

## Minutes of the Thirteenth (Virtual) Meeting of Renhold Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2022 at 7.00pm.

N.B. – To save space, Actions to be taken are highlighted in Turquoise

### **Present:-**

Amanda Quince (Chair), Ian McIver (I.T.), Keith Herkes (Treasurer), Jooles Roberts (Minutes Sec), Claudia Dietz, Nicky Gribble, Denis Ivins, Sarah Mitchell-Wood, Peter Norris, Tony Ploszajski, Kirstin Rayner and Paul Sawford.

Apologies:- None.

**1. Welcome & apologies for absence (AQ).** AQ welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked all those who have worked hard over the last few weeks to ensure that the RNP continues to move forward.

**2. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial interest for the meeting (AQ/All).** None.

**3. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising (all).** Most matters arising appear on this Agenda, with the following additions:

Little & Early Grove - both will appear in the list of LGS, if BedsRCC agree this.

Cemetery – BedsRCC could not find any information with regard to land for the extension of the cemetery & passed the subject back to RNPWG. Clerk to RPC could not find anything from the planning records over the last few years. PN Peter Norris, who knows the Manager, will ask for the information needed for LGS designation.

A zoomed, segmented, more focused map showing the designated aspirations, the Ends, new estates etc – this will be done when time allows. PN needs more direction from the group-future agenda item AQ.

Input from local businesses – KR to resend information to AQ.

### **4. Discussion re Vision and Objectives (KR & TP)**

KR & TP presented a draft of their work. Amendments after group discussion in blue font.

KR :-

#### **Vision as a result**

##### COUNTRYSIDE

To retain and protect **the landscape setting** (formal definition in the GIS) including the historical agricultural and parkland character of **the Renhold Ends** (the old village – formal definition in the GIS) and the separation from Bedford **urban area**.

##### COMMUNITY (to include play spaces, football field & village hall)

To maintain the integrity and individual identity of the urban developments and to support physical proposals to develop social cohesion (**and provide affordable housing**) within the Parish.

To maintain the integrity and individual identity of **all parts of the Parish** and to support **the development of social cohesion within the community, (and to make provision for housing to meet the needs of the community)** - CD suggested this should appear in the Objectives)

##### CONNECTEDNESS

To enhance natural capital (nature and environment – formal definition in the plan) **with** all future developments to benefit both **the** existing and new residents. This includes improved cycling, walking and riding infrastructure (non-motorised travel).

##### CONNECTIVITY

To **protect and** enhance nature and the environment (natural capital – formal definition in the plan) with all future developments benefitting both existing and new residents. This includes improved cycling, walking and riding infrastructure (non-motorised travel).

Strapline to be the 3 headings, “Countryside, Community, Connectivity”, which is short, punchy and easily remembered.

## Questions

1) Are we happy that there is only limited reference to housing development in the vision? Currently covered under the COMMUNITY element of the vision? Add and provide affordable housing?

ANSWER It was agreed that a formal definition is required, covered above.

2) Only two objectives under COMMUNITY. Does the current statement cover what we want to achieve?

ANSWER If facilities and activities were to be split it would give 3 objectives, which could be used as the framework for the number of policies.

3) Natural capital – can we find someone to talk to us about this – perhaps Landscape Officer at BBC? KR thinks we need to mention that we are a ‘carbon sink’ for north Bedford urban area. Need to identify proportions of the parish which are woodland, farmland, streamside environments, and urban. Not sure if the GIS does this?

ANSWER Natural capital (defined as world’s stock of natural resources, which include geology, soils, area, water and all living organisms) will soon become common parlance in the same way as biodiversity has.

4) Water resources and improving biodiversity of streams – need to contact Internal Drainage Board about a project and Anglian Water, Natural England etc. about what is achievable to put in the plan. (N.B. PN and NG are Renhold Brook wardens).

ANSWER Start with the Wildlife Trust who have a Water Warden. This could be done as a joint project with Ravensden NPSG.

### **TP’s Work on Objectives :-**

COUNTRYSIDE **Small-scale housing development in appropriate places/small infills** dependent on local needs

COMMUNITY **Maintain the rural/village character**

COUNTRYSIDE **Preserve the parish as it is/no more housing** Policies will flow through the Vision

COUNTRYSIDE \*Conflict between no more housing and small scale housing must be resolved

CONNECTEDNESS **Deter through traffic/traffic calming**

CONNECTEDNESS **Preservation/enhancement of countryside/habitats** – [Strongly supported by community in Survey](#)

COMMUNITY **Activities to bring the village together/community facilities** – [Non-land issue, so this cannot be an objective](#)

COUNTRYSIDE **Keep a separation between Bedford and Renhold** – [Reflected in the Vision](#)

### **Core (these 3 articulate more cohesively)**

**1. Preserving the character of the Parish (by appropriate, community-specified, small scale development and maintaining the gap with Bedford and between the Ends)**

**2. Conserving the natural environment (with LGS designations and greenspace improvements)**

**3. Enhancing non-vehicular transport (improved Rights of Way network)**

[Liaise with Ravensden NPSG](#)

[Consider a different way of thinking about it. Not traffic calming, but a change in traffic priority. Declassify roads, ban traffic, provide “school streets”. All of this would be easier on the new estates than in the older village.](#)

[If BBC takes the issue of speeding traffic away from the police, it has a new Moving Traffic Policy, including weight restrictions and TRO, which could benefit Renhold. Possibly ask Andy Prigmore how he would feel about a school street.](#)

**Summary – Need to make contact with the public shortly to update them on what is being done**

### **5. Preparation and distribution of Executive Summary and Questionnaire**

This will cover:-

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

How has it been [determined](#)?

What happens next?

(It is not necessary to 'reinvent the wheel' & the basis can be taken from other NP's). [AQ](#) to distribute Gamlingay's NP to those who did not have it. Sarah volunteered to draft the questionnaire on vision and objectives [SMW](#).

Draft to be available at next meeting once everyone has read it through and added their comments. [All](#)

**6. Template format for each topic in the Neighbourhood Plan (TP)** TP's proposal for a template format for the authors of each section of work was agreed.

Format: Introduction – general context, i.e., [shortages](#)  
Subject X in Renhold – i.e. Housing. Focus on Renhold  
Community views/support for subject – follow on from community surveys  
NP objectives for subject – in response  
NP policies for subject – what has to be done to achieve those objectives.

KR suggested that before writing policies there is a need to say whether they conform with the 2040 Local Plan which goes live on April 26<sup>th</sup>. CD suggested an appendix or preamble stating how compliance has been justified. This is probably best done at the end when it can be decided whether this will be the already adopted Plan 2030 or the new 2040 Plan.

### **7. Final decision on Housing Needs Analysis Recommendations (CD/KR)**

BedsRCC final recommendations:-

5 x 2 bedroom houses (3 shared ownership / 1 rent / 1 starter home)  
2 x 3 bedroom house (1 rent / 1 starter home)

CD's recommendations, amended in view of advice from KR that for rental every bed space has to be occupied, i.e. 3 beds = 5 people, which puts pressure on schools etc :-

5 x 2 bedroom houses (1 shared ownership / 2 rent / 2 starter home)  
2 x 3 bedroom houses (1 shared ownership / 1 rent)  
Provision of 3 open market units to allow downsizing (1 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed house & 1 bungalow for those who are over 55 or with a disability)

NG suggested Renhold Charity Cottages might be approached with a view to providing more bungalows, as they have land and intend to build in the future. KR agreed this is a good idea, someone local who already offers this provision, rather than lots of developers.

IM pointed out that there is already an allocation of social housing in Renhold, on the Aspire estate  
With regard to specifying semi detached rather than detached houses, CD said to leave this for the Policy which will talk about design.

With regard to amendments to their recommendations Gemma at BedsRCC has already stated "As previously mentioned I am not able to alter my recommendations on the number & tenure of units. The numbers outlined in the report are purely based on the data collected and the need shown. Any alterations made would then not be a true reflection of the consultation results. The benefit to having an independently commissioned report is that the results have been independently verified. As an organisation we have established a relationship & reputation with other partners which has been built up over a long period of time based on our independence. I cannot alter the results of a consultation based on the request of whoever commissioned it, this would severely devalue the benefit of what we do. I am sure you will understand this".

[However the results can be interpreted differently, and it was agreed that the opinion of CD is more in keeping with what would be best for current & future residents of Renhold.](#)

**8. Feedback from GI Local Green Spaces Work (CD/NG/TP/AQ)** Mike [at BedsRCC](#) emailed [the feedback results to AQ \(document attached\)](#). The sub-group asked for biodiversity to be included, and now that it has been proved that the Village Hall was gifted to the village, a playground and picnic area could also be included. No response has yet been received from Mike.

[Green Gaps Policy \(document attached\)](#) TP said that following discussions with CD the Green Gap Policy has been reordered

TP read through this for the meeting and CD explained the maps. PN suggested that the Parish boundary needs to be added. KR asked, if it is ever challenged, is there any reason for the width of the area coloured in between Norse Road and Church End? CD said that probably a supporting argument is that without that gap the view of the Church would be lost, and this is in BBC Policy. PN reminded that in the Call for Sites the strip across the top has been put in for 30-40 houses. JR enquired how the road would cope, and PN said it would probably need to be widened, which would also solve the traffic problem outside the school in terms of parking. CD read out BBC policy which means that the entire field can be included:-

**“Renhold (Church End) – Bedford** The gap between Church End and Bedford is less than 900 m. Church End is located on higher ground overlooking Bedford and any development in this area is likely to reduce openness and contribute to visual coalescence thus affecting the separate character and identity of Church End”.

This forms part of the supporting text for Policy AD42 - Local Gaps (found in Allocations and Designations Local Plan 2013).

More discussion with regard to the cemetery took place and PN offered to speak with the manager, who is a neighbour, and will hopefully put her in touch with BedsRCC

**9. Update on TPO applications(KH/NG)** A pro forma which BBC use in assessing whether a tree, or group of trees, can be protected has now been located and if this can be made to work it will be used to present RNP's proposals to BBC, rather than wait for them to respond. KH has a pinned map of the trees which already have TPO on them (some of these trees no longer exist). KH/NG will start their work with Bushey & Jubilee Spinneys. It has been established that there is not just one Tree Officer, and the name of 2 people has been acquired. PN enquired whether there is any sort of label which is placed on TPO trees so that they can be identified and was told that there is not.

#### **10. Feedback on Listed Building List (JR/DI/SMW)**

The parts of the Parish which contain Listed Buildings were split into 3 sections with DI taking Salph End/Ravensden Road, SMW Church End/Top End, and JR Green End & Water End. Using Nat England & Heritage sites information was cross checked, some local knowledge was input, and a table produced (attached). PN suggested that if the document were headed 'Renhold' that word could be taken out of each line, making it easier to read and this was agreed DI. The last 3 properties on the list which have been highlighted are where local knowledge has corrected the entries. JR said the other anomaly being Blue Cottage in Green End, the name of which was changed to Little Thatch probably even before the listing.

AQ said that the intention eventually would be to write to the homeowners asking if they had a potted history, and any photographs for the website rather than the plan itself, but before that is done she will speak to one of the villagers who does work at Bedford Archives to see what information can be sourced from there. When BedsRCC have responded to this document IM to put the table on the website.

**11. Feedback on Village History (KH/AQ/DI)** Document attached. AQ to speak to archivist to see if there are any pictures of the people & places mentioned in the article. DI to provide AQ with the list that he has found. JR suggested that as Top End has 2 thatched cottages, and Green End 7 that a slight amendment is required, and also doubts whether the Forge mentioned is still there. It was opposite the Three Horseshoes but was probably taken away when the whole property was demolished to make way for a new house. NG to investigate. JR also suggested that mention be made that the 'Green' at Green End, was once much bigger, with just a single track leading up to the farm, and the village sign is sited on it. Part of this document will be used in the about Renhold section and the whole article, when completed, will appear on the website IM.

**12. Feedback on visit to Ravensden Village Hall IM/PN/TP/KR/AQ)** IM reported that it was agreed that it was an extraordinarily professional production, the graphics were very good, the people were extremely friendly and were keen to work with Renhold NPWG, which is good news as both Parishes will be in the same Ward under the new scheme, which will make us stronger, & they offered their help where needed. There are 3 key areas of common interest: The brooks, footpaths and the gap between the two Parishes. All their information was sent to AQ following their presentation and our grateful, thanks were recorded. It was noted that the Ravensden housing needs survey was carried out in 2016. KR suggested speaking with them with regard to Marsh Wood to ask them to consider including it.

Ravensden is to receive money under Section 106 which they intend to spend on footpath improvements. The gaps between Renhold & Ravensden footpaths could be considered for a joint project if they are in both Plans. Ravensden have their EWR Policy in their NP and it was agreed this should be put into the RNP **PN**. Although no big development is wanted in Renhold, TP enquired what Section 106 money could be spent on? KR suggested a list be created, using the NP to evidence that the information came from the community.

**13. Next Steps (AQ)** Complete the Vision and Objectives. **JR** to type this section up first & send to AQ for distribution and comment asap **All**.

**14. Action Plan: Timescales, assigned responsibilities (All)**

Preparation & Distribution of Executive Summary & Questionnaire – **SMW** offered to help **AQ**

Tree Protection Orders **KH/NG**

Contact Archivist **AQ**

Summary for Village Magazine to show Executive Summary document (which may be re-named) and let people know that RNPWG are pressing on with things **KH**

Housing – awaiting Jemma at BedsRCC

Look at putting documents on Facebook – **SMW/IM**

Meeting closed at 9:15 pm

**Date of next Zoom meeting: Friday 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2022 at 6:30pm**