



Minutes of the Kelbrook & Sough Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting no 13

Date and time: 18th December 2019 at 18.30.

Venue: Kelbrook and Sough Village Hall

Attendees:

Debbie Richardson (Chair), Audrey Wilson, Garry Wilson, Steve Petrovic, Christine Wheatley, Alan Wheatley, Linda Petrovic, Val Kimberley

Apologies

Matthew Kennedy, Paul Maskell, Isabel Wood, Andrew Oliver

- 13.1 The previous minutes were approved. Proposed by G.Wilson and seconded by S. Petrovic.
- 13.2 Actions from Minutes – see separate document on updated actions
- 13.3 Action 5.5 DR has obtained an updated picture of surface flooding impacts which shows a number of areas in the parish impacted by surface water flooding. Earby has had some flood defence improvements but further work is needed. This information will feed into the drainage and flooding policies being developed.
- 13.4 Action 8.6 GW and AuW will base views on the Government Guidelines and the research from GW's Character Areas. The open views must be visible from public paths, Country Hedges Lanes roads and bridleways. The views will be important in terms of preserving Character Areas. Views will also include Bleara Road area at the far side of the parish. Stoops Farm views should be included since they formed a significant part of the refusal to provide permission to build on the fields opposite the building. SP and LP will join GW and AuW when they are reviewing the views.
- 13.5 Dry Stone walls are also part of our heritage and need to be maintained and retained. It is not totally clear who has responsibility for this.
- 13.6 Health benefits of the countryside environment will also be included in the plan.
- 13.7 Action 12.3 GW has contacted the Electricity supplier and is waiting for feedback on the outages he has suffered in the last 3 years.
- 13.8 Action 9.5 DR will check with Matt Kennedy whether sites with amenities such as the school playing fields should be included in the green spaces.
- 13.8 The group worked through the queries on scoring the sites that were raised by GW.
 - Q 1.5 Particular use designation - refers to designated as potential Housing, Industry, Mining, Land Fill, etc. ACTION: *No rescoring required since they were all scored as 5 for Housing*
 - Q 1.9 Land availability - This is scored on our belief. We should ask landowners, but if there are overwhelming scores for other sites, it would not matter - where we do not know, we could score in the middle and review with a plus or minus 2. – ACTION: *This was scored on what they indicated on their forms which was immediate. We had a couple that were not.*
 - Q 1.10 PDL- If unoccupied, how long has the site been vacant? ACTION *Has not been scored because all except 1 are green fields with sheep*
 - Q 2.1 We are unable to perform this calculation, but on a broad brush approach, which is what is being requested, we should score every site as VIABLE, because PBC have supposedly removed those that are not. ACTION *We have done this*

Q 2.3 Strength of Demand in the area –

- The area in question is that to be covered by the NP, i.e. Kelbrook & Sough.
- If we use the ONS data sets as suggested, I believe that this relates to population and its growth (census growth from 2001 to 2011 and LCC projection 2017).
- There are also data sets referencing deprivation which include an element of overcrowding. K&S have none of these.
- The latest Zoopla stats show that only 9 houses have moved in the last 12 months, yet there are plenty for sale and most, if not all of the local estate agents we would contact are on Zoopla (Sally Harrison, Pettys, Hunters, Keenans). So we can make a very reasonable case to show that there is only demand driven by population increase or decrease.
- ONS also shows that of the 15.5M owner occupied houses in the UK in 2018 the annual sales amounted to 7.7% changing hands. Using Zooplas statistics (as recommended by PBC) < 2% of K&S houses changed hands in 2018.
- Suggest that we therefore score each site as a 1 = very weak. We can, and probably should, further relate the length of time it took to sell the new builds at Salterforth and the large incentives offered to so do. ACTION: *We have already scored them all as 1*

Q 2.4 Level of Supply - It is purely about the supply in K&S and those areas adjacent or (say within 2 miles) I would suggest that we consider this as a 1 = abundant. We have proved in 2.3 above that there is very weak demand. Also there is a major development granted in Salterforth (adjacent to Earby boundary), large developments approved in Barnoldswick and we must also remember that the Cob Lane site, which has planning permission, does not have developers queuing up to build 10 houses. ACTION: *For most we have not scored*

Q 3.6 Topography

- We have little specialist knowledge in this area, however, flat ground should be scored as a 5.
- The rest are affected by the gradient and Part M of the building Regs. Cut and fill costs increase excavation two fold as a minimum and can increase foundation costs up to 3 times (more in extreme circumstances).
- Buffer zones for wildlife, safety (near a road, noise), surface water flooding or screening will also impact.
- Part M of the building regs which requires disabled "visitability". Where steps would have been constructed, ramps are required. there should be no steps from drive to house frontage. Internally all ground floor levels should on one single level - the same as that when entering the dwelling.
- We need to revise our scores for those already completed and view some of the sites differently. It needs discussion.
- ACTION: *This was discussed and it turns out that they had been taken into account although there may be room for review.*

Q 3.11 Loss of agricultural land - Most of our land is grade 5 because it is pasture for sheep, and as far as I can see mostly unmapped in the Magic classifications. If a crop could be generated, like the fields on the left hand side of the disused railway line, walking from Thornton to Tempest Arms, the land would be considered as grade 4. So, if we have seen a land user take a silage crop from a field, it is grade 4, otherwise grade 5. ACTION: *Review these – some are scored lower*

Q 3.23 Flood zone - I have checked on the recently updated EA maps and the sites are all Flood Zone 1

Q 3.24 Surface Water Flooding Risk - A new map is available and we need to review this for every site as there are some startling revelations - there are some high risk parts to some of the sites.

We have all heard off "run off" when considering planning applications and SuDS, this is known as "run to". <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map>

ACTION: *Potentially review scores*

Q 3.26 Impact on surrounding uses not users - e.g will landfill or mining or industry affect the housing estate next door. This is a one way question - impact of a new development on the use of neighbouring land. As far as I can see all sites score a 5. ACTION: *Currently all scored as 3*

- 13.9 The scoring of sites will be updated once we have agreed our policies and, if they affect the scoring of sites we will add these scores.
- 13.10 SP has reviewed the air quality policies within the Pendle Development Plan. The policy omits global warming and greenhouse gases. The next steps for our Neighbourhood Plan policy will be to further develop the existing Pendle Policy.
- 13.11 AW has continued to work on the transport policies where he has reviewed the Pendle Plan and other neighbourhood plans. It was suggested that he puts forward his proposed policies and then they can be reviewed and reworded as required. One thing to include is to state that any new trains must be electric and not diesel powered. This will link to the Air Quality policy
- 13.12 GW has looked at every dwelling in Kelbrook and Sough built before 1848. These have been documented and the document circulate. Recommendations are:
- The Steering Group should decide which buildings become listed.
 - It could become invaluable for the Parish to have its own Parish Listed Buildings and Character Areas, recognised by plaques and maintained by the local Parish.
 - The buildings are all put onto a map so that individual property locations or groups of properties can be viewed and two or three areas be selected as Character Areas.
 - Residents may not want their homes to be listed, however in general, listed buildings increase the value by approximately 10%.
 - Steering Group members to look at GW's document, note any comments on the listings to discuss at the next meeting.
 - We decide at a later date what information from GW's document goes into the plan and what forms part of the appendices. GW had a meeting with the local History Society to discuss any factual inaccuracies.
 - Sough Mill (possibly 1880) There may be restrictions on planning where the mill site is concerned, as this mill comes under the umbrella of Textile Industry. AW and CW may have a brochure which they will bring to those next meeting.
 - The committee thanked GW for his detailed work on the history of Kelbrook and Sough.
- 13.13 On behalf of the Parish Council a copy of the Lancashire Historic Environment record has been requested. The cost of so doing is £189 plus VAT. Had Pendle opted into the scheme, as every other Lancashire Authority has, this would not have cost anything. It was pointed out by LCC that they wondered how Pendle was fulfilling its obligations under the NPPF without access to the Counties archaeology department.
- 13.14 The Neighbourhood Plan links land and land management. VK has researched a number of Neighbourhood Plans and, in conjunction with the work she has already undertaken, it is important to emphasise that the environment and local farming industry is a strength of the Parish. This will be a key element in the plan with respect to our local economy and improving businesses.



Kelbrook and Sough Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group – Minutes

- 13.15 Broadband policies. DR has started to investigate possibilities. Due to the limitations of the copper wiring in the parish, broadband may never reach the speeds that were promised and alternative solutions may be required. For example, the Shooting School uses 4G mobile signals for internet access.
- 13.16 Ownership of Sough Park. IW sent DR an email stating that the Park is owned by the Parish in perpetuity however, GW believes that this has been taken over by Pendle Council and they own the Park although they are delegating maintenance back to the Parish. Due to budget cuts, opening the toilets remains an issue.
- 13.17 Meetings for next year. DR has asked for bookings for the following dates for 2020. Meetings will continue to be held at 7.00pm on Wednesdays
- Wednesday 22nd Jan (changed from 15th)
 - Wednesday 19th Feb
 - Wednesday 25th March (4th Wednesday)
 - Wednesday 15th April
 - Wednesday 20th May
 - Wednesday 17th June
- 13.18 DR wished everyone a very Happy Christmas. There being no other business, the meeting was closed.

Next Meeting – Wednesday 22nd January at 7.00pm.

A. Wilson, Secretary