

**Minutes of Twenty-eighth Meeting of Renhold Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**

**Monday 27th January 2025 at 7.30pm**

N.B. – To save space Action to be taken highlighted in Turquoise

**Present: -**

Claudia Dietz, Keith Herkes (Treasurer), Dennis Ivins, Peter Norris, Tony Ploszajski, Amanda Quince (Chair), Kirstin Rayner, Jooles Roberts (Minutes), Paul Sawford

**1. Welcome & apologies for absence (AQ)** AQ welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Apologies received:** Nicky Gribble, Ian McIver and Sarah Mitchell-Wood

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

**3. Thank you**

AQ thanked the team for all they have done since the last meeting, but especially;

- KH for organising the boxes for the responses to Regulation 14 Consultation & for collating the answers
- TP for his analysis of the responses from Bedford Borough Council (BBC) and resident feedback
- CD for her work with regard to two representations made by planners
- KR for ongoing advice.

PN was asked whether Bolnhurst had been thanked for lending us the display boards. PN to contact them for their bank details, pass them on to Lizzie, The Parish Clerk, & thank them.

AQ to buy small thank you for Sue Levitt for her ongoing support with her village facebook site, will thank Steve from Ravensden for sharing their Regulation 14 slides with us, Robbie for his extra work in keeping our part of the PC website up to date and the Church and the Village Shop for hosting two of the collection boxes.

**4. Review of Minutes of last Meeting and Matters Arising (AQ)**

No outstanding matters as everything has either been completed or will be covered during this meeting

**5. Attendance of representative from CPRE re Dark Skies Policy wording**

No response was received to the request for attendance. AQ to chase

**6. Drop box spreadsheet returns from each area in the Parish (KH)**

236 responses received in total, made up of replies put into the boxes at:

Aspires 5	Church 21	Cranbourne Gardens 11
Hand delivered 51	Pavillion 1	School 24
The Spires 2	Village Hall 18	Village Shop 68
Email 35		

By location of respondent:

Water End 3	Green End 35	Top End 43
-------------	--------------	------------

Church End 26  
The Spires 14

Salph End 45  
Aspires 9

Ravensden Road 26  
Cranbourne Gardens 34

## **7. Analysis & discussion of survey response from Bedford Borough Council (TP)**

### **Draft policy RNP1: Small-scale housing:**

As the Housing Needs Survey from 2021 cannot be regarded as current and will need to be repeated in 2026 anyway, it was agreed to approach Beds RCC to conduct a second Survey and Analysis in Feb/Mar 2025.

KH informed Team that funding for NPs from Locality has been reviewed & if we had not made an application by February, funding would have been lost. Application was made. AQ has had an acknowledgement. Dave Chapman from Locality rang & AQ explained why a new Housing Needs Survey was required. Subsequently Johannes Moeller, from Locality, has received the quote from Beds RCC and is now querying the day rate. AQ has rung Siobhan from Beds RCC to clarify.

TP said a new Survey is very important as the evidence-based survey was undertaken in 2021 and is close to being regarded out of date, & based on developer submissions received during the Reg 14 consultation there is already scrutiny of it.

KR advised that the new Housing Needs Survey should, in principle, be a replica of the previous one, so they are easy to compare.

As soon as Locality respond AQ to contact Beds RCC to begin the process. Beds RCC now use JCB printers in Great Barford following our recommendation to them in 2021 as their rates are very favourable.

The original housing needs survey identified a need for 12 dwellings. Two developers are suggesting that if a large proportion of the new dwellings is affordable housing – there needs to be a larger number of market value properties to make the development viable. If the latest survey identifies greater demand, then the number of additional dwellings proposed could be increased accordingly.

It was agreed that draft policy RNP1 should continue to reflect the outcome of the housing needs survey. AQ said whilst we need to stand firm, the Government have added 260 extra homes on top of the 924 already required of BBC and time will tell if/how Renhold might be affected by that new housing target for the Borough. AQ assured team that NG would keep everyone updated.

**Draft policy RNP 6: Important Green Gaps:** Rationale of the Important Green Gaps Policy was questioned by BBC. It is aspirational rather than evidence based, & BBC questioned whether the Policy is solid enough. Where is the evidence?

It was agreed that whilst the Green Gaps Policy is not in the Green Infrastructure Plan, it is in the Design Guide & therefore reference should be made to this source material in the NP. The exact location & extent of the Important Green Gaps is marked on the policies map and a number of respondents have commented.

The Group need to review to check whether it is sufficiently robust. Once all amendments are made, AQ will ask Sonia from BBC to read through & advise. KR said that we have to show that responses

have been taken seriously add 'taken into account. Whilst the Group consider that the Green Gaps Policy is defensible, it does need to be looked at again. CD/TP/KR will review. OS copyright licence from PC to be utilised to create final map.

### **Draft policy RNP5: Local Green Spaces**

BBC has questioned whether:

- a) All landowners of the proposed Local Green Spaces have been consulted and consented to the designation.
- b) All sites require Local Green Space designation because some are covered by other policy protection.

Early Grove & Little Early Grove are already subject to other protection (ancient woodland and PROW) One of the owners does not see the need for extra protection from Local Green Space: whilst the other is keen to have as much protection afforded to that space as possible.

Village Hall grounds. This is questionable, as they are not open to the Public, although many people in the Parish feel that they should be. A Millennium grant was accepted, which indicates that it should be.

TP to speak with Ian Locke to establish the basis on which the Lockes gave the land in the first place.

PN to investigate ownership of the Village Hall

CD advised that the cost is £7 each to obtain plans from Land Registry and the back- up information

KH to go ahead & get these, so that dialogue may then be opened

Renhold Sports Club A representative sent in a response to say that they were not happy to be designated as a Green Space. KR said listing the sports field as a Community Facility would give them a degree of protection. If the site is to be lost to building for example, an alternative would need to be found. TP said that the sports field would be protected by Sports England.

Mindful of the fact the Parish Clerk has already replied to the Sports Club, we now need to respond from the RNPWG asking what the problem is & what they would like the Plan to show. TP thought it a good idea that they be reminded once the NP is 'made', Renhold Parish Council can direct how 15% of all S106 funding arising from developments in the parish spent on additions and improvements to local facilities like Renhold Sports Club.

RNPWG to review the inclusion of each of the current proposed Local Green Spaces. Subject to this, AQ to speak again to all landowners to secure their consent.

### **Draft policy RNP8 Community Facilities**

We need to agree whether to include commercial community assets such as the shop and pub should be included, because planning policy cannot compel commercial operations to be re-provided if they

are not economically viable. It was agreed to leave them in the policy, with provision for Community Right to Buy.

The draft policy specifies that equivalent provision should be made, but it does not define 'equivalent provision' tightly enough.

**DI** to research definitions of 'equivalence' and 'sufficient benefit'

**TP** to tighten the wording up

### **8. Analysis & discussion of Survey responses from residents**

These will be published on the website where the areas must be noted, acknowledged or at least listed. Leave the reference nos. on the original, but do not display on website as they will be meaningless.

**WATER END** – Dark skies. The percentage who supported the Policy to be noted

Check Village Design Guide re a definition of or reference to backland development and add to glossary if it is not there **CD/TP**

**GREEN END** – limiting CO2 emissions will be added to aspirations List. **PS** to check the Design Code to see whether there is anything relating to this

Dark Skies - Following the completion of the Plan, we suggest asking residents via Village Magazine to comply with environmentally-friendly lighting etc by writing an article about the options to help wildlife by providing PIR movement sensor lighting

Parking at the school – **AQ** to enquire of Parish Clerk as to what progress has been made. Red lines to partly replace the yellow lines on the bend may be an option & was discussed at last PC meeting  
Science Park, reconfiguring the approach into the village can be added to Aspirations List.

However, NP cannot contradict BBC Policy

Extending footpath from 60 Green End to roundabout & creating a bus stop to be added to Aspirations **AQ**

Parish Clerk to be asked for Planning Applications to be put onto the PC website separately from them being noted on the Agendas with a clear link to Bedford BC Planning to reach the widest audience & allow contributions from the public **AQ**

**Vision** Why have some areas of the village not been included?

Dark Skies & Design Code applies

Green infrastructure

Plan covers the whole Parish

Heritage assets

Mitigating transport issues

One resident asked why the land adjacent to their house had been omitted **TP/PN/CD** to discuss

It was suggested that part of the land put forward by the land-owner in Ravensden Road might be added as a potential housing site. KR advised that this might weaken the argument – why would housing on one side of the footpath be allowed, but not on the other side? **CD** to detail why suggested

Ravensden Road site may not be a suitable site, including loss of trees, biodiversity, connecting wildlife/habitat corridors, etc. It cannot be said that half of the site is suitable & half not.

An owner of land in Wilden Road responded to say that it is a garden that has been included into an Important Green Gap. However, it is a sizeable plot that is currently used as paddock land, & the site was submitted for consideration under the Call for Sites for the Bedford Local Plan 2030.

The developer of the proposed 400 houses at Salph End may resubmit. If the application were to be submitted again, BBC might approve it if they cannot meet its housing targets, whereupon the decision with regard to the number of houses to be allocated to the Parish will probably no longer be the decision of the RNPWG, but once our plan is 'made' design and build can be influenced. The more advanced our draft Plan is, the greater weight will it be given by the decision-maker for any planning application.

KR advised that Regulation 16 should be submitted asap.

KR suggested that AQ should reply to those who responded by email to say that the results of the Survey will be published shortly.

Maps RNPWG cannot plagiarise or add things to BBC maps, they can only use them in their original format. -The Parish Council should have a licence to access OS maps. IM to check the licence details. PN to contact Sonia Gallaher at BBC

A new policies map will be created once the Important-Green Gaps boundaries and the list of Local Green Spaces have been agreed.

#### **Matters to be carried forward to next meeting**

Next steps – Actions and responses to resident feedback AQ, Gladman & Phillips Planning CD, analysis of responses from Statutory Consultees TP, and plans for meeting with Village Hall, Sports Field, Land owners and other key stakeholders. AI

#### **Date for next meeting Monday 10<sup>th</sup> February 7:30 at The Chapel**

Thanks recorded to Albert Browning for his ongoing support with the use of the Chapel. The meeting closed at 9:15 pm.