

Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party Minutes

2pm on Monday, 6 January 2025

Rennington Village Hall

Present

Alan Tremlett (Chair), Stephen Baggott, Ruth Bridgens, Tony Lomas and Peter Purdom.

Apologies

Bob McKittrick, Laurence Dent and Sally Roberts.

Tony Lomas was welcomed as a new member of the Working Party. It was agreed that Ruth would update Sally and that Peter would update Bob on the discussions of this meeting.

Minutes of 15 October 2024

The Minutes of 15 October 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

Draft Regulation 14 Plan

The Group noted that NCC had confirmed that both a Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) and a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) were required. NCC were undertaking the HRA and Stephen agreed to chase up this work. Funding for AECOM to undertake the SEA had been approved; after the initial 'kick-off' meeting (yet to take place) this piece of work would take some 16 weeks to complete.

Consideration then turned to the comments made by NCC about the Draft Regulation 14 Plan:

- **Reference to affordable housing duplicates the NLP but no affordable housing was allocated.** It was confirmed that the existing references should stand as drafted. In so doing the Group confirmed their support for affordable housing even though any such initiative (no matter how unlikely because of land costs) would most likely be in conjunction with a market-led development.
- **Number of bedrooms to reflect HNA.** It was agreed to revise the 'split of houses' such that 20% of dwellings should be 1- 2 bedroomed (rather than simply 2-bedroomed)
- **Car Parking.** It was agreed to remove this policy.

- ***Leaving developers flexibility for their proposals.*** Bearing in mind the views of the community the Group confirmed that the plan should specify two criteria - hectarage AND number of houses. Alan agreed to seek advice on hectarage sizes for both potential developments (Rock & Stamford).

- ***Principal residency.*** The Group noted that within the NLP the 20% rule does not apply to houses where business rates are paid; on that basis the Parish falls below the 20% threshold. Even so the Group, mindful of the views within the community during the consultation process, believed that the Plan should require all new dwellings to be for principal residency only.

- ***Design Code.*** It was agreed to delete the extracts from the Design Code. In their place Stephen agreed to draft a paragraph giving the context and justification for the Design code.

- ***Numbering of policies.*** The Group agreed that the Plan be revised such that each policy would have a separate number.

Stephen also confirmed that he would be advising NCC of the Group's decisions and that the Draft Regulation 14 Plan would be amended accordingly.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Debate focused on the merits of designating various buildings within the Parish and whether or not the same criteria should be consistently applied. Taking on board the differing views expressed a decision on this element of the Plan was deferred to the next meeting.

Acknowledging the difficulties facing the Group, Stephen offered to draft a section on the heritage of the parish for the next meeting. He suggested that this might serve as a potential alternative to identifying certain buildings as non-designated heritage assets. This idea was supported.

Local Green Spaces

It was agreed to incorporate Ruth's work on LGS into the Plan - amended as necessary to emphasise their intrinsic importance to community activities.

Date of next meeting

To be agreed.