Q2  Name / Name of organisation (if you are responding on behalf of an organisation)
    N/A

Q3  To which part of the Core Strategy does this comment relate?
    Part of document eg Key Statement reference, 'Vision' section etc...
    Core Strategy is therefore not legally compliant or sound as it fails to provide any future protection to any private land that has been consistently protected under Policy G6 Essential Open Space. Abolishing the said policy and not replacing it with adequate protection is General Policies G6

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
    ☐ Effective
    ☐ Consistent with national policy
    ☐ 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.

A Public Consultation on G6 Essential Open Space was instigated by the Borough Council in August 2011. Overwhelmingly the public response was for the retention of G6 Essential Private Open Space. This view was supported by the History Society; the Heritage Society; the Longridge Town Council; the Dilworth Ward Councillor, Nigel Evans MP and the Dilworth Community Voice. Following planning applications to develop G6 Essential Open Space in Longridge, an Appeals Inspector visited 46 Higher Road on 24th February 2012. The Appeal Decision APP/T2350/A/11/2163951 stated that development would have a significant adverse effect on the visual amenity and character of the area. The shortage of housing land supply in the District does not outweigh the harm that would be caused. By failing to afford any future protection to private land; by scrapping a policy which has previously protected Private Open Space; the land will again be under threat of development and irreparable damage would be caused to the visual amenity and the character of the area. The Borough Council has failed to explain why it proposes a replacement G6 policy that specifically excludes private land currently designated as G6; when such land has been regarded as essential open space for decades. There is no rational basis for this approach; the Borough has performed extremely poorly in its review of G6 and has seriously failed to show appropriate sensitivity to public opinion as expressed through the consultation process.
Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) 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 as precise as possible.

We require changes to Key Statement Paragraph 10.26. to include not just Public Open Space but also to include Private Open Space. All residential sites of any size should be included and not limited to sites over one hectare. The statement should be re-worded as follows: Parks, Playing fields, informal open spaces, allotments and private gardens can all be of great importance to the character of a neighbourhood. Open Space is not just an amenity for public recreation but an important consideration in the conservation of natural and built heritage of the area and the landscape character. The Borough Council will refuse development proposals which involve the loss of existing public and private open space unless it can demonstrate that the proposals will not compromise the visual amenity, public and private recreation, the value of general openness and the landscape character of the area and its surrounds.

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.)
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.

Q12 Date of completion

15.6.12

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this comments form, your comments are very much appreciated. Please click the submit button below to send us your comments.