Philip Dagnall

From: 15 May 2012 19:32
To: Core19
Subject: Core Strategy Consultation

Dear Madam or Sir,

We object to almost every aspect of the proposed Core Strategy Plan. We believe it is thoroughly unsound because it does not resolve most of the following issues in anything like an equitable or professional manner:

1. **Public Sector Strategy Assessment**
   a. The report shows only lip service to the requirements of HMRC’s Green and Magenta Books, as already shown in earlier objections. These apply just as much to local as to central government, but RVBC seems to ignore them.

2. **Utilities**
   a. There are no guarantees from anywhere that water and wastewater services can be provided for extra substantial developments;
   b. Continued liaison is required to ensure timely delivery of a sustainable infrastructure;
   c. Failure on these many issues will affect the quality of life for the existing community and the environment, often significantly;
   d. New developments of substantial size will put pressure on existing refuse collections, which are already unsatisfactory;

3. **Health Service**
   a. On your statistics, 1,670 new homes equals 4,024 extra people living in Clitheroe, currently standing at 14,697 (Wiki – citing ONS), an increase of 27.38%, all seeking proper medical care – could the Medical Centre ever cope with this?
   b. There is no confirmation that Clitheroe Hospital will be upgraded or developed due to the economic downturn, and it has already been withdrawn at least once;
   c. There are no plans to increase GP practices but informed health services in places outside the Ribble Valley.

4. **Transport**
   a. The Government say a Transport statement and a Travel Plan should support all developments – the Core Strategy document does not evidence this in any effective manner;
   b. RVBC’s response is that the Local Travel Plan contains no significant highway improvement, yet Clitheroe is already regularly going into gridlock at peak periods;
   c. LCC will be developing a Local Transport Plan **over the next few years**, which statement does not answer the needs of the Core Strategy plan;
   d. Whalley Rd is already a DEFRA ‘Quality Air Management Zone’ due to high levels of Nitrogen Dioxide – there are no plans to alleviate this issue apparent;
   e. RVBC hope to develop a Cycle strategy for the Town – in other areas this has resulted in significant risk to both pedestrians and car drivers;
   f. There are no plans to increase public car park provision for the estimated extra 2,269 cars – this may well drive shoppers out of Clitheroe, to the serious detriment of our local economy and employment situation – see Blackburn Shopping Centre for an example of this;
5. Leisure
   a. RVBC have no plans to fund a new sports Centre, yet Roefield is bulging at the seams;
   b. No money is reported as available to upgrade Roefield Swimming facilities, even though it patently needs key maintenance;

6. Education
   a. RVBC acknowledge there are already significant implications at the Standen Estate site for education. Yet their response is that LCC holds the responsibility for providing adequate Primary school places – this is evasion of a key issue;
   b. LCC is unable to provide greater detail of available money for education as funding is only known until 2014, because the Government has not yet determined future funding – this is evasion of a key issue;
   c. Land at Standen Estates will be available for a primary school but there are no plans or budgets to build one – does this mean more bussing of children out of the District?
   d. The 1,670 new homes in Clitheroe will bring over 300 children of Secondary School age.
   e. RVBC state there are numerous secondary schools in towns outside the Ribble Valley for Ribble Valley residents one – does this mean yet more bussing of children out of the District? This factor is the major one attracting residents in – on a false premise.

7. Inequitable distribution
   a. Clitheroe makes up 25% of the Ribble Valley population and it is inequitable that we should have to absorb any more than 25% of any planned new development. Instead, we are expected to build 42% of the overall plan – based on ‘hopes and aspirations’. This is neither a credible nor professional standard of infrastructure plan. No wonder planning decisions are overruled by the government inspector – you are not giving him/her the proper tools to do so.
   b. Why are we funding a Director of Development - who appears unable to generate such a competent plan out of our Council and other Taxes, during times of austerity?

Regards

[Redacted]