

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10TH NOVEMBER 2014 AT BOLTON BY BOWLAND
VILLAGE HALL**

Present; John Walmsley, NP steering group
 Allan Clements, NP steering group
 Chris Bosonnet, representing the Estate
 Claire Parker, Kirkwells

58 members of the parish

Introduction and meeting programme by John Walmsley

Presentation on Housing/Local Green Space

John Walmsley; Overview given of where we are at with the Neighbourhood Plan, where RVBC is with The Core Strategy and what are the proposals regarding housing and green space to be discussed during the course of the evening (in particular sites 1, 2 and 3 proposed for small developments)

Chris Bosonnet; Sites 1 and 2 are owned by his mother, site 3 by his sister

 His mother would need a lot more information regarding the proposals for sites 1 and 2 as she is not in favour of development.

 The housing on both these sites would likely front the road as this is in keeping with the rest of the village. Perhaps a small garden at the front with parking areas at the side or rear. Parking would need to be a consideration due to the close proximity to the Primary School and perhaps a drop off/pick up/parking area for the school would need to be included into the plan.

Would the school want to lease some of the land for future expansion?

Site 3 is the more controversial site. Initially this site was identified by RVBC as a possible development area for circa 25 houses. This is inconceivable because of a few reasons namely; it is a flood zone, it is a conservation area and AONB and there is no requirement for this many houses. But perhaps a small scale development fronting Nook Lane with access and parking at the rear would be a possibility. Due to its central location this could be a serious contender from RVBC planning perspective but there are hurdles such as the electricity wires that would have to be moved (perhaps underground?) and also the flood risk.

It would be another small scale development, not the entire croft.

DISCUSSION

Q Roger Park, BBB – ref area 3, how many houses are you proposing and would the rest of the croft be designated a green space?

A CB – 6 houses and the rest of the area would be given consideration as a green space

Q Mike Smith, Closes Hall Mews – how many houses would be on the other two sites and what types of houses?

A CB – 6 on each. The rest of the identified space would be parking and green space on the larger sites

JW - we would see the identified sites as being mixed sites offering affordable and sheltered housing, open market housing and green space

AC – it is down to us to decide what to have

Q David Blackledge, BBB – what is the definition of affordable?

A CP – in planning terms it is social renting or affordable private renting or shared ownership (part rent/part buy)

Q Mike Smith – is that above £100k or below?

A CP – that is down to RVBC

JW – we can't just build starter homes there must be a mix

CP – although they are viable as well as we are just at planning stage

CB – if the property is going to be sold, according to RVBC it must be 40% cheaper than a like for like property in the same location

Q Steve Mercer, King Henry Mews – what facilities would be provided with these houses? How and who would pay for it?

A AC – the Parish Council would need to pay for facilities and look after maintenance etc.

JW – we do have thoughts on what is needed but money would be vital as to what would be developed. However green space doesn't mean it has to be developed, it can stay as it is.

Q Rob Harrison, Stocks House BBB – there are roughly 50 houses in BBB, therefore x3 development sites is a very high percentage. This has large implications for facilities, traffic etc. My concern lies also with the proposed affordable housing....

A AC – Your view is valid and will be recorded, however think about things such as the sustainability of the school which could have a positive knock on effect from new houses. The primary school at Gisburn has over 100 pupils now.

Q Mary Walsh, BBB – is the school here not at capacity?

A AC – possibly but it is also about budgets and keeping it open

Q Ian Willock, Holden – is the increase at Gisburn down to affordable housing? I understood that some local families here sent their children to Gisburn? That is down to choice!

A AC - no doubt the small development at Gisburn has helped attendance.

Q David Howarth, Stump Cross – re the small developments - can we dictate how many are built and therefore safeguard the situation?

A JW – we propose to define the number and type of housing on each site. The Neighbourhood Plan can and must reflect our views.

CP – as well as the number and types of houses, we can also specify the phasing

Q Geoff Curry, BBB – can we clarify the number of affordable houses vs others. I would suggest that there should be no development without affordable houses

A JW – the RVBC core strategy lays down that mix of housing for all developments so we would have to follow their guidelines

Q Rob Harrison, Stocks – what is the proposal regarding access on the lane to Nicky's croft if this development went ahead?

A CB – we haven't looked at this level of detail, but possibly the road would be widened?

JW – if we decide on x3 developments then we would have to liaise with RVBC and there could be some or a lot of problems regarding this and other points

Q Ian Willock – re the question of affordable. The price of houses here is a lot higher as it is very desirable to live here – how can £360k for example be affordable?

A CB – It is a question of taking a similar sized house for example a two bed roomed cottage, and being significantly cheaper with the new build

Q Ian Willock – so the developer would make his money on the other houses built?

A CB – the landowner would have to take the hit as the developer wouldn't on such a small scale development.

Table discussions by all

Plenary session, results feedback

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Geoff Curry - the number of houses talked about tonight is just for new. What about other types of development such as barns, farms etc?

JW – the plan is to have two policies;

- a. To define a small number of small new developments
- b. To have a criteria for developments in the countryside

Colin Darlington BBB – are the Parish Council aware of any refusals by RVBC recently for countryside developments?

AC – the odd one where a barn has not been given permission to change use

Geoff Curry – RVBC have had the same stupid policy over the last 30 years that goes against such developments!

JW – we can ‘bend’ things in our plan so that it fits in with the core strategy but is sympathetic to our wants and needs.

Thanks & wrap up by John Walmsley and Allan Clements