

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

**Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2022 at 7.00pm.**

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

**Present:-** Nicola Gribble (Acting Chair), Keith Herkes, Ian McIver, Peter Norris, Tony Ploszajski, Kirstin Rayner, Julie Roberts

**Apologies:-** Amanda Quince (Chair) Claudia Dietz, Denis Ivins, Sarah Mitchell-Wood, Paul Sawford

**1. Welcome (NG).** NG welcomed everyone to the meeting, explaining that apologies due to illness, work commitments, etc., meant there were only 7 in attendance but as there was no new business to discuss it was felt that this was enough.

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

**MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

**a. GI Plan final adjustments with BRCC – ratification of the LGS options/final issue of the GIP map (PN)** The amendments are with BRCC who have amendments to the map in hand. However the historic land use map shows an excessively large area of park land within the Howbury Estate. Discussion has taken place with the owner of the Estate. PN sourced original maps from Beds Archives & a footnote will be made to the historic map within the GI Plan. It will need to be decided collectively what use is to be made of the GIP, there is probably an excess of content, & it will need to be adopted by the NPWG and the PC. KR suggested that what does not go into the GIP could be put as a supporting document to the Plan. There has been no contact with Mike Fayers from BRCC for a few weeks, but it is believed that the matter is well advanced. PN to contact MF for an update

**Sustainability** TP thanked everyone who had responded when the Draft Plan was circulated. The Policy Writing document sent to all today by KR, which helps the author to focus on what they are trying to achieve, would prove very useful. When submitting the Plan it has to be accompanied by a Basic Conditions Statement, which is a separate document. TP will run the Draft Plan through the filter to check what needs to be tightened up. KH questioned whether the fact that the Policy Writing Document is dated 2017 means there might be updates & KR informed that how Inspectors look at basic policy has not changed. IM asked whether there is a route map which shows the Inspector where to find information. KR will send further information, a broad brush on how we gather our document information. Everything comes from the Vision & Objectives TP started to look at Sustainability Statements, but it has not yet been established whether there will be any built development within the Policy. It was agreed not to take this any further at this stage.

**Business & Employment section** As soon as time allows IM will try to find a list of the businesses based in Renhold, and will in due course put a request out on social media. TP

will ask the Editors of the village magazine if they will publish something as well. Businesses will be asked to make contact if they would like any information. The next edition of the magazine is a double issue Dec/Jan. There will be a summary of what NPWG have done & what it is hope will be achieved in 2023. It was agreed to aim for the February edition of the magazine, the deadline being 12<sup>th</sup> January. It was agreed to request a whole page. Thoughts & ideas to NG by end November so that a draft may be compiled. **ALL**

**c. Inclusion of a Tree Preservation Order section/policy within the NP** (KH/NG) KR suggested that the Plan might state that for every tree removed which could be seen from the highway, 2 are planted to replace it. **TP** to draft wording. Hedging might be included. **KH/NG** will get together shortly to make a start on the list of trees with a TPO. KR suggested that a search might be done on Locality.

**d. Fuel/energy poverty assessment** (TP) Fuel poverty is defined as when households spend the required amount to heat their home, they are left with a residual income below the official poverty line. Whilst there are no parish-level figures for fuel poverty, in 2020 13.8% of households in Bedford Borough as a whole are classified as being in fuel poverty, which is higher than the national and regional averages. Given higher energy costs in 2022, it is likely that fuel poverty affects a significant number of households in Renhold. PN suggested caution with regard to spending too much time on this as the situation is likely to change as time progresses. The 2021 data might now be available, & BBC should be able to provide the information from Renhold if it is listed separately from the Borough. **PN** will try to provide the name of the Borough Officer responsible for statistics/census data. KR suggested any new development should be as fuel future proof as possible, and this can be built on as appropriate. **TP** will continue to update this section in the Draft Policy.

**e. Incorporation in the NP of precisely mapped delineations of the village 'Ends'** (NG/PN) After consideration NG had felt that Ravensden PC would not have the necessary authority to make decisions with regard to renaming Ravensden Road as Struttle End. The Clerk to Renhold PC has therefore been asked to investigate the correct procedure. KH checked with NG that the Clerk was fully aware of the reasoning behind the request, i.e., to ensure that the 38 houses along Ravensden Road are included in an 'End'. **NG** to follow up with the Clerk.

TP said that there could be a problem, because as part of the formal NP process on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2020 the Borough Council approved the area to be covered by the Renhold NP as the land within the parish boundary. The inclusion of land in Struttle End will therefore need to be formally approved by the Borough Council and we will need to present a clear rationale for this. The houses on Ravensden Road have postcodes starting MK41, whereas Struttle End has postcodes MK44 so this is unhelpful in terms of cohesion. PN had not yet approached BBC and as a result of the current discussion within the WG will not now do so.

**f. Inclusion in the Plan of ROWs as multi-use paths** Some text has been added into the Plan by TP, who noticed that there are no designated cycle paths or cycle accessible paths - the path opposite the village school has been designated the lowest status cycle use on the Borough Plan. TP has expanded on multi-access elements & the removal of stiles. KR said if this is in the Draft from the beginning it has to be taken into consideration if there are any

planning applications. It was agreed that the best description would be “non-vehicular travel mode”. Linking up roadside cycleways to Great Barford would be very welcome, & if the Science Park goes ahead will probably be included in those plans.

**g. Village History/photographs** (JR/KH) JR stated that an appointment has been provisionally made at Beds Archives for 18<sup>th</sup> November. Catalogue nos for everything to be viewed have to be given in advance. The website is not easy to navigate, but most catalogue nos. have now been found. Photos for personal use can be taken. The Archivist will know in advance what is copywritten & will inform us. We need to check what can be reproduced for the Plan. Archives offer a copying service, for which they charge.

KH had a telephone call from someone who says she took photos of albums once held by the W.I. and she will try to find the floppy disk on which they are stored. Ongoing **JR/KH**

KR forwarded to **JR** for distribution to the Group a document detailing what sort of evidence is needed for the Plan.

**h. Identification of small scale development sites within the NP** (PN) The spreadsheet has been updated ready for distribution. Almost all sites have been rejected as non-compliant. 27 Hookhams Lane, for which planning permission had been sought for demolition to enable 13 or 14 houses to be built on land behind, but refused both by the Borough and on appeal has reappeared with a new reference no. on the current call for sites list as a location for 20 dwellings, with an inferred planning application. NG said this application has not yet been provided to the PC. **PN** will update the Call for Sites Plan & will circulate. NG said that a letter has been sent to the Agent for Greene King with regard to the land adjacent to the Polhill Arms, but no response has yet been received.

**i. Designation of Conservations Areas** (JR) For various reasons no one was available to attend the Little Barford consultation, so JR made a direct approach to BBC. A response was received from Ian Johnson, Manager for Heritage & Planning Compliance. He said the designation can only be completed by the BC & can only be supported where there is significant & demonstrable architectural or historic interest. He has some knowledge of Renhold & is not aware of any areas of significant size which might comply. He is aware of significant historic buildings, but they are often interrupted & interspersed with more modern features & buildings. He suggests that if there is an area which is considered might qualify it should be provided to him & we will be given an initial view. JR disagrees with this, and feels that there are 3 areas which should qualify. A section of Green End, from the Green travelling towards Top End. Around the Church, and Abbey Farm. AQ made contact with JR to suggest that perhaps more should be made of Salphobury. The most disappointing information from Mr. Johnson is that BBC have not allocated any resources to undertake further detailed reviews in the current financial year, & nor are there any reviews programmed for 2023/4. KR suggested that through the NP a Village Design Guide could be created, employing Locality to do this work. The choice would then be removed from BBC. This could be a supporting document to the NP. There is an opportunity to work with BBC with funding from Locality, and KR suggests keeping the conversation open with BBC.

Contact could be made with Sonia Gallagher to get an independent opinion. JR to make contact CD with regard to the response to the Borough & moving the matter forward.

**A.O.B.**

Finances (KH)

Accounts up to end of March have been agreed & signed off. There is £1k left in the kitty for printing, etc. and the intension is to apply for a further £1k from the PC who need an application so they can account for it in the precept. NPWG need to establish the expenditure needed to move forward and submit a claim to Locality whose financial year ends February 2023. The total amount which can be accessed from Locality is £10k and of this £7.5K has been drawn. The PC will need to be told what is needed from the precept. KR advised caution against spending all the Locality funding. Approx £2.5K will be needed for the Village Design Guide, and when the stage of Regulation 14 is reached it will be necessary to go out to the community again with the Draft Plan. Sally Chapman should do some of the work. The Plan Check/Assessment should inform whether the Plan is sufficiently robust – this is usually done by an external consultant. The PC should be asked to increase the precept. KH said that he needs estimates/quotes to present to Locality.

KH/All

Meeting closed at 8.20pm with NG thanking everyone for their time and for volunteering

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> January at 7pm