and the Sustainability Appraisal Report are available on the enclosed disc as required (with other key documents).

This is an important stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy. The consultation document represents the Council's preferred planning strategy for the Borough to guide development up to 2028 and comments are now being sought in advance of submission of the document to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

You may have made comments at previous stages leading up to this latest document. These comments have informed the development of the Core Strategy. A Regulation 17 Statement is available which sets out how issues raised at previous stages have been addressed in the Core Strategy.

It is important that you make your comments now on the Publication version of the Core Strategy, as it is the comments made at this stage that will be considered by the Independent Inspector who will be appointed to examine the Core Strategy. The Inspector will assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with:

- The Duty to Co-operate;
- Legal and procedural requirements; and
- whether it is "sound".

Further details on these issues, including "soundness" are provided in the Guidance Notes setting out how you should make your response are available on the Council's website at www.ribblevalley.gov.uk (follow the link to Core Strategy). It would be helpful if you used the form provided on the website to make your comments on the Core Strategy.

Chief Executive: Marshal Scott CIFA
Directors: John Hoag B.Eng., C. Eng., MICE, Jane Pearson CIFA

It is the Council's intention to submit the Core Strategy subject to no fundamental issues being raised in relation to soundness, in July 2012 for Examination. The hearing sessions are anticipated to be held in Autumn 2012.

Representations should be made no later than 5pm on Friday 15 June 2012. Representations received after this deadline will not be considered.

You may also make comments at this stage on the Sustainability Appraisal Report and Habitats Regulations Assessment by the same deadline.

The Council is also making available a Regulation 17 Consultation Statement and relevant evidence base and supporting documents.

Please let us know if your contact details are incorrect or need updating. Furthermore, in order to minimize consultation costs, if you prefer to be contacted by email, please let us know so we can amend our details.

If you require any further details of the consultation, please see our website www.ribblevalley.gov.uk (follow the link to Core Strategy) or contact us on 01200 425111 and ask for the Forward Planning Section.

Yours faithfully

COLIN HIRST
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

Philip Carter
Environment Agency
Lutra House
Dodd Way
Bamber Bridge
Lancashire PR5 9BX

Guidance Notes to Comments Form and Comments Form

CORE STRATEGY PUBLICATION VERSION (REGULATION 19) CONSULTATION GUIDANCE NOTES TO COMMENTS FORM

Introduction

This Core Strategy Publication Version development plan document (DPD) has been published so that comments and representations can be made on it. Any such comments will be submitted with the document to the Secretary of State who will then appoint an independent Planning Inspector to examine the plan in an Examination in Public. The purpose of this examination will be to consider whether the Core Strategy complies with a set of legal requirements and is "sound".

Legal Compliance

The Inspector will consider whether the document meets the legal requirements under s20(5)(a) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 before moving to the various tests of soundness.

You should consider the following before making a representation on legal compliance:

The Core Strategy should be within the current Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the key stages should have been followed. The LDS is the Council's programme of work setting out which DPDs it wishes to produce over a three year period. The Council keeps the LDS under review with updates published in the [Annual Monitoring Report \(AMR\)](#)

The process of involving the community in the development of the document should be in general conformity with the Council's [Statement of Community Involvement \(SCI\)](#). This sets out the Council's strategy for involving the community in the preparation and revision of Local Development Documents such as the Core Strategy.

The document should comply with the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England Regulations) 2004 (as amended, including the [amended Regulations of 2012](#) which came into force on April 6th). On publication the Council must publish the documents set out in the regulations and make them available at its principal offices and on its website. It must also inform all those bodies required by regulation and any persons who have requested to be notified.

The Council is required to produce a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report to accompany the Core Strategy which will describe the process through which the SA has been carried out and the baseline information that has informed the process and its outcomes. SA is a tool for appraising policies to ensure that they best reflect social, environmental and economic factors.

The Core Strategy will also have regard to the [Sustainable Community Strategy](#)

The Council has a duty to co operate on planning matters that cross administrative boundaries and in preparing the Core Strategy it needs to work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities are clearly considered.

In addition the document must have regard to the recently published [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#).

Tests of Soundness

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has recently amended the various soundness tests that existed within previous guidance. The current definitions of soundness are laid out in para 182 of the NPPF, which is set out in full below:

"The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework."

General Advice

If you wish to make a representation seeking a change to the Core Strategy or a part of it you should make clear in what way it is not sound having regard to the legal compliance checks and the four soundness tests outlined above. You should try to support your representation with evidence showing why the document should be changed. It would also be helpful if you could also say precisely how you think the Strategy should be changed. Representations should cover concisely all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify your representation and the suggested change as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further submissions based on based on the original representations made at this stage. After this stage further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for Examination at the Examination in Public of the document later this year.

The Inspector may choose to call people to present their views verbally in the Examination, though this is at the Inspector's discretion. If you think that you would wish to participate in such a way then you should indicate this in Question 8 of the form.

Please note that the Inspector is not obliged to consider any previous representations that have been made about the Core Strategy. You are urged, therefore, to re-submit on copies of the form, any previously submitted representations that, in your view, remain valid and that you wish the Inspector to consider.

| | |
|------------------|---------|
| For official use | Ref. No |
| | Ask'd |

RibbleValley
Local Development Framework



**Ribble Valley Core Strategy
Regulation 19 Comments Form**

Before using this form to make any comments please ensure that you have read the Core Strategy document and the Guidance Notes, which can be found on Ribble Valley Borough Council's website - www.ribblevalley.gov.uk and follow the Core Strategy link. If after reading the Guidance Notes you should have any queries in completing the form please telephone 01200 425111.

This form has two parts: -

Part A - Personal Details (you need only complete one copy of Part A)

Part B - Your comment(s) (Please complete a separate Part B for each comment you wish to make.)

All completed comments forms must be received by the Council no later than 5:00pm on Friday 15th June 2012.

Please return paper copies marked 'CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION' to Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe, BB7 2RA

Part A

Q1 Please can you provide the following information which will assist us in contacting you if we need to discuss any of your comments further.

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Name | <input type="text"/> |
| Name of Organisation (if you are responding on behalf of an organisation) | <input type="text"/> |
| Database Reference number (if you have one) | <input type="text"/> |
| Address | <input type="text"/> |
| Post Code | <input type="text"/> |
| Email address | <input type="text"/> |
| Phone number | <input type="text"/> |

Copies of all comments made in Part B of the form will be put in the public domain and are not confidential, apart from any personal information. All personal information within Parts A and B will only be used by the Council in connection with the Local Development Framework and not for any other purpose and will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The Council will summarise the comments and all representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate.

Part B

Please use a separate form for each individual comment.

Q2

Name / Name of Organisation (if you are responding on behalf of an organisation)

Q3

To which part of the Core Strategy does this comment relate?

Part of document eg Key statement reference, 'Vision' section etc...

Paragraph No.

Q4

As a consequence do you consider the Core Strategy is:

i) Legally compliant

Yes

No

ii) Sound *

* The considerations in relation to the Core Strategy being sound are explained in the Guidance Notes

Q5

If you consider the Core Strategy is unsound, is this because it is not... (please tick the appropriate box)

Justified

Consistent with national policy

Effective

Positively prepared

Q6

Please give details of why you consider that the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy, please also use this box to set out your comments. Please continue on a separate sheet if required.

Q7 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness.

You will need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be precise as possible. Please continue on a separate sheet if required.

Please note: your comment should cover succinctly all the information, evidence, and supporting information necessary to support/justify the comment and the suggested change, as there will not normally be another opportunity to make further comments based on the original comment made at the publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination in the forthcoming Examination in Public. Please note also that the Inspector is not obliged to consider any previous comments that have been made in respect of the Core Strategy. You are urged, therefore, to re-submit on this form any previously submitted comments that, in your view, remain valid and that you wish the Inspector to consider.

Q8 If your representation is seeking change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I do wish to participate at the oral examination

Q9 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. *(Please note that the Inspector will determine who participates.) Please continue on a separate sheet if required.*

Q10 If you wish to be kept informed as the Core Strategy progresses through to adoption, please indicate which of the following stages you wish to be informed of by ticking the box(es) below.

- Submission of the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State for independent Examination
- The publication of the Inspector's report following the Examination
- The formal adoption of the Core Strategy

Q11 If you have any other comments to make on the Core Strategy that have not been covered elsewhere, please use the box below. *Please continue on a separate sheet if required.*

Q12 Date of completion

Q13 Signature

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this comments form, your comments are very much appreciated.

If after reading the Guidance Notes you should have any queries in completing this form please telephone 01200 425111

Availability of Documents Statement

Availability of Documents

The following documents are available as part of this consultation:

- Core Strategy Publication version;
- Resultant changes to adopted Proposals Map;
- Sustainability Appraisal (Full Report);
- Statement of Representations procedure
- Sustainability Appraisal (Non Technical Summary);
- Habitats Regulations Assessment;
- Infrastructure Plan;
- Regulation 17 Consultation Statement;
- Relevant evidence base and supporting documents.

They are available for inspection during normal opening hours at:

Planning Reception, Level D
The Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

They will also be available at the following libraries during normal opening hours:

Chatburn Library, Sawley Road, Chatburn
Clitheroe Library, Church Street, Clitheroe
Longridge Library, Berry Lane, Longridge
Mellor Library, St Mary's Gardens, Mellor
Read Library, Jubilee Street, Read
Whalley Library, Abbey Road, Whalley.

In addition the Publication version of the Core Strategy and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Plan only, will be available to view at the following locations during normal opening hours:

Longridge Civic Hall; and
The Station Buildings, Longridge

They can also be viewed on the Council's website at: www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
(follow link to Core Strategy)

All documents forming part of this consultation can be made available for a reasonable charge. Requests can be made via core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk or in writing to:

Core Strategy Consultation
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Statement of Representations Procedure

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012: Notice of Consultation Regulation 19: Publication of Local Plan

Statement of Representations Procedure Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley

The subject matter of, and area covered by, the local plan:

The Core Strategy will provide the strategic planning policy framework for guiding development in the Borough up to 2028. It covers the whole Borough and includes the spatial strategy for development, key policies and development management policies and the identification of a strategic site. It will be used to guide development in the borough and determine planning applications in the plan period.

Representations about the Core Strategy must be received by:
5.00pm on Friday 15th June 2012.

The address to which representations must be made is:

Core Strategy Consultation
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Representations may be made in writing to the above address or electronically by:

- completing the on-line consultation feedback form available at www.ribblevalley.gov.uk (follow the link to Core Strategy); or
- email to core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk

A response form is available to download at www.ribblevalley.gov.uk (follow the link to Core Strategy), at inspection points or by request from 01200 425111.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

- (i) the submission of the local plan for independent examination under Section 20 of the Act.
- (ii) the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the local plan under section 20 of the Act, and
- (iii) the adoption of the local plan.

Marshal Scott
Chief Executive
Ribble Valley Borough Council
4th May 2012

(produced by Ribble Valley Borough Council and circulated to every household in the Borough)

Core Strategy moves to its final stages

RIBBLE Valley Borough Council is moving into the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2014-20.

The strategy will guide development in the borough until 2020, including how many new houses the borough needs and where they will be built.

Building on widespread consultation undertaken in the borough in recent years, it will also include sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

On Wednesday, April 4, a special meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council's planning committee will decide on its "preferred option" or where future houses will be built.

This option will then be subject to a six-week consultation, before the council's planning committee makes a final decision on Thursday, June 21.

Formal adoption

The matter will then be referred to a meeting of the full council on Tuesday July 10, or Tuesday, July 17, before being referred to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the Core Strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

The meetings take place in the Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber in Church Walk, Clitheroe, starting at 6.30pm, and members of the public are welcome to attend. As the dates of the meetings are provisional, members of the public are advised to check with the council on 01200 425111 before attending.

On February 2, Ribble Valley Borough Council's planning committee decided that the borough would need an additional 4,000 houses over the Core Strategy period, of which 1,000 have already been constructed, or are the subject of planning approval.

Biological heritage site in eco-friendly scheme

Neglected lodge gets set to win a new lease of life

A NEGLECTED former lodge in Clitheroe is to receive a new lease of life thanks to a unique environmental credit scheme.

Ribble Valley Borough Council has joined forces with The Environment Bank to renovate Primrose Lodge using "biodiversity offsetting," whereby developers pay compensation for the impact of their activities elsewhere.

Biodiversity offsetting allows developers to purchase credits from The Environment Bank, which are then used to fund the creation and management of conservation sites.

Ribble Valley Borough Council's countryside officer, David Hewitt, said: "Biodiversity offsetting is a dynamic initiative that allows us to offset the

destruction of habitat in one place

restored or protected habitat in a different place.

"It also allows us to pool credits to enable bigger and more strategic placed sites, such as Primrose Lodge which will be an important asset for local people."

Primrose Lodge, a man-made reservoir built for manufacturing processing and the generation of ice factories at the Primrose works site in Clitheroe where developers will be able to purchase conservation credits.

The lodge is already a Lancashire biological heritage site and plans to have it designated Clitheroe's local nature reserve, the other two being Salford and Cross Hill.



GREEN FOR GO: David Hewitt right with Cara Reace of The Environment Bank

BL

News 5
Thursday, May 3, 2012

TELEGRAPH HEALTH

Don't miss our round-up of all the latest news

SS
r
eft

money from
nt to feed
ling habit



interviewed formally
y a Lloyds Banking
up investigator and
ed up.
mon Gurney, def
ing said references
the defendant's be-
spoke of him as a

Your views count on future plans

A SIX-week consultation is about to begin on the future development of the Ribble Valley.

Residents are being invited to have their say on the council's Core Strategy, which will decide how many new homes the borough needs to build by 2023.

Colin Hirst, Ribble Valley Council's head of regeneration and housing, said: "This is an important stage in the final preparation of the Core Strategy.

"Although residents may have already commented, it is representations submitted to this consultation that will be presented to the Government's Planning Inspectorate."

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available from 4 May at the Ribble Valley Council offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe, the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge, local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

The closing date for comments is 5pm on 15 June.

File copy

LANCASHIRE Telegraph

Ribble Valley development plans need your view

2:26pm Thursday 3rd May 2012

A SIX-week consultation is about to begin on the future development of the Ribble Valley.

Residents are being invited to have their say on the council's Core Strategy, which will decide how many new homes the borough needs to build by 2028.

Colin Hirst, Ribble Valley Council's head of regeneration and housing, said: "This is an important stage in the final preparation of the Core Strategy.

"Although residents may have already commented, it is representations submitted to this consultation that will be presented to the Government's Planning Inspectorate."

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available from 4 May at the Ribble Valley Council offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe, the Station Buildings in Barry Lane, Longridge, local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

The closing date for comments is 5pm on 15 June.

© Copyright 2001-2012 Newsquest Media Group

LANCASHIRE Telegraph

<http://www.lancashiretelegraph.co.uk>

CLICK

find



http://www.lancashiretelegraph.co.uk/trade_directory/

News

»» This week

The star
21
The number of...

»» Inside

Opinions 6-7
Memory Lane 10
People in the news 11
Village Voice 12
Wedding feature 14
Kelly's Eye 46
Sport 46-8

»» The Guide pages 15-34

»» Homes pages 17-32

»» Classified pages 44-45

»» Jobs page 41

»» Motors pages 42-43

»» From the web
longridgenews.co.uk

»» top 5 stories this week

- 1 Queens hope to make festival one to remember.
- 2 No to Vodafone mast in St Paul's tower
- 3 Stories from our Marathon marvels!

Core Strategy is in its final stages

»» Six week consultation period has started

By Gillian Whalley

THE future of Longridge and the Ribble Valley is being mapped out for the next 20 years as the borough council reaches the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2008-28.

Residents are being invited to have their say on the strategy, which will guide development including how many new houses the borough needs and where they might be built. Building on widespread consultation undertaken in the borough in recent years, it includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

Last month, a borough planning committee decided on its "preferred option," which is now subject to a six week consultation which started last Friday, May 4 and closes at 5pm on Friday, June 15.

Head of regeneration and housing Colin Hirst said: "This is an important stage in the final preparation of the Core Strategy. The consultation document outlines how development in the borough will be guided until 2028 and comments are now being invited from residents before it is submitted to the Government's Planning Inspectorate for scrutiny.

Although residents may have already commented, it is representations submitted to this consultation that will be presented to the government's Planning Inspectorate.



ROAD TO FUTURE: Berry Lane in Longridge for which the future is being mapped out

Residents can comment on whether the strategy has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. It will be submitted to a council meeting on July 17, before being referred to the

Planning Inspectorate, which will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

All information is available at the borough council in Clitheroe and the Station Buildings in Longridge.

Scot
bad

LONG
wefed
Scold
May 3
Leglo
They
form
count
great
humo
throu
perfo

Ma
in C
this

THE
Cour
Alan
maye
May 5
from
C
suced
by Co
centr
in the
town
of 7p
annus
Both
publi
be dis

Ca
ho

POLI
cont
Cald
was
11.5
7.90
Prog
£30
and

Following Page: Clitheroe Advertiser, May 10th, 2012

Help to shape future

by Sue Plunkett

RESIDENTS in the Ribble Valley still have time to say how many new homes they think should be built in the borough – and where – over the next 16 years.

Ribble Valley Borough Council is in the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2008-28.

The strategy will guide development in the borough until 2028, including how many new houses the borough needs and where they might be built.

Reflecting widespread consultation undertaken in the borough in recent years, it also includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

Last month, a special meeting of the council's planning committee decided on its preferred option, which is now subject to a six-week consultation, which began last Friday, May 4th.

Colin Hirst, the council's head of regeneration and housing, said: "This is an important stage in the final preparation of the Core Strategy.

"The consultation document outlines how development in the borough will be guided until 2028, and comments

are now being invited from residents before it is submitted to the Government's Planning Inspectorate for scrutiny.

"Although residents may have already commented, it is representations submitted to this consultation which will be presented to the Government's Planning Inspectorate."

Residents are invited to comment on whether the strategy has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is 'sound'.

The strategy will be submitted to a council meeting on Tuesday, July 17th, before being referred to the Planning Inspectorate.

The inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the council offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe; the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge, local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk.

The closing date for comments is 5 p.m. on Friday, June 15th.

Help define our Valley's future

by Duncan Smith

A SERIES of drop-in sessions have been arranged for Ribbles Valley residents interested in having their say on the borough's core strategy.

Ribbles Valley Borough Council is in the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2006-18 - a kind of development blueprint to guide how the borough evolves over the coming 16 years.

The most controversial aspect has been how many new houses can be constructed in the borough during that period, and exactly where they can be built.

Building on widespread consultation undertaken in recent years, the core strategy also includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

A series of drop-in sessions have been arranged for residents interested in taking part in the latest consultation.

The sessions are:

● Monday, May 28th, 10 a.m. to 6-30 p.m. at Station Buildings, Beres Lane, Longridge

● Thursday, May 31st, 1 to 7 p.m. at Ribbles Valley Borough Council Chamber

● Thursday, June 7th, 1 to 6 p.m. at Sharnburn Village Hall

The strategy will be submitted to a meeting of Ribbles Valley Borough Council on Tuesday, July 17th, before being referred to the Government's Planning Inspectorate for approval. The inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its adoption by the end of 2012.

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the Ribbles Valley Borough Council Offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe; the Station Buildings in Beres Lane, Longridge; from local libraries and online at www.ribblesvalley.gov.uk.

The closing date for comments is 5 p.m. on Friday June 15th.

And action group is holding information meetings too

TODAY, May 24th, sees the first public meeting organised by the Clitheroe Residents Action Group to discuss Ribbles Valley Borough Council's Core Strategy plan.

The meeting will be held at Clitheroe Cricket Club in Chathburn Road, starting at 7.30 p.m.

It is designed to inform Clitheroe residents about the core strategy's preferred option which, if approved, could mean building 1,500 new houses in the town up to 2028.

While CRAG is not opposed in principle to building new houses in Clitheroe, its members insist

that 1,000 new homes in the town would be a more realistic level.

It points out that in terms of population, Clitheroe makes up 25% of the Ribbles Valley, but the core strategy would require it to soak up 42% of any planned new housing.

CRAG spokesman Steve Rush said: "We have decided to hold these meetings in response to requests from concerned Clitheroe residents about how RVBC's plans will affect them."

Many are confused with what they find on the council's website and most do not want to respond to 555 pages of information.

"We intend to give an outline of what is being proposed along with information on how people can respond to the proposals."

A summary sheet will be available for people to take away and consider their response.

We will also have our petition available to sign objecting to these proposals.

"This is an extremely important time for the Clitheroe community as the Core Strategy will have a huge impact and shape the future of the town."

The second of these meetings will take place next Thursday, May 31st, at the same venue and time.

Clitheroe Advertiser & Times, Thursday, May 31, 2012

Clock ticking on housing strategy

TONIGHT (May 31st) sees the final public meeting arranged by Clitheroe Residents' Action Group (CRAG).

It will be held at Clitheroe Cricket Club, on Chalburn Road, starting at 7.30 p.m. and is designed to give Clitheroe residents an insight into how the action group believes Ribble Valley Borough Council's proposed Core Strategy could affect the town.

As part of that strategy, up to 1,670 houses could be built in Clitheroe up to 2028, which CRAG believes will put an intolerable strain on local infrastructure and significantly change the town's character.

CRAG spokesman Steve Rush said: "The first public meeting, held last Thursday, was a huge success.

"A full room at Clitheroe Cricket Club was informed about the National Planning Policy Framework, the council's core strategy preferred option and the infrastructure document.

"This gave people the information and clarity RVBC has failed to provide, and allows individuals to decide if they are in favour or not."

Mr Rush also criticised the timing of a series of drop-in sessions on the core strategy organised by the council.

They are part of the final round of local consultation, which closes on June 15th.

The first was held on May 22nd, with another on Monday, another today and the last one on June 7th.

"These sessions should all have been arranged in the first three weeks of consultation,

not the last three weeks, to give people more time to prepare their responses," said Mr Rush.

"I cannot express the importance of residents passing on their views to RVBC.

"This final meeting will give residents the information they require to make an informed decision before preparing their response to RVBC."

● Two drop-in sessions remain in the series organised by Ribble Valley Council, designed to let local people learn more about the Core Strategy and have their say.

The first takes place today in the borough council chamber in Church Street, Clitheroe, from 1 to 7 p.m., with the final session at Staidburn Village Hall next Thursday, June 7th, from 1 p.m. to 6 p.m.

During the consultation, which ends at 5 p.m. on June 15th, residents are invited to comment on whether the strategy has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements.

The strategy will then be submitted to a meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council on Tuesday July 17th, before being referred to the Government's Planning Inspectorate.

It will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

The core strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the Ribble Valley Borough Council Offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe; the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge, from local libraries and online at www.ribblevalley.gov.uk.

L.O.
func
an I
bac
four
trip
Scot
Th
soris
Th
diy,
need
of ck
Th
north
usua
they
Sour
work
Un
miss
their
wind
ferrie
Th
weat
had r
on T
with
so ha
elect
Th
Hara
Bern
with
cafes
Ex
at t
acco
told
Ev

SPECIAL SCENIC TRAIN EXCURSION TO NORTH

Bawdlands Garage Clitheroe B

DROP-IN SESSIONS FOR CORE STRATEGY

A SERIES of drop-in sessions have been arranged for Ribble Valley residents interested in having their say on the borough's core strategy.

Ribble Valley Borough Council is in the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2008-28, which will set out future development in the borough.

The strategy will guide development until 2028, including how many new houses the borough needs and where they might be built.

Building on widespread consultation undertaken in recent years, it also includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

A series of drop-in sessions have been arranged for residents interested in taking part in the consultation.

The sessions are: Monday, May 28, 10am – 6.30pm, Station Buildings, Berry Lane, Longridge; Thursday, May 31, 1 – 7pm, Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber; Thursday, June 7, 1 – 6pm, Slaidburn Village Hall.

The strategy will be submitted to a meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council on Tuesday, July 17, before being referred to the Planning Inspectorate.

The inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the Ribble Valley Borough Council Offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe; the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge, local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk. The closing date for comments is 5pm on Friday, June 15.

ISSUE 419


Ril

Th
M

Why
thinki

R
CLI
Satu
10ar
Roya
Refr
Disp
plate
local
with
winn
Com
celel
occe

Ribble Valley Borough Council Website



Ribble Valley
Borough Council

A-Z of Council Services
A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P
Q R S T U V W X Y Z

Search
Display options Site map Advanced search
Cookies

Register here
Sign in

Residents Business Council

Home > Residents > Planning > Planning Policy > Ribble Valley Core Strategy Publication Version (Regulation 19) Consultation Draft

Ribble Valley Core Strategy Publication Version (Regulation 19) Consultation Draft

A quick guide

This consultation was open for a 6 week period from Friday 4 May to 5.00pm on Friday 13 June 2012.

The Core Strategy, when formally adopted, will form the central part of the new Local Plan for the Borough and, together with other related documents, will eventually replace the current Districtwide Local Plan which dates from 1998.

The Core Strategy has been developing over the past few years. In 2007 an initial consultation explored broad issues such as housing, the environment, work, tourism and others through leaflet questionnaires, workshops and a travelling exhibition. Following a change in legislation in 2008 two further consultations were held in 2010 and 2011 relating to a series of potential strategic options for development and associated development management policies under the then Regulation 26 Issues and Options procedure. These involved explanatory booklets circulated within the major local newspaper, public meetings and workshops held with groups of parish councils and at the Council offices in Clitheroe, press releases and web details. All these consultations, together with separate consultations on important evidence based documents such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, have been summarised and reported to Council members. In addition all the individual responses made to the 2010 and 2011 consultations have been made available to the public.

We have developed the Core Strategy Publication Version (Regulation 19) Draft (27.71Mb) which defines the most sustainable strategy for future development and which was the subject of the most recent consultation.

A smaller file size version of the Core Strategy (Reg 19) version without photos (3.41MB) is available. (This version has full page photographs removed resulting in blank pages. The text remains the same as the full version.)

Accompanying the Core Strategy document and required by legislation is a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that assesses the social, economic and environmental impacts of a plan and aims to ensure that sustainable development is at the heart of the plan making process. There is also a short Non Technical Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal. Accompanying the Sustainability Appraisal is a Habitats Regulations Screening Report which is also a regulatory requirement in relation to environmental aspects of the plan.

Accompanying the Core Strategy is an Infrastructure Plan which gives an indication of the implications of the Core Strategy for a wide variety of local infrastructure including schools, health and utility provision.

How could I make my comments?

On the Core Strategy document only

There were a variety of ways to comment specifically on the Core Strategy:

1. Fill in and submit your comments using the Council's online consultation facility <https://www.feedbackonline.org.uk/consultation/6562/>
2. Fill in a Response form and return them to the Council marked "Core Strategy Consultation" to the following address: Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe, Lancashire B57 2RA. See below for where to obtain these forms
3. Email us at core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk
4. Write to us at the Council Offices address.

It was important to read the accompanying Guidance Notes to the forms before submitting responses on the forms. Even if you did not intend to use a form but instead opt for an email or letter response it was helpful to consider them as they outlined the more specific formats of response required at this stage of the regulatory process. This also really helps us and the Planning Inspectorate in the forthcoming submission and examination processes the document will subsequently go through.

On the Sustainability Appraisal and/or the Infrastructure Plan only

If you wished to make comments on the above two documents we requested that you do not use the dedicated Core Strategy forms or the Council's online Core Strategy feedback system.

However anyone was welcome to send us an email to core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk or send us a letter to the Council address mentioned above.

We requested that people be as clear as possible about which parts of the documents, either paragraph numbers or section headings, page numbers etc that comments related to.

Residents Services

- > Arts and Heritage
- > Benefits
- > Building control
- > Community and living
- > Council tax
- > Countryside
- > Deeds, Festivals and Celebrations
- > Environment
- > Environmental health
- > Housing
- > Land charges
- > Markets
- > Payments
- > Planning
- > Sports, leisure and healthy living
- > Transport and streets
- > Village halls
- > Recycling and refuse

Focus on

- > Council Tax
- > Online Payments
- > Events
- > Benefits
- > Document Downloads
- > Fair Processing Statement
- > Planning
- > Leader's Message
- > What's New?
- > Fennine Lancashire
- > Visit Ribble Valley

Getting involved

- > Contact Your Councillor
- > Committee Meetings
- > Feedback Online
- > Feedback

Latest Jobs

- > Part Time Environmental Health Officer (Pollution)
- > Temporary Receptionist - Ribblesdale Pool (Maternity Leave)

Ribble Valley Borough Council website (continued)

Where could I view the documents?

In addition to the links to the documents on the Council's website that are mentioned above, the documents were also available to view on computer disc and also, apart from the Supporting Documents, in hard copy form at the following local libraries: Clitheroe, Chatburn, Lunanoe, Mellor, Read and Whalley. Also available on disc only at those locations are a wide variety of supporting documents that have informed the development of the Strategy.

In addition hard copies only of the consultation documents were available for inspection at Longedge Station Buildings.

All the above venues also had dedicated hard copy Core Strategy comments forms.

Inspection hard copies of the consultation documents and the supporting documents were also available, together with hard copy consultation comment forms, at the Planning Reception at Ribble Valley Borough Council's Offices, Level D, Church Walk, Clitheroe from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday.

All the consultation documents were available in large print and other formats on request.

What happens next?

Following this consultation the results are being summarised and then reported to Council members. It is the Council's intention to submit the Core Strategy in July 2012 for examination by the Planning Inspectorate in an Examination in Public that it is anticipated will be held in the autumn, subject to no fundamental issues being raised in relation to the document's soundness. The summaries of this consultation, and any individual responses that the Inspector wishes to see, will also be made available to the Inspector as a part of this process.

Please note that this consultation is now closed.

It was open for a 6 week period from Friday 4 May to 5.00pm on Friday 15 June 2012.

> Pages in Ribble Valley Core Strategy Publication Version (Regulation 19) Consultation Draft

1. Consultation May-June 2012
2. You are here: A quick guide
3. Ribble Valley Core Strategy supporting documents

Related Downloads

411

Delicious

StumbleUpon

Related Services

Bebo

Facebook

Print this page

Email this to a friend

Comment on this page

irectgov

powered by
powered by Pado Content Management
ids with valid HTML and CSS

- Back to the top
- © 2012 Ribble Valley Borough Council
- Terms & Disclaimer
- Feedback

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices,
Church Walk,
CLITHEROE,
Lancashire,
BB7 2RA
01200 425111

**Ribble Valley Borough Council Press releases re Consultation
(May 1st, May 16th and May 24th 2012)**



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

PRESS RELEASE

CORE STRATEGY MOVES TO FINAL STAGES

RESIDENTS in Ribble Valley are invited to have their say on future development in the borough.

Ribble Valley Borough Council is in the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2008-28.

The strategy will guide development in the borough until 2028, including how many new houses the borough needs and where they might be built.

Building on widespread consultation undertaken in the borough in recent years, it also includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

On Wednesday, April 4, a special meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council's planning committee decided on its "preferred option," which – along with accompanying reports – is now subject to a six-week consultation from Friday, May 4.

Colin Hirst, Ribble Valley Borough Council's head of regeneration and housing, said: "This is an important stage in the final preparation of the Core Strategy. The consultation document outlines how development in the borough will be guided until 2028 and comments are now being invited from residents before it is submitted to the Government's Planning Inspectorate for scrutiny."

"Although residents may have already commented, it is representations submitted to this consultation that will be presented to the Government's Planning Inspectorate."

Residents are being invited to comment on whether the strategy has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is "sound."

The strategy will be submitted to a meeting of Ribbles Valley Borough Council on Tuesday, July 17, before being referred to the Planning Inspectorate

The inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the Ribbles Valley Borough Council Offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe; the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge, local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk. The closing date for comments is 5pm on Friday, June 15.

Ends.

Ref: PR1221.

Date: May 1 2012.

Further details are available from Ribbles Valley Borough Council's communications unit on 01200 414483 or 07971 978766.



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

PRESS RELEASE

STILL TIME FOR SAY ON CORE STRATEGY

RESIDENTS in Ribble Valley still have time to have their say on future development in the borough.

Ribble Valley Borough Council is in the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2008-28.

The strategy will guide development in the borough until 2028, including how many new houses the borough needs and where they might be built.

Building on widespread consultation undertaken in the borough in recent years, it also includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

On Wednesday, April 4, a special meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council's planning committee decided on its "preferred option," which is now subject to a public consultation.

Residents are being invited to comment on whether the strategy has been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is "sound."

The strategy will be submitted to a meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council on Tuesday, July 17, before being referred to the Planning Inspectorate.

The inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

A series of drop-in sessions for Ribble Valley residents interested in taking part in the consultation is underway.

The remaining sessions: Monday, May 28, 10am – 6.30pm, Station Buildings, Berry Lane, Longridge; Thursday, May 31, 1 – 7pm, Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber; Thursday, June 7, 1 – 6pm, Staitham Village Hall.

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the Ribble Valley Borough Council Offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe; the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge; local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk. The closing date for comments is 5pm on Friday, June 15.

Ends.

Ref: PR1232.

Date: May 24 2012.

Further details are available from Ribble Valley Borough Council's communications unit on 01200 414483 or 07971 976766.



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

PRESS RELEASE

DROP-IN SESSIONS FOR CORE STRATEGY

A SERIES of drop-in sessions have been arranged for Ribble Valley residents interested in having their say on the borough's core strategy.

Ribble Valley Borough Council is in the final stages of producing its Core Strategy 2008-28, which will set out future development in the borough.

The strategy will guide development until 2028, including how many new houses the borough needs and where they might be built.

Building on widespread consultation undertaken in recent years, it also includes sections on affordable housing, commerce, employment, the environment and transport.

A series of drop-in sessions have been arranged for residents interested in taking part in the consultation.

The sessions are: Tuesday, May 22, 1 – 7pm, Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber, Church Street, Clitheroe; Monday, May 28, 10am – 6.30pm, Station Buildings, Berry Lane, Longridge; Thursday, May 31, 1 – 7pm, Ribble Valley Borough Council Chamber; Thursday, June 7, 1 – 6pm, Stadburn Village Hall.

The strategy will be submitted to a meeting of Ribble Valley Borough Council on Tuesday, July 17, before being referred to the Planning Inspectorate.

The inspectorate will then hold a public examination of the strategy, with a view to its formal adoption by the end of 2012.

The strategy, guidance notes and comment forms are available at the Ribble Valley Borough Council Offices in Church Walk, Clitheroe, the Station Buildings in Berry Lane, Longridge, local libraries and www.ribblevalley.gov.uk. The closing date for comments is 5pm on Friday, June 15.

Ends.

Ref: PR1228.

Date: May 16 2012.

Further details are available from Ribble Valley Borough Council's communications unit on 01200 414483 or 07871 976765.

Example of poster placed in locality, eg parish noticeboards etc

**Ribble Valley
Borough Council**



**Core Strategy 2008 – 2028
A Local Plan for Ribble Valley
Regulation 19 Consultation Draft**

INVITATION TO COMMENT

Copies of the document to view, and forms on which to make comment, are available at:

- the Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe;
- the Station Buildings, Longridge; and
- local libraries in the Borough.

To see the document online please go to www.ribblevalley.gov.uk and then follow the Core Strategy link.

Online comment forms are available.

You can email your comments to: core19@ribblevalley.gov.uk or contact us on 01200 425111.

Closing date for receipt of comments is 5.00pm on Friday 15th June 2012.

