

BBB, Gisburn Forest and Sawley Parish Council

Meeting of 21st Neighborhood Plan Steering Group, 21 June 2016

Present: Allan Clements, Paul Levet, Paul Wilson

Apologies: Roger Park, Martyn Bishop

In attendance: Richard Sherras (RVBC), Claire Parker (Kirkwells), Elizabeth Twist, Hayden Fortune

1. Steering Group (SG) Attendance

ADC invited Elizabeth Twist (new Parish Council (PC) Chair) and Hayden Fortune to the meeting. Hayden has been involved in the recent Tosside discussions. It was agreed that Elizabeth and Hayden should formally join the SG and this will be raised at the next PC meeting.

2. Update on progress

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

The SEA has now been issued after comments received from the Environmental Agency, Historic England and Natural England. It was noted that when SEA plans are produced then guidance says that these three bodies should be consulted.

Historic England has suggested that a full heritage assessment should be conducted if Site 1 in BBB is developed.

Claire Bradley would issue the comments received about the SEA to the SG and incorporate any necessary changes in the draft submission neighbourhood plan (NP). **Action CB**

Draft Submission NP

Kirkwells has now received comments from RVBC about the amendments that were made to the plan after the consultation stage (*Regulation 14*). RVBC has drawn attention to the need for any housing development to comply with the requirements of DMG2 as listed in para 6.1.6 of the draft submission plan. CB was happy that the new draft of the submission version of the NP will have addressed the comments made by RVBC.

Claire Bradley would issue the comments received from RVBC to the SG. **Action CB**

3. Tosside.

In view of the recent representations made to the PC the SG discussed the issues being raised in Tosside.

The following points were noted:

- a. It was accepted that in the REG 14 consultation draft of January 2015 the plan did not comply with the official RVBC boundary and that Map 2 in the draft submission version should be redrawn to show this. **Action CB.**
- b. The difference between these boundary lines is a triangular piece of land and it was proposed that this should be designated as a green space.
- c. Mrs Lumb's questions have been answered at various forums. RVBC is also replying to her latest correspondence.
- d. The SG agreed that effective consultation has been carried out at Tosside. It was unfortunate that some people have moved to the village since that consultation

period and that some other residents did not attend the consultation events.

- e. The SG agreed that the draft plan has never included the statement of 20 houses being located on the Church Acre site. It was agreed that the draft plan would be modified to make this clear and it was the SG's view that a statement should be added to the plan that referred to "up to 12 houses on the site". **Action CB**
- f. Richard Sherras raised the issue of the Craven, RVBC, and Parish Boundaries in Tosside. He stated his intention to bring this issue to the attention of the examiner by making representations at the next RVBC consultation round. It would then be up to the examiner to comment and make a decision on any possible extending of boundaries prior to any referendum.

4. BBB

- a. RVBC has pointed out the difficulties of working with the phasing suggested for the developments of Sites 1 and 2 in BBB. (Note Site 3 has already been discarded as a development site due to flooding concerns.) The phasing proposal had been introduced to allow a mechanism where residents could, after some development, assess its impact and decide whether further development be appropriate. CB reported that in addition to RVBC's concerns about this phasing policy, examiners of other Neighbourhood Plans, in other areas, had removed similar policies and it was her advice that we should not proceed with this phasing mechanism. After some discussion it was proposed that only one site with up to 8 houses be developed in BBB. This had the benefit that it would be absolutely clear what was being proposed. Consultation feedback (on the SEA) from the Historic England (ibid) suggested that should site 1 be proposed then this might involve more heritage assessment before a NP could be submitted. In view of this, the additional costs involved and the delay that this work would cause, the SG agreed that we should focus development on Site 2 in BBB.

5. Next Steps

- 1. Kirkwells would make further revisions to the plan as a result of the consultation and the comments discussed at this meeting.
- 2. Kirkwells would produce the basic conditions and consultation statement.
- 3. The SG would proof read these documents.

6. Timetable

Kirkwells to produce next draft plan	15 July 2016	
SG to study plan and proof read	12 August 2016	
Plan issued to Parish Councillors	22 August 2016	
Plan discussed at Council	5 September 2016	

At the meeting on 5 September the PC would be asked to approve the plan to go forward to RVBC with a recommendation/request that the next stage of consultation (Reg 16) could begin no later than October 1 2016. Once that was complete the plan, representations received and consultation would be sent by RVBC to the examiner. The target date for the referendum is March 2017 but this will depend upon how long the examiner takes to review the information and any actions arising as a result of his examination.

A D Clements 24/06/16