

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

Wednesday 28th September, 2022 at 7.00pm.

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

Present:- Claudia Dietz, Nicola Gribble (Acting Chair), Keith Herkes, Denis Ivins, Ian McIver, Sarah Mitchell-Wood, Peter Norris, Tony Ploszajski, Kirstin Rayner, Jooles Roberts, Paul Sawford

Apologies:- Amanda Quince (Chair)

1. Welcome (NG). NG welcomed everyone to the meeting. The gap of 5 months between the 14th & 15th meetings was not intentional, but many of the members had been busy with other village matters, and for this reason a time limit of 2 hours was the suggested duration for this meeting

2. Declarations of relevant interests (All) No interests were declared

3. Proposal of updated Terms of Reference (ToR) and membership list (PN) PN advised that the ToR were very outdated and a new set had been distributed to the Group prior to the meeting (with the members list separated, as these may change). Members comments were taken into consideration and the ToR were presented here for approval. KH had made some last-minute suggested alterations with regard to the section 'Reporting to the Parish Council', which will be incorporated. The Members List stated 5 core member roles, Chair, Deputy Chair, Treasurer, Minutes Secretary, IT/GDPR/Website. Membership & roles may change as the Plan progresses and upon advice from individual members the list will be updated by the Minutes Secretary JR

The ToR & Membership (Attachments 1 & 2) were approved and will be distributed to the Group, with a copy to the Parish Clerk

4. Update on GI Plan final adjustments with BRCC (PN) NG thanked PN for his work on this huge task. PN explained that RNPWG had contracted with BRCC to produce a GIP which when received was to be opened up to the whole Group. However, when it arrived there were some errors & a list was sent by PN to Mike Fayers. MF took the view that they had imported the maps & had little control over what was overlaid. He had taken advice from information suppliers & did not feel that much could be done to change them. Wooded areas such as those in people's gardens had been included, i.e., possible old orchard etc, and this became a matter of concern for some residents. 7 sites have come through assessment as being appropriate, none of which would be of concern to the landowners. Land on the Howbury Estate is deemed as being too big to be included.

About a month previous to the meeting the matter was taken up again, by which time BRCC had issued a new copy. There were still some map issues and the last part of the document had changed quite dramatically. PN compiled an update of concerns to MF who replied with a more favourable response than previously. The GIP will be held on the website, not actually included in the NP.

Some old Rights of Way are still marked as footpaths on old & OS maps, and KH stated that what goes into the Plan must be true & accurate. It was realized at the Focus Group meeting how far behind things were with regard to the GIP.

KR reminded the meeting that Green Spaces do not mean open access to the public, but they can walk past, view & enjoy them. Land owners may object, but BRCC will have looked at the rules to decide whether the sites being put forward comply with the criteria to qualify as Local Green Space, & which are already protected. Under Reg 14 a decision will be made as to whether to alter the list. BBC will then look at the document under Reg 16, and then the Inspector will decide whether they should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

NG summarized, saying an updated document based on current information has been produced, and thanked PN & TP for their work on this. BRCC have indicated that the requested GI Plan map and textual changes were being progressed and should enable final issue within 4 weeks. TP had followed up to establish the status of the Local Green Space Designations and MF had explained that whilst the finalization of the GI Plan was dependent on final amendments being agreed with PN, it did already include the results of the BRCC selection process of 7 LGS sites that the PC/WG could choose from to take forward into the Neighbourhood Plan. The final version of the GI Plan would require endorsement by the WG and PC before it became 'final'. SMW suggested that ratification of the LGS options needs to be done before the GI study is signed off. Secretary's Note: MF subsequently confirmed that the detailed description of the 7 proposed LGS sites, albeit initially identified within the GI Plan document, would additionally be more fully described in a separate report.

5. Minutes of Meeting of No.14 18.03.22 to encompass further actions discussed at later Focus Group Meeting on 23.08.22 (Attachments 3&4) It is the intention from now on to try to have more regular meetings.

TP explained he had produced the Draft NP when he realized how much had already been done, and what the gaps were, and he was thanked very much for his work. TP in turn thanked everyone, especially KR for her high-level input, and CD for her planning advice. A couple of weeks is needed to incorporate the additions & amendments & tidy it up and TP will be working on this.

- a. Sustainability Statement for the NP (Discussion) TP was of the opinion that this section in the Gamlingay Report was very good & would like to base Renhold's on that. KR confirmed that the person who compiled the one for Gamlingay was happy for him to do this. NG's suggestion to TP that anything put into the Plan should be easy for the general public to understand, i.e., plain speaking where possible rather than legal/planning jargon, was agreed.
- b. Inclusion of a business & employment section in the NP (IM/for discussion) JR queried whether if a solution cannot be offered a topic should be included, and was assured that it can be put in as an aspiration, it shows that the subject has been given consideration. Although farming was once the major business in Renhold this is declining, and more information needs to be sought. IM to attempt obtain a list of the businesses in Renhold. Reg 14 stage might be a good opportunity to enquire of parishioners how many of them are business owners (actually running a business from home, as opposed to people working from home), and what their aspirations are? It was felt that another survey would not be welcomed by residents, and it was

agreed that a request in the village magazine (if agreeable with the editorial team), noticeboards, Facebook pages etc would be a better approach, with possibly a link to Survey Monkey. It would also be useful to know how many residents use the businesses based in Renhold? Are they of benefit to the residents? Do any residents neighbouring a business have an objection? A time limit would need to be put on responses, with contact details for RNPWG in case of query.

- c. Inclusion of a Tree Preservation Order section/policy within the NP (KH/NG) Pressure on their time has meant that this has not yet been actioned, and will be addressed by KH/NG asap. JR enquired whether BBC have a list of the existing TPO and was informed there is a list, but this needs to be checked & it would be good to have areas of trees covered as well, not just individual trees. There is a criterion for inclusion.
- d. Inclusion of fuel/energy poverty assessment within the NP? (KR/discussion) NG enquired whether this was a short-term issue and would not be relevant in the future. KR explained that it might be useful to include it. Although it may not lead to a policy, it would link into sustainability, particularly in relation to new buildings, i.e., new heating sources (not gas, oil or coal, where the use has to cease by 2040). It would need a comment on how things are now - what percentage of houses are using what heat source. TP agreed to create a draft.
- e. Incorporation in the NP of precisely mapped delineations of the village 'Ends' (PN) A start has been made and will continue. PN informed the meeting that it transpires that Struttles End is in Ravensden. Therefore the 38 houses along Ravensden Road, Renhold Parish, are not in an 'End', and there is therefore no Green Space gap to give protection, particularly in relation to the potential 400 new houses which would span from Salph End. BBC to be approached with regard to the possibility of designating Ravensden Road as being part of Struttles End (PN) after Renhold PC has sought the views of Ravensden PC (NG)
- f. Provision in the NP for the development of cycle paths & roadside footpaths (TP/discussion) There is plenty of mention of PROW, footpaths & bridleways, but nothing on cycleways, begging the question should multi-use paths be encouraged? The bridleways are multi-use, but it was felt there might be a couple of footpaths, i.e., the one opposite the village school, which could be designated as multi-use. Mention was made of the footpath through Woodfield Farm leading up to Pells Farm Shop. JR advised that whilst this might offer a useful link it is not suitable for horses or cycles as there is a stretch through an avenue of trees which is grassed, rendering that area unsuitable for cycles or horses, which would churn it up, with which KH agreed. JR said that landowners have to give access over their land, but no one can dictate how it should be surfaced.

There is possibly the opportunity to link up accessibility from Renhold to Ravensden. TP to look at cycle routes & put some text together. Multi-use paths & the conversion of more accessible stiles could be put into the Plan as aspirations. PS mentioned later in the meeting the possibility of linking the A421 Goldington Road

roadside cycleway to Great Barford, and PN observed that this was part of the EMP6 science Campus declared scope.

- g. Accumulation of sufficient village history & photographs for the NP (JR) JR gave some background with regard to 2, maybe 3, very large photo albums containing very old black & white photos of the village which seem to have disappeared since she last saw them in about 1990. JR/KH to work on a request to be put into the village magazine & on noticeboards asking if anyone has these, and KR suggested maybe a general request for historical photos, rather than specifically these albums. If nothing materializes an approach might be made to the owner of the Alternate Renhold Facebook site, where lots of photos of Renhold are on display.
- h. Update on the status of the developing NP document (TP) TP reported that there is still quite a long way to go & requested a couple of weeks in order to prepare a further Draft Plan ready for Reg 14. If this plan was to include the identification of small-scale development sites the time scale would be further extended, which in view of some of the planning applications currently being put forward is not thought to be a good idea. CD said that the Local Plan should be adopted by end of 2023, with KR going on to say that RNP is likely to take longer, but could still be taken into account even at a later date if a development is not already built

A.O.B.

Inclusion of identified small scale development sites within the NP KR suggested that as a need has been identified, if there is no reason not to identify a site at this stage the logic needs to be shown. PN confirmed his offer to annotate his spreadsheet of accepted 'Call for Site' submissions where there already exist Planning Authority support or objections in principle to help inform discussion on this aspect. Renhold's allocation is 7 modest dwellings. Renhold Charity Cottages have land, and KH has approached them. They have preserved rights to build one 2-bedroom unit, and this could possibly be included in the allocation. They did however inform KH that it is not easy to rent out the dwellings they already have when one is vacant, and this could be relevant in the Plan. There is a specific criterion, which includes that the new tenant must have close connection to Renhold, but there does not appear to be an age restriction.

PN to add an extra column 'call for sites' spreadsheet to identify any live/recently approved planning applications for new houses in the parish (=unallocated sites). CD offered assistance if required

Designation of Conservation areas (JR) Surprise was expressed amongst the Group that there are no conservation areas within Renhold. JR/NG/PS to attend the Little Barford Consultation on 5th October in St Neots to try to gain information & speak with the Council Historic Environment Team.

Next virtual meeting date agreed: Wednesday 9th November at 7pm

Meeting closed at 9.05pm with NG thanking everyone for their time and for volunteering