Please use a separate form for each individual comment.

Q2 Name / Name of organisation (if you are responding on behalf of an organisation) 
None

Q3 To which part of the Core Strategy does this comment relate?
All references to Longridge

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

see above

Paragraph No.

Q4 As a consequence do you consider the Core Strategy is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Legally compliant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Sound *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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)

- [x] 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.

Prepared 1) I would submit that the timescale from the end of the consultation on 15/06/12 to the Council meeting on 17/07/12 is insufficient to allow the comments from the consultation to be adequately processed and go through the Committee Report cycle and so allow Committee Members to have a thorough overview of the consultation responses before going to the inspector. 2) Ribble Valley Borough Council has failed to consult Preston Borough Council properly on cross boundary issues. In particular issues related to development on the boundary between Longridge and Whittingham. To my knowledge (as a Councillor for Whittingham Parish Council) there has not been a consultative joint meeting between the 2 authorities since 4th April 2012 (over 12 months ago). The emerging core strategies for both authorities refer to the town of Longridge that could be developed westwards into Central Lancashire. This is a key cross boundary issue in both core strategies which hitway station. Such facilities are found readily nearer to Clitheroe/Whalley. Effective 5) The plan in its current form is indeliverable as it has not taken into account the loading of the required housing onto the road network around Longridge and to the M6. 6) There has been no joint working for over 12 months between Ribble Valley BC and Preston BC over cross boundary issues at Longridge. Consistent with National Policy 7) For the reasons given above the development of housing in Longridge on the scale envisaged by both Preston and Ribble Valley emerging core strategies is unsustainable with respect to current and proposed infrastructure.
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.

Preston; Ribble Valley and Lancashire County Councils should quickly convene a joint working meeting to determine what would be sustainable development for Longridge. A much reduced housing volume is required to make the core strategy sustainable for Longridge. A formal consultation should be made with United Utilities to determine the sewerage requirements needed to service the proposed scale of housing required for the Longridge area in the emerging core strategies and plans of Preston (Central Lancashire) and Ribble Valley. The Council needs to take into account Lancashire County Council’s Transport Infrastructure Masterplan which is being brought forward from 2013 to September 2012 for consultation. This plan will hopefully address the current problems of unsustainable traffic flows through Longridge; Grimsargh; Broughton and to the M6/M55 junction. To retain Upper Whittingham as a rural Parish and not a housing estate for Longridge; there should be a zone of separation extending along the well defined boundary between Longridge and Whittingham.

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
- [x] 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.

I am concerned that the views of an individual will not considered "material" in the consultation process and will not be adequately represented at the enquiry stage.

Q12  Date of completion

13/06/2012

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.