

Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses – Date

Ref. No.	Consultee Name	Page No.	Para. No.	Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Comments	Amendments to NP
1-1	Cllr Elms				Comment	Thank you for info and keeping me informed.		
2-2	Highways Agency				Comment	Having considered the draft plan, there are no comments that the Highways Agency would need to make.		
3-3	Environment Agency		5.2		Support	We support the reference to flooding as a constraint in Objective 6.		
3-4	Environment Agency		6.14 6.15 6.16 6.17		Comment	These sections discuss the proposed site allocations and flood risk. Our flood maps indicate that Sites 1 and 2 are in Flood Zone 1. As they are less than 1 hectare in size they would not require a site specific flood risk assessment (FRA) under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).		
3-5	Environment Agency		6.16	BBGF1 and 2	Comment	Site 3 is wholly within Flood Zones 2 and 3. We estimate the size of the site as approximately 9500m ² of which approximately 6900 m ² is in Flood Zone 2 and the remainder in Flood Zone 3 (a map showing the Flood Zones for this site is attached). It is our opinion that as the site is greenfield then it is likely to be Flood Zone 3b, i.e. functional floodplain. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) to the NPPF states that housing is classed as 'more vulnerable' and therefore incompatible development in Flood Zone 3b. We would recommend that the site boundary is redrawn to exclude Flood Zone 3b or it is specifically		

						stated that it will be allocated as local greenspace as part of any development. Alternatively, the land owner may wish to challenge our flood maps as they are based on modelling and therefore indicative. It should also be noted that any development within 8m of the top of the river bank of Skirden Beck or Kirk Beck would require our consent as they are classified as Main River. This would only affect Site 3 of the proposed sites.		
3-6	Environment Agency			BBGF1	Comment	The proposed site in Tosside is in Flood Zone 1 and less than 1 hectare in size and therefore a FRA would not be required.		
3-7	Environment Agency			BBGF2	Comment	Phasing of New Housing Development: this Policy states under Phase 2 that a community consultation exercise will determine whether Site 2 or Site 3 is the most appropriate if further development is required. If both sites are allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan this determination may be in conflict with the Sequential Test as this requires that sites at least risk of flooding are developed first, unless there is a specific reason that Site 2 is undevelopable.		
3-8	Environment Agency			BBGF5	Comment	We support the requirement to include Sustainable Drainage Systems in any new development.		
3-9	Environment Agency			BBGF17	Comment	Flooding: we support the intention of this Policy but feel that it is not necessary as it duplicates existing controls. Any development proposed in Flood Zones 2 or 3, including Site 3, would require a FRA which would require the measures in the Policy to be considered. In addition, applying flood resilience measures to property boundaries would effectively reduce the capacity of the floodplain in which the development was sited. This would likely result in an objection from the Environment Agency unless		

						compensatory flood storage was provided elsewhere.		
3-10	Environment Agency			BBGF18	Support	We support this strategy as it is in conformity with Policy DME6: Water Management of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and adds further detail to support this Policy.		
3-11	Environment Agency			BBGF19	Comment	Renewable Energy: this policy refers only to wind energy. Given the nature of the watercourses in the area, the Parish Council may wish to consider reference to hydro-electric schemes in this policy.		
4-12	Architectural Liaison Officer			BBGF5	Comment	<p>Crime and community safety are a significant consideration with regard to detrimental effect on residential amenity. Lancashire Constabulary have dedicated Architectural Liaison Officers whose role is to design out crime opportunities on new development and encourage the inclusion of Secured by Design principles to create safer communities with fewer crime risks. Natural surveillance, adequate boundary treatments to promote a sense of ownership and adequate physical security measures form part of these design principles which should be encouraged to promote safe neighbourhoods and deter crime, anti-social behaviour and nuisance.</p> <p>Lancashire Constabulary seek to work with Bolton-by-Bowland, Gisburn Forest & Sawley Parish Council to design out crime and nuisance risks within new development to create safer communities.</p>		
5-13	English Heritage					Thank you for consulting English Heritage, on this occasion we have no comment to make on the application to designate a Neighbourhood Plan Area, we do not need to be consulted at future stages unless the developing plan proposes significant impacts or changes in relation to designated heritage		

						assets or their setting that would require statutory notification to English Heritage by virtue of government notification procedures,		
6-14	Michael Dakin				Support	I have read the plan and wish to record my thanks to those concerned for all the hard work put in so far. I do think our village could do with modest expansion and the phased approach looks good.		
7-15	Richard Matthews		4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all. It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was</p>		

					indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17. Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden		
7-16	Richard Matthews		6.39 & 6.40	Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is</p>		

					<p>to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct , I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p>		
7-17	Richard Matthews	52	6	Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which</p>		

					<p>said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					improvements to the road.		
8-18	Lynne McDonough & John McDonough		4.17 & 4.18	Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 does not make sense. The comment ‘there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;’ What is “it” which is debateable in Tosside.</p> <p>However of greater importance is that a parking need in Holden should have been included at all. Please remember that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>Following these consultations and surveys the overwhelming view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was the objective in the first place, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested</p>		

						actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.		
8-19	Lynne McDonough and John McDonough		6.39 & 6.40		Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is totally misleading and does not reflect the views of Holden residents who were extensively consulted on this issue. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the current unsatisfactory increase in traffic flows now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is essentially what makes it attractive in the first place. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p>		

						<p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need . This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in creating/improving footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. This being the case, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p>		
8-20	Lynne McDonough and John McDonough	52	6		Comment	<p>On the contrary, the extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear. There was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden</p>		

					<p>View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” is rather misleading and implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents that lane from Copy Nook to Holden which was originally intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant. This was a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. The overwhelming feeling amongst Holden residents is that some measures other than widening which would lead to a worsening of the traffic problems in Holden should be investigated. This issues needs to be addressed by other means than widening. There are several possibilities which have been identified including possible traffic restrictions/calming measures to the road and it is noted that this issue</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7. This has been communicated to Lancashire County Council but with limited budget they are not proposing any changes. The Parish Council has adopted this issue and will continue to propose and discuss with the County Council possible measures to improve the road in line with the views of the overwhelming majority of the Holden residents.		
9-21	George Brookes	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all. It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p>		

					<p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
9-22	George Brookes	29	6.39 & 6.40	Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place.</p> <p>The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p>		

						<p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct , I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p>		
9-23	George Brookes	52	6		Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of</p>		

					<p>the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					 to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.		
10-24	Sarah Hames-Clarke	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	The problem isn't so much inadequate parking provision in Holden as an unacceptable level of traffic attempting to park there and therefore parking on the narrow lane (which, contrary to the signage, is a designated Quiet Lane to its end past the bridge). As representatives from RBVC have agreed, traffic using the Nursery should be parking within the Nursery curtilage. The last thing Holden wants is more parking provision which will encourage more visitors and further overflow onto already dangerously-overcrowded roads.		
10-25	Sarah Hames-Clarke	29	6.39 & 6.40		Comment	The problem isn't so much inadequate parking provision in Holden as an unacceptable level of traffic attempting to park there and therefore parking on the narrow lane (which, contrary to the signage, is a designated Quiet Lane to its end past the bridge). As representatives from RBVC have agreed, traffic using the Nursery should be parking within the Nursery curtilage. The last thing Holden wants is more parking provision which will encourage more visitors and further overflow onto already dangerously-overcrowded roads.		
11-26	Joel Hames-Clarke	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	The problem isn't so much inadequate parking provision in Holden as an unacceptable level of traffic attempting to park there and therefore parking on the narrow lane (which, contrary to the signage, is a designated Quiet Lane to its end past the bridge). As representatives from RBVC have agreed, traffic using the Nursery should be parking within the Nursery curtilage. The last thing Holden wants is more parking		

						provision which will encourage more visitors and further overflow onto already dangerously-overcrowded roads.		
11-27	Joel Hames-Clarke	29	6.39 & 6.40		Comment	The problem isn't so much inadequate parking provision in Holden as an unacceptable level of traffic attempting to park there and therefore parking on the narrow lane (which, contrary to the signage, is a designated Quiet Lane to its end past the bridge). As representatives from RBVC have agreed, traffic using the Nursery should be parking within the Nursery curtilage. The last thing Holden wants is more parking provision which will encourage more visitors and further overflow onto already dangerously-overcrowded roads.		
12-28	Nicholas Hellewell	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all. It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and</p>		

					<p>that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
12-29	Nicholas Hellewell	29	6.39 & 6.40	Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to</p>		

					<p>have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct , I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “... of</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

						roadside footpaths in between villages.”		
12-30	Nicholas Hellewell	52	6		Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to</p>		

						Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.		
13-31	Ribble Valley Borough Council				Comment	Is there a plan period for this plan, i.e. a start and an end date? BBGF2 refers to an end date of 2028.		
13-32	Ribble Valley Borough Council		1.23		Comment	Bullet 2 - To what does the 54.3% in brackets refer?		
13-33	Ribble Valley Borough Council		4.1		Comment	The document should state that there are other parts of national planning legislation that might have a bearing in addition to NPPF and NPPG.		
13-34	Ribble Valley Borough Council		4.2 4.3		Comment	The document should make it clearer that the Neighbourhood Plan must be in conformity with the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. While the detail is quoted within Appendix A (which is referred to in 4.4) a clear statement in either 4.2 or 4.3 of this relationship would be helpful.		
13-35	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.4		Comment	This contains housing requirement figures that relate to a previous version of the Core Strategy. The correct versions are now within the Adopted Core Strategy Table 4.12 Page 42 which breaks down an overall figure of houses in "Other Settlements" in a more detailed way.		
13-36	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.7		Comment	It should be emphasised that these policies relate to Adopted Ribble Valley Core Strategy policies. This would help in reading through further sections of the		

						<p>plan.</p> <p>The three proposed housing sites all appear to be sites mentioned as Included Sites within the RVBC 2013 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and therefore this document should be referenced within this section.</p>		
13-37	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.9		Comment	The reference to the (RVBC) Local Housing Needs Survey should be referenced in Appendix A as an important technical source.		
13-38	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.11 & 6.12		Comment	<p>It is not clear how any information quoted as general housing need could be translated into actual housing units over the plan's period mentioned in BBGF1 and BBGF2. This is a detailed and important matter and should be set out before any consideration of actual sites is undertaken. Numbers are mentioned within Policy BBGF1 but their derivation should be made clearer here or within 6.13. These numbers would need to be justified to aid in any decisions on relevant planning applications.</p> <p>It is also important that Core Strategy policy DMG2 is adequately referred to in relation to this issue.</p>		
13-39	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.12 6.13 6.14		Comment	<p>It is also unclear what criteria have been used to select the various sites mentioned and their relative sustainability. What other sites were considered? Is it dependent on SHLAA information? Also Ribble Valley Borough Council are embarking on the development of a formal land allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and it will be important that there is significant liaison regarding any proposed allocations through the Neighbourhood Plan and through RVBC's document, which will have a series of formal consultations.</p>		
13-40	Ribble Valley		6.16		Comment	While the various general tests that would apply to		

	Borough Council					Site 3 within Flood Zone 3 are laid out it is still unclear how it could be considered sustainable as a housing site. Is this site the most sustainable solution? Are there not more sustainable sites? There also needs to be a link here to Policy BBGF19 Flooding, which appears later in the document.		
13-41	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF1	Comment	<p>Note above concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of Site 3 • Derivation of housing numbers in final para. <p>New Housing Development (Policy BBFG-1) Proposals map sites 1 – 3: New Housing Development (Policy BBFG-1) A number of the identified preferred development/housing sites appear to be adjacent or within close proximity to Designated Heritage Assets (Listed Buildings, Conservation Area, Focal Buildings). It is likely that the a number of the areas designated for 'future development' or 'housing' currently play a role in the overall setting/importance and inherent value of the aforementioned assets. A detailed assessment in relation to potential impacts, opportunities/constraints should be undertaken prior to 'site allocations'. Further detailed liaison on this matter on a site by site basis with RVBC officers is recommended. This could involve the development of supplemental guidance that could address a range of important considerations such materials, boundary treatments, roofscapes etc.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Tosside settlement boundary (Map 02) does not appear to match the defined settlement boundary as carried forward by the Adopted Core Strategy.</p>		

13-42	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF2	Comment	The phasing stated in this policy may be difficult to justify, for instance in terms of development viability considerations. Does it refer to development for market housing or only local needs or both? Also it is not clear how the housing policies here relate to the Core Strategy policies and their emphasis on affordable housing. It should also be mentioned that recent changes to Planning Policy Guidance regarding Planning Obligations and associated thresholds may also have an effect on the local provision of affordable housing and whether or not it would be NPPF compliant.		
13-43	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.21		Comment	The reference to following criteria to allow conversion of existing farmstead building to housing needs clarification. Housing within the Open Countryside (i.e. outside defined settlement of Bolton by Bowland and Holden) would need to have regard to the Adopted Core Strategy Key Statement EN2 and policy DMH3.		
13-44	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.22		Comment	Clarification is needed to define “exceptional circumstances” envisaged to justify new build?		
13-45	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.23 6.24		Comment	Clarification as to the intention of the plan to allow up to 6 new dwellings in each existing farmstead? If it is envisaged that there would only be 1 or 2 such developments how could this number be justified and what site criteria could be used to judge applications? It is noted that the recent changes to the GPDO regarding change of use of farm buildings to dwellings do not apply within the AONB are mentioned in 6.27.		
13-46	Ribble Valley Borough Council		6.28		Comment	Refers to “restrictions and criteria” that are presumably within BBGF3 or are these to be developed later?		

13-47	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF3	Comment	<p>Policy BBGF3 (replacement dwellings) does not appear to take account of the possible loss of character to the AONB resulting from the demolition of traditional buildings (undesigned heritage assets).</p> <p>Also it is unclear how this policy relates to the Core Strategy policies DMH3 Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB and DMH4 Conversion of Barns and Other Buildings to Dwellings, with which it shares many elements. Its final criteria regarding meeting “identified local needs” would seem to limit such conversions to affordable only dwellings which may render many sites financially unviable.</p> <p>The terms ‘Countryside Settlements’ requires further definition as does Isolated Location (e.g. isolated from services/facilities or visually isolated).</p>		
13-48	Ribble Valley Borough Council	26			Comment	<p>Objective 2</p> <p>Further consideration is required to statutory duties at 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p>		
13-49	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF4	Comment	<p>Policy BBGF4 is entitled ‘Protecting Heritage Assets’ but the text appears to refer to Designated Heritage Assets only. Further detailed liaison with specialist RVBC staff is recommended relating to various aspects of this policy including the implications of and definition of “preserve and enhance” and to “identified open spaces and views within the conservation area”.</p>		
13-50	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF5	Comment	<p>Encouragement of conversion of barns/existing buildings for housing provision in the countryside and Policy BBGF5 ‘General Design Principles –</p> <p>We would suggest further consideration to the ‘optimum viable use’ of heritage assets such as, but not limited to, barns within the policy.</p>		

						<p>Furthermore, we would suggest that detailed design guidance on barn conversion accompanies these proposals (and Policy BBGF12), particularly as NPPF emphasises great weight to be given to conservation of cultural heritage within AONBs and the significance of “non-designated heritage assets” which could encompass barns and other agricultural buildings. Further clarification can be sought from specialist bodies such as English Heritage, which we assume have also been consulted on this draft. Also RVBC specialist staff would be available for further liaison.</p> <p>Also we are uncertain as to the intended relationship of items (a) to (e) in the policy to other policies in the Core Strategy. (a) to (e) seem to be stated as the only criteria to be met before approval can be given. In the Core Strategy there are many other considerations that may come into play in relation to an application e.g. DMG1 and DMG2. Whilst these policies are mentioned in the Technical Evidence section the exact relationship needs more clarity.</p>		
13-51	Ribble Valley Borough Council	29			Comment	<p>Objective 3 Technical evidence section should refer to Core Strategy Key Statement DMI 1 Planning Obligations. This specifically relates to Bowland Plan policy BBGF7.</p>		
13-52	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF6	Comment	<p>We are uncertain as to which planning body this policy is directed toward. We are also uncertain as to whether this is a policy as such but rather a statement of support for other, unstated, bodies’ plans and road safety and traffic management? We are also uncertain as to how this could be applied to an application put to us. Are there particular traffic management projects that this statement is referring</p>		

						to?		
13-53	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF7	Comment	As mentioned above Core Strategy Key Statement DMI1 Obligations sets out the Council's priorities in seeking Planning Obligations and these include "Improvements in highway safety". Also within Core Strategy Chapter 8, which contains the above Key Statement, "Transport" is mentioned as an item for obligations negotiation. Possibly there could be a better link to Appendix D item 6 here which sets out the Parish's intentions on local bus services as a Parish Action outside the neighbourhood plan. This relates to the last bullet in the policy.		
13-54	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF8	Comment	We are uncertain as to the exact meaning of the final sentence of the policy – further detail would help here on the types of connection intended and also the meaning of "other communications networks".		
13-55	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF10	Comment	Item A includes concepts such as "significant periods of time" without defining them. Core strategy policy DMB1 contains a minimum period of marketing. We also have concerns as to how Item B could actually be enforced should any particular site become economically unviable and be used for another purpose. As such it may conflict with DMB1.		
13-56	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF11	Comment	The development of land for a potentially wide variety of employment uses could involve many considerations that go beyond the four elements mentioned in the policy. To aid clarity the relationship of these points to the various relevant Core Strategy policies such as DMB1 would help. It is important that there is no unnecessary duplication of Neighbourhood Plan policies and Core Strategy adopted policies.		
13-57	Ribble Valley			BBGF13	Comment	Bullet 2 seems to state that tourism development can		

	Borough Council					<p>only be located within a converted building and therefore may conflict with Core Strategy policy DMB3. In general this policy seems to us to limit the nature of tourism development.</p> <p>Bullet 1 may also conflict with the same policy. Also what does the word “accommodation” specifically mean in this context?</p> <p>Second paragraph, all bullets points should end with ‘; and’</p>		
13-58	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF14	Comment	<p>In referring to NPPF paras 76 and 77 is it the intention of the Plan to designate the list of spaces as “Local Green Spaces”? If so does it follow Planning Policy Guidance on the subject, for instance have local landowners been specifically consulted on these proposed designations? Also, if such designation is proposed, it would seem that BBGF14 is effectively a list of spaces, or a type of allocation and not a specific policy as such.</p> <p>The intention to designate is made clearer in Appendix D as a Parish Action. The link to this Appendix, or perhaps some of its text would be more usefully placed as explanation of this policy.</p> <p>Site 03 may potentially adversely affect the sense of ‘openness’ of 2. Stocks Green.</p>		
13-59	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF15	Comment	<p>There may be some contradiction between this policy and Core Strategy Key Statement EC2 which states that</p> <p>“Proposals that have an adverse impact on existing community facilities would only be permitted as an exception where the proposed development would bring defined and demonstrable benefits”.</p> <p>Also it may be difficult to insist on the provision of an alternative site that item a) appears to state.</p>		

						However it may be worth investigating further as a possible mitigation measure for the loss of a facility.		
13-60	Ribble Valley Borough Council	37			Comment	Objective 6 – Natural Environment Add Core Strategy policy DME6 Water Management to the list of relevant policies in the Technical Evidence section. Also it is suggested that the Forest of Bowland AONB Renewable Energy Position Statement be referred to in this section. Also reference should be made to national planning policy guidance (NPPG) on Flood Risk, in particular the sequential and exceptions tests for development within Flood Zones 2 and 3.		
13-61	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF16	Comment	Bullet 3 refers to “Protecting important views” – where are these defined or what criteria will be used to define them? Are they those defined within the Landscape Character Assessment documents referred to within the technical Evidence?		
13-62	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF17	Comment	Fuller reference should be made here to Planning Policy Guidance on flood risk, especially as in earlier parts of the document it was suggested that there are potential housing sites within Flood Zone 3 (see section 6 above). While The Sequential and Exceptions tests are mentioned in Section 6 (6.13) as background information they should be also brought into this policy in some detail. It is assumed that the Environment Agency, the lead flood risk advice body may well have more detailed comments to make on this policy. There may also be issues relating to the effect on visual impact of raising land levels. Further dialogue with RVBC is recommended.		
13-63	Ribble Valley Borough Council			BBGF19	Comment	This policy should be reviewed in relation to the AONB Position Statement mentioned above.		

13-64	Ribble Valley Borough Council	44			Comment	Appendix A - Should contain reference to the RVBC Local Housing Needs document as an important technical source (see also 6.9 above).		
14-65	Diane Matthews	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'There is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to "Support improvements to car parking provision in villages ." is far too broad and</p>		

						should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.		
14-66	Diane Matthews	29	6.39 & 6.40		Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place.</p> <p>The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is</p>		

						<p>far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct , I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p>		
14-67	Diane Matthews	52	6		Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.”</p> <p>The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this</p>		

						<p>section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated</p> <p>..... to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.</p>		
15-68	Lancashire County Council	23	6.17		Comment	<p>Lancashire County Council (LCC) is responsible for planning the provision of school places. Consideration is given to the influences on local population change, including the birth rate, inward and outward migration and the location of new and proposed housing developments.</p> <p>The reduction in capital funding, being made available to LCC, means that the need to seek contributions from housing developers, where the development is expected to impact upon school places, may increase. LCC measures the impact of each development on the</p>		

						<p>surrounding schools, where the expected number of pupils from the new development exceeds the available places in local schools, a contribution towards the expansion of an existing school or the building of a new school, may be sought.</p> <p>An additional issue for LCC is the lack of suitable sites for the provision of additional school places. LCCBB will work closely with the local planning authority to identify suitable sites through the site allocation process. Whilst the growth in pupils is currently impacting on the primary school sector, this growth will move into the secondary sector.</p>		
15-69	Lancashire County Council			BBGF5	Support	<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority is pleased to see the inclusion of the following policy in relation to flood risk in the Bolton with Bowland and Gisburn Forest Draft Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy BBGF5 General Design Principles H) Use of Sustainable Drainage Systems 		
15-70	Lancashire County Council			BBGF17	Support	<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority is pleased to see the inclusion of the following policy in relation to flood risk in the Bolton with Bowland and Gisburn Forest Draft Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy BBGF17 Flooding 		
15-71	Lancashire County Council			BBGF18	Support	<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority is pleased to see the inclusion of the following policy in relation to flood risk in the Bolton with Bowland and Gisburn Forest Draft Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy BBGF18 Water Management and Surface Water Run-off 		
15-72	Lancashire County Council				Comment	<p>Local sources of flooding and sustainable drainage systems are reflected within the Bolton with Bowland and Gisburn Forest Draft Neighbourhood Plan. It is</p>		

						considered that the policies contained within the Bolton with Bowland and Gisburn Forest Draft Neighbourhood Plan are in general conformity with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Core Planning Principles Section 17) and the Planning Practice Guidance as well as the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 (Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change and Policy DME6: Water Management).		
16-73	Coal Authority					As you will be aware the proposed neighbourhood area is outside of the defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
17-74	Tosside Community Link				Support	<p>I am writing on behalf of the 13 local residents who are the elected Trustees of Tosside Community Link (TCL), a charity that provides a framework for all local voluntary groups to work together for the benefit of the community. It provides a venue, the community hall, for the operation of events and services for the community.</p> <p>TCL fully support the current initiatives in Tosside ie</p> <p>a) The application for the funding of a study into the possibility of a district heating system using biomass or ground source heat pumps and some form of electricity generation for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>b) The feasibility study that is being undertaken to find a way to use Church Acre for the benefit of the community. A community-led mixed development of homes would help satisfy local needs for housing and also help to regenerate Tosside.</p> <p>We are very clear that the Neighbourhood Plan is extremely important in obtaining widespread support</p>		

						for the implementation of these projects, particularly for Church Acre. A number of recent local meetings have demonstrated this support. Accordingly we have worked with Tosside Parochial Church Council (PCC), who own Church Acre and have agreed that both organisations would like the following changes made to the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) :-		
17-75	Tosside Community Link	16	4.19		Comment	This para does not help to sell houses although we can see why you are making the point to get broadband. According to AA Route Planner the longest time for a journey to Leeds or Manchester is 1hr 22minutes so doubling this it is under 3 hours not 2-4 hours. Could this para be reworded to exclude this reference, preferably by deleting the sentence "This location comescommuting times".		
17-76	Tosside Community Link	22	6.18 new para		Comment	(this means all following para numbers need to be changed) - Similar paragraphs to Bolton by Bowland on consultation meetings (see 6.12 to 6.17) should be introduced regarding Tosside. Our suggestion is to insert prior to Policy BBGF1 the following :- " para 6.18 - A possible housing site has been identified in Tosside which could be used to satisfy local housing needs and with the appropriate mix of affordable and open market homes could regenerate the village. A consultation event was held to discuss the idea of a community led development of this site which is known as Church Acre and to see whether the community supported this development. The meeting was attended by 40 people and there was overwhelming support for this development."		

17-77	Tosside Community Link	22		BBGF1	Comment	Change last sentence to read "Development in Tosside on the preferred site will be limited to a reasonable density consistent with making the project viable as a community led project". (I.e. We do not want to limit the number at this stage. Previous plans of 12 dwellings did not use all of the available land)		
17-78	Tosside Community Link	35	6.53		Comment	We suggest that the last sentence should read "The main additional amenity suggested was playground/sports area/park/picnic area in Bolton by Bowland." The key actions from the Tosside workshop included "build small park/playground" and in the Miracle Box under community facilities "playground, outdoor sports area and allotments". No-one raised this point at the latest consultation meeting and as it could impinge on the viability of the development of Church Acre, which is the main priority, we would prefer the reference to Tosside be excluded. During further consultations with the community we will be able to judge the strength of opinion for these facilities and consider whether the Plantation Woodland or some part of Church Acre should be used.		
17-79	Tosside Community Link	39	6.63		Comment	The study, which is supported by Tosside residents, may recommend the installation of wind turbines and/or solar PV arrays. The electricity generated could be sold to an energy supplier so that the community benefits from this sale in terms of cash not necessarily electricity. If this is agreed a new business could be set up to run it but business is not mentioned in the current NP. We suggest 6.63 should read "This Neighbourhood Plan supports and encourages the installation of all forms of micro and small renewable energy systems to generate heat and power, subject		

						to any new building being sited in the landscape in a sensitive and appropriate manner” If you feel that micro and small needs to be defined we suggest you use the wording in the Forest of Bowland AONB position statement dated April 2011 para 3.2.		
17-80	Tosside Community Link	40	6.64		Comment	we suggest this is deleted as it is covered in 6.63 above but the following could be inserted in its place “Collective action to reduce, purchase and manage energy is supported to both save money and reduce our carbon footprint”		
17-81	Tosside Community Link	40		BBGF19	Comment	Renewable Energy. As written it only addresses wind energy and is in line with the FOB position statement para 4.4 We suggest that as far as Tosside is concerned we do not expect to be installing hydro or anaerobic digestion systems in the area but the other items in the AONB position statement should be included. Alternatively a much shorter policy could be written repeating what has been suggested above in 6.63 and 6.64.		
17-82	Tosside Community Link	42	Map 2			As drawn, we are very happy with the settlement boundary as it includes Church Acre. However our understanding is that Church Acre is not within the current settlement boundary. In order that planning permission for homes on Church Acre may more easily be obtained we would like some reference made to extending the settlement boundary to include Church Acre somewhere in the NP. Our suggestion is to insert, perhaps as a new para 6.20 after our suggested new para 6.19, “The settlement boundary for Tosside should be extended to include the area marked in red in Map 2. “ We understand that Bolton by Bowland would also like to extend their settlement boundary and may also want this kind of statement.		

						<p>b) Page 42 Map 2 – This shows the Settlement Boundary including Church Acre but excluding the part of the settlement in Craven so we believe the boundary shown is incorrect. This might be by design but using red for the boundary and red for the new housing site is far from clear so we suggest the settlement boundary should be marked in a contrasting colour. This could be described on Map 2 as “Current Settlement Boundary” to fit in with the note in 8a) above</p> <p>c) Page 42 Map 2 – This should be revised to extend the red colour which defines the housing site to include the almost triangular piece of land which is above the Old School House.</p>		
18-83	Lisette Bradshaw	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment ‘There is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tossie and Holden;’ does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked</p>		

					<p>within the nursery curtilage.” This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
18-84	Lisette Bradshaw	29	6.39 & 6.40		<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place.</p> <p>The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding</p>		

					<p>on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need . This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct , I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p>		
18-85	Lisette Bradshaw	52	6		<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated</p>		

					<p>notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

						possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.		
19-86	United Utilities				Comment	We have reviewed your consultation documents and have no comments to make at this stage, but wish to be included in further consultations and where necessary, the development of your future growth plans and supporting policies, to ensure we can facilitate the delivery of the necessary sustainable infrastructure in line with your delivery targets, whilst safeguarding our service to customers.		
20-87	Forest of Bowland AONB		4.21		Comment	Suggest minor amendment of paragraph to: "There was support for promoting tourism and developing local businesses, including through the conversion of old or unused building, where it conserves and enhances local landscape character. "		
20-88	Forest of Bowland AONB		6.25		Comment	Suggest replacement of paragraph to: "The Forest of Bowland AONB Partnership recognises the need to maintain resilient and sustainable communities within the area. Sensitive re-use or conversion of a group of buildings in a more isolated location (such as a farmstead) could be supported by the AONB, particularly where a development would help retain an important building or feature within the landscape an/or conserve and enhance landscape character." Policy wording for Policy 3 may need to be amended to reflect the above?		
20-89	Forest of Bowland AONB			BBGF5	Comment	The designated area of Bolton by Bowland and Gisburn Forest has a distinctive local landscape characterIn seeking to conserve and enhance the		

						character and unique identity of the area, all development will take account of the following:		
20-90	Forest of Bowland AONB			BBGF7	Comment	<p>In looking to implement highway improvement schemes and traffic calming measures within the designated area, the AONB would recommend these schemes avoid creating a "suburbanising" effect on the character of the villages and wider countryside (e.g. proliferation of painted lines, kerbing, signage clutter, speed humps etc.). A stated intention in this policy "to ensure schemes will conserve and enhance landscape character of the designated area" would be welcomed.</p> <p>Northumberland Coast AONB has assisted the community in Bamburgh to address traffic calming and parking issues whilst avoiding the above effects. I can get details of this project if this would be of interest to the Parish Council.</p>		
20-91	Forest of Bowland AONB			BBGF8	Comment	<p>Suggest minor amendments to wording as below:</p> <p>The development of new high-speed broadband and mobile infrastructure to serve the Parish will be supported, where it is sympathetically designed and significant landscape and visual effects have been adequately mitigated.</p>		
20-92	Forest of Bowland AONB			BBGF9	Comment	<p>Suggest minor amendments to wording as below:</p> <p>"Linkages to wildlife corridors and actions to promote biodiversity conservation along routes to support local biodiversity objectives..."</p>		
20-93	Forest of Bowland AONB			BBGF16	Comment	<p>Suggest minor amendments to wording as below:</p> <p>"Using appropriate local building materials, which</p>		

						respect the building vernacular of existing settlements."		
20-94	Forest of Bowland AONB			BBGF19	Comment	A reference to the Forest of Bowland AONB Renewable Energy Position Statement 2011 would be welcomed somewhere in this section.		
21-95	Jeremy Holmes	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village . The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17 .</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested</p>		

						actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden		
21-96	Jeremy Holmes	29	6.39 & 6.40		Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested</p>		

					<p>actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct , I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p>		
21-97	Jeremy Holmes	52	6		<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact</p>		

						<p>adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.</p>		
22-98	Johnathan Dickinson	21	6.14		Comment	<p>The proposal to develop site 3 is opposed by a large majority of residents. In those circumstances it beggars belief that it has been included in a ‘neighbourhood’ plan. The creators of the plan appear to have disregarded the wishes of the community and</p>		

						<p>bowed to pressures exerted by the landowner. The plan doesn't explain why site 3's inclusion is justified despite it being contrary to the wishes of the majority. Site 3 is in the heart of the village, adjacent to the historical village green. It is rich in wildlife and home to a variety of species. Any development of site 3 would result in a blot on a beautiful landscape and do irreparable damage to our largely unspoilt village. If the purpose of a neighbourhood plan is to give residents a meaningful say in planning decisions which affect them, this plan purports to ignore the community's local knowledge and understanding of its own needs. Preferring instead to reflect the demands of a landowner who wouldn't be able to get permission for development of site 3 under any other circumstances. In our view the deal struck with the landowner renders the plan lacking in credibility and integrity. We will not be supporting this plan in the referendum. The decision of the residents of the Sawley ward to opt out of inclusion in the plan seems, with hindsight, to have been sensible. Anyone in favour of this plan is voting for a pointless and lasting destruction of the natural environment.</p>		
23-99	Michael Heyworth	23	6.17	BBGF2	Comment	<p>What is affordable housing in a property hotspot? Isn't there a risk that the prominent position of Plot 1 on the approach to the village will shout 'housing estate with up to 6 properties?'</p>		
24-100	Tony Barker	21 & 22	6.14 & 6.15	BBGF1	Object	<p>I will not support a plan with site 3 included</p>		
25-101	Karen Barker	21 & 22	6.14 & 6.15	BBGF1	Object	<p>Site 3 was clearly unpopular, therefore leaving the door open is not reflecting the wishes of the community. The area should be a protected green</p>		

					space.		
26-102	Ann Groves	24	6.22		Comment	Wording 'in very exceptional circumstances' seems rather extreme. Could it just say will be considered.	
27-103	C Walmsley	16	4.17 & 4.18		Object	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to "Support improvements to car parking provision in villages ." is far too broad and</p>	

						should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.		
27-104	C Walmsley	29	6.39 & 6.40		Comment	<p>There is no available land in the village (Holden) for a car park. The road (1-5) Brookside is privately owned. Road outside my address is owned by me and is on my deeds.</p> <p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place.</p> <p>The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision</p>		

						<p>in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages .”</p>		
27-105	C Walmsley	52	6		Comment	<p>A Give Way sign at the entrance to Holden Lane (alongside Copy Nook Hotel) and the same in the direction of Copy Nook at the at the only place where it is easy to pass.</p> <p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane</p>		

					<p>was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated</p> <p>..... to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.</p>		
28-106	Ian Willock	6	4.17 &	Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden,</p>		

			4.18			<p>and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to "Support improvements to car parking provision in villages ." is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
28-107	Ian Willock	29	6.39 &		Comment	The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely		

			6.40		<p>misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of</p>		
--	--	--	------	--	--	--	--

					<p>roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages .”</p>		
28-108	Ian Willock	52	6	Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which</p>		

					<p>have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.</p>		
29-109	Carole Willock		4.17 & 4.18	Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment ‘there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;’ does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through</p>		

					<p>the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
29-110	Carole Willock	29	6.39 & 6.40	Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place.</p> <p>The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st</p>		

					<p>August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages .”</p>		
29-111	Carole	52	6	Comment	The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of		

	Willock				<p>roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said "It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village." The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words "too small for the current traffic volumes" rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it</p>		
--	---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

						was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.		
30-112	James Waddington	23 & 24	3.22		Comment	Last line of paragraph needs changing to: <i>New buildings in such situations should be allowed.</i>		
30-113	James Waddington			BBGF3	Comment	Last bullet point: Add additional words to clarify the development meets an identified need as defined by the parish council.		
31-114	Joan Pickup	16	4.17 & 4.18		Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden, and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p>		

						<p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking provision in villages .” is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
31-115	Joan Pickup	29	6.39 & 6.40		Comment	<p>The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place.</p> <p>The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p>		

					<p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages .”</p>		
31-116	Joan Pickup	52	6	Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane</p>		

					<p>was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated</p> <p>..... to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.</p>		
32-117	John Pickup	16	4.17 &	Comment	<p>Firstly paragraph 4.17 is ambiguous. The comment 'there is inadequate parking provision within Holden,</p>		

			4.18			<p>and it is debatable in Tosside and Holden;' does not make sense.</p> <p>More important however is the inclusion of a parking need in Holden at all.</p> <p>It should be remembered that extensive consultations and surveys took place in Holden to contribute to the neighbourhood plan and these were accepted by the Steering Group as a valid contribution to the formation of the plan.</p> <p>The comprehensive view of Holden residents was that additional public parking was definitely not wanted since this would worsen the problem of the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no "wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage." This on street parking issue connected with Holden Clough Nursery was already being dealt with by the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of Holden residents is to be reflected in the plan, which I understood was indeed the objective, I would suggest that the statement that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is deleted from Para 4.17.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 4.18 under suggested actions , the proposal to "Support improvements to car parking provision in villages ." is far too broad and should refer to the specific villages where this need has been identified . This should certainly not include Holden.</p>		
32-118	John Pickup	29	6.39 &		Comment	The observation in Local Evidence that there is inadequate parking provision in Holden is extremely		

			6.40		<p>misleading and again does not reflect the views of Holden residents who have been consulted extremely thoroughly. There is no wish to extend car parking provision in Holden as this will inevitably worsen the unwelcome increase in traffic now passing through the village. Residents are more than happy for walkers to pass through the hamlet using the existing network of paths but object strongly to the suggestion of a public parking provision which would encourage the use of Holden as the starting point for such walks and thus destroy the peaceful nature of the hamlet which is core to what makes it attractive in the first place. The circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August specifically refer to there being no “wish to have a public car park in village and that vehicles visiting the nursery should be parked within the nursery curtilage.” The residents’ concerns regarding on road parking connected with visitors to Holden Clough nursery are the subject of planning processes within the Borough.</p> <p>If the overwhelming opinion of the Holden residents is to be reflected in the Plan, which I understood was indeed the objective , I would request that the statement that “there is inadequate parking provision in Holden” is deleted from Para 6.39.</p> <p>Therefore it follows that in Para 6.40 under suggested actions , the proposal to “Support improvements to car parking in villages” is far too broad and I would request that it be modified to refer to the specific villages where the residents have identified this need. This should certainly not include Holden.</p> <p>Returning to Para 6.39, I fail to see how “the lack of</p>		
--	--	--	------	--	--	--	--

					<p>roadside footpaths in villages” can be addressed without ruining the character of both Holden and Bolton By Bowland. It was my understanding from the workshop notes that there was some interest in roadside footpaths between villages, but not within the villages. If I am correct, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages.”</p> <p>Similarly in Para 6.40 under suggested actions, I would request the wording be modified to read “..... of roadside footpaths in between villages .”</p>		
32-119	John Pickup	52	6	Comment	<p>The extensive consultations in Holden on the issue of roads were extremely clear that there was no wish to increase the size of the road from Copy Nook to Holden. It was strongly felt that to do so would very seriously detract from the attractive rural nature of the area. This view was expressed in the circulated notes from the Holden Meeting of 21st August which said “It was strongly agreed that widening the lane was not something that was desirable and would impact adversely on the character of Holden village.” The question of asking to have the lane widened was also put in the Holden View questionnaire and 75% were of the opinion that widening would impact adversely on the character of Holden village and the visual aspect of entry into it. Additionally a significant number thought that widening would increase the current problem regarding excessive speed on this section of road. There is much concern about the volume and speed of traffic now using this and other roads in the village but this issue has to be addressed by other means. There are several possibilities, which</p>		

					<p>have been identified, and I note that this issue has been addressed in Policy BBGF6 and F7.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that the words “too small for the current traffic volumes” rather implies that widening is needed. I request that the above first paragraph be modified to read as follows :-</p> <p>The consultation workshops indicated a strong feeling from Holden residents and other locals that the attractive dry stone walled lane from Copy Nook to Holden intended for local and farming traffic is now having to cope with vast amounts of leisure traffic either carrying bikers to Gisburn Forest or visitors to the Holden Clough restaurant, a purpose for which it was never intended and one for which it is extremely unsuitable. This has been communicated to propose and discuss with the County Council possible traffic restrictions, calming and in keeping improvements to the road.</p>		
33-120	Mary Walsh				<p>The Draft Plan promoted by the Steering Group was on the agenda for discussion at the special Parish meeting held on 5th January. After a short introduction to the plan on which we were not allowed to speak we were asked to vote and although it was made clear the vote was not for the content of the plan, but merely to send out for public consultation, days later it was reported in the local paper, the parish news and in the letter sent out to the public that the parish council had voted to approve the plan which we hadn't. This some might say is for a small group promoting their own plan.</p>		
33-121	Mary Walsh				<p>The plan is focussed on building houses on four sites in the parish.</p> <p>(a) all sites are outside the settlement boundary,</p>		

						<p>in an AONB and Conservation Areas.</p> <p>(b) All are in Tier 2 settlements where there is no requirement for market housing, and that it is limited to local needs and regeneration benefits</p> <p>(c) It would set a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other similar unjustified proposals, and necessitate extending all the boundaries which has not been identified in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>New housing on the sites identified would result in significant encroachment of build development in the BxB Conservation Area, and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty into the defined open countryside resulting in significant harm to the character and setting and contrary to the Ribble Valley Core Strategy</p>		
33-122	Mary Walsh					Bolton by Bowland has a small population growth and a housing need wasn't identified in the Housing Needs Survey		
33-123	Mary Walsh					There is no evidence of what support the community have given. The plan does not represent the community or Parish Council members. It undermines people's perception and at 51 pages it is too long and confusing, and contains more information than the community can possibly digest		
33-124	Mary Walsh					There is nothing to show the protection of high value heritage assets – This plan by virtue of its location would result in an outward expansion of the villages into the defined open countryside beyond the settlement limits to the detriment of the character and appearance of the wider landscape context, and the value of protection on high level assets in the		

						village of Bolton by Bowland and the historic built environment in the designated area, and contrary to the policies in the adopted Core Strategy		
33-125	Mary Walsh					There is no evidence that the owners of the land wants to build on these sites		
33-126	Mary Walsh					The plans to increase the number of green spaces and the huge costs for advice has cost the parish dearly when a conflict of interest is evident		
33-127	Mary Walsh					The plan doesn't meet national policies satisfy substantive legislative requirements, basic conditions, and is not sustainable development.		
33-128	Mary Walsh					Bolton by Bowland is the only parish in the whole of Ribble Valley promoting a Neighbourhood Plan, further more although around 1000 communities have taken the first formal steps towards producing a plan only 80 draft plans have been produced for consultation and only 13 have passed the community referendum stage. So this means 987 have failed which should give us something to think about.		
34-129	John Seed			BBGF13	Comment	One local issue that I have become involved in is the use of Bailey Lane as an access to the Forestry Commission estate. Until fairly recently Bailey Lane was an important if not main recreational access to the forest for walkers and cyclists. Timber was taken out by various tracks. This recreational activity brought significant business to the Dog and Partridge and other village businesses. Latterly the Forestry Commission have developed their new hub and café and have made Bailey Lane their principal route for timber lorries and other heavy traffic whilst at the same time discouraging cyclists and walkers. This development is a decision for the Commission, but it does have an effect on Tosside which should be taken		

						into account in the Plan. The prohibition of vehicle parking at the commission end of Bailey Lane has unintentionally increased parking problems in the centre of the village – something which may need to be addressed.		
35-130	Andrew Marshall				Comment	I am writing in support of the letters written by Tosside Community Link and Tosside Parochial Church Council this week. I am in full agreement with the contents of these letters but would also like to make two further points.		
35-131	Andrew Marshall	24	6.22		Comment	I suggest that the words in bold below should be added to the last sentence so that it reads" New buildings in such situations would only be considered in very exceptional circumstances as decided by the Parish Council. " Without this addition it would mean that these exceptional circumstances would be decided by Ribble Valley BC and would not necessarily take into account local knowledge. In the spirit of Localism I feel that the Parish Council is in a better place to make this judgement.		
35-132	Andrew Marshall	25		BBGF3	Comment	Since Policy BBGF1 deals with new housing "within the defined settlement boundaries" Policy BBGF3 must deal with all new housing outside these defined settlement boundaries. If Church Acre is not within the defined settlement boundary of Tosside (see 8a) of TCL letter) it would mean that Policy BBGF3 would apply. Are you sure that "The development meets an identified local need" would be adequate or could it be reworded to say "The development meets a local need identified by the Parish Council".		
36-133	Tosside Parochial Church				Comment	I am writing on behalf of the 8 local resident members of Tosside Parochial Church Council (PCC) which owns the land in Tosside known as Church Acre (CA),		

	Council				<p>situated behind St Bartholomew's Church and along Bailey Lane. As an Anglican PCC we have a duty to act in the interests of every member of our parish and what follows arises from a fervent desire to serve our community. The PCC fully support the current initiatives in Tosside i.e.</p> <p>a) The application for the funding of a study into the possibility of a district heating system using biomass or ground source heat pumps and some form of electricity generation for the benefit of the community. This benefit would extend to the village's church building which would use the district heating system if it can be demonstrated to provide improved heating for a reasonable cost.</p> <p>b) The feasibility study that is being undertaken to find a way to use Church Acre for the benefit of the community. The real need identified is for a community-led mixed development of homes to help satisfy local needs for housing and also help to regenerate Tosside.</p> <p>We are very clear that the Neighbourhood Plan is extremely important in obtaining widespread support for the implementation of these projects, particularly for Church Acre. A number of recent local meetings have demonstrated this support. Accordingly we have worked with Tosside Community Link, the charity that runs Tosside Community Hall, and have agreed that both organisations would like the following changes made to the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) :- We have listed these changes in the same order as the January 2015 Consultation Draft Neighbourhood showing page and paragraph numbers.</p>		
--	---------	--	--	--	---	--	--

36-134	Tosside Parochial Church Council	16	4.19		Comment	This para does not help to sell houses although we can see why you are making the point to get broad band. According to AA Route Planner the longest time for a journey to Leeds or Manchester is 1hr 22minutes so doubling this it is under 3 hours not 2-4 hours. Could this para be reworded to exclude this reference, preferably by deleting the sentence "This location comescommuting times".		
36-135	Tosside Parochial Church Council	22	6.18		Comment	<p>new para 6.18 - (this means all following para numbers need to be changed) - Similar paragraphs to Bolton by Bowland on consultation meetings (see 6.12 to 6.17) should be introduced regarding Tosside. Our suggestion is to insert prior to Policy BBGF1 the following :-</p> <p>" para 6.18 - A possible housing site has been identified in Tosside which could be used to satisfy local housing needs and with the appropriate mix of affordable and open market homes could regenerate the village.</p> <p>A consultation event was held to discuss the idea of a community led development of this site which is known as Church Acre and to see whether the community supported this development. The meeting was attended by 40 people and there was overwhelming support for this development."</p>		
36-136	Tosside Parochial Church Council	22		BBGF1	Comment	Change last sentence to read "Development in Tosside on the preferred site will be limited to a reasonable density consistent with making the project viable as a community led project". (i.e. We do not want to limit the number at this stage. Previous plans of 12 dwellings did not use all of the available land)		
36-137	Tosside	35	6.53		Comment	We suggest that the last sentence should read		

	Parochial Church Council					<p>"The main additional amenity suggested was playground/sports area/park/picnic area in Bolton by Bowland." The key actions from the Tosside workshop included "build small park/playground" and in the Miracle Box under community facilities "playground, outdoor sports area and allotments".</p> <p>No-one raised this point at the latest consultation meeting and as it could impinge on the viability of the development of Church Acre, which is the main priority, we would prefer the reference to Tosside be excluded. During further consultations with the community we will be able to judge the strength of opinion for these facilities and consider whether the Plantation Woodland or some part of Church Acre should be used.</p>		
36-138	Tosside Parochial Church Council	39	6.63		Comment	<p>The study, which is supported by Tosside residents, may recommend the installation of wind turbines and/or solar PV arrays. The electricity generated could be sold to an energy supplier so that the community benefits from this sale in terms of cash not necessarily electricity. If this is agreed a new business could be set up to run it but business is not mentioned in the current NP.</p> <p>We suggest 6.63 should read "This Neighbourhood Plan supports and encourages the installation of all forms of micro and small renewable energy systems to generate heat and power, subject to any new building being sited in the landscape in a sensitive and appropriate manner"</p> <p>If you feel that micro and small needs to be defined we suggest you use the wording in the Forest of</p>		

						Bowland AONB position statement dated April 2011 para 3.2.		
36-139	Tosside Parochial Church Council	40	6.64		Comment	We suggest this is deleted as it is covered in 6.63 above but the following could be inserted in its place "Collective action to reduce, purchase and manage energy is supported to both save money and reduce our carbon footprint"		
36-140	Tosside Parochial Church Council	40		BBGF19	Comment	Renewable Energy. As written it only addresses wind energy and is in line with the FOB position statement para 4.4 We suggest that as far as Tosside is concerned we do not expect to be installing hydro or anaerobic digestion systems in the area but the other items in the AONB position statement should be included. Alternatively a much shorter policy could be written repeating what has been suggested above in 6.63 and 6.64.		
36-141	Tosside Parochial Church Council	42			Comment	Map 2 - As drawn, we are very happy with the settlement boundary as it includes Church Acre. However our understanding is that Church Acre is not within the current settlement boundary. In order that planning permission for homes on Church Acre may more easily be obtained we would like some reference made to extending the settlement boundary to include Church Acre somewhere in the NP. Our suggestion is to insert, perhaps as a new para 6.20 after our suggested new para 6.19, "The settlement boundary for Tosside should be extended to include the area marked in red in Map 2. "We understand that Bolton by Bowland would also like to extend their settlement boundary and may also want this kind of statement.		
36-142	Tosside	42			Comment	Page 42 Map 2 - This shows the Settlement Boundary		

	Parochial Church Council					including Church Acre but excluding the part of the settlement in Craven so we believe the boundary shown is incorrect. This might be by design but using red for the boundary and red for the new housing site is far from clear so we suggest the settlement boundary should be marked in a contrasting colour. This could be described on Map 2 as "Current Settlement Boundary" to fit in with the note in 8a) above		
36-143	Tosside Parochial Church Council					Page 42 Map 2 - This should be revised to extend the red colour which defines the housing site to include the almost triangular piece of land which is above the Old School House.		
36-144	Tosside Parochial Church Council					Finally, we understand that our suggested wording/changes may need to be changed into "planning speak" if the steering group require it. However the purpose of this letter is to give you the background and reasons for our suggestions which we trust you will incorporate in the next version of the Neighbourhood Plan.		