

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and RBWM

Meeting Notes

Date & Time	Friday 21 August 2020 11.15am
Venue	Video conference meeting
Attendees	RBWM: Phillipa Silcock (PS), Ian Gillespie (IG) DNPSG: Marjorie Clasper (MC), Alison Crampin (AC), Fiona Cryle(FC),

Agenda item		Action
Q1	<p>Background: PS replaced Robert Paddison at RBWM as the contact for NP groups but will be leaving at the end of August. Helen Murch had also left and IG had been brought in to help cover the work and preparation required for BLP examination.</p> <p>Before the meeting, questions were emailed to PS and IG by MC. These were used as an agenda.</p> <p>We are dealing with green and open spaces in Datchet and, having read the borough’s Open Spaces Study, we would like some advice on how we can best protect our Local Green spaces from development. Who would be the best person to talk to about this process? I have attached a couple of examples of 2 open spaces, not in the Green Belt, which we would like to protect – the Recreation Ground and the Sabatini Land for your comment.</p> <p>PS recommended we look at Hurley and The Walthams’ NP and contact them for advice. They dealt with the designation and protection of open spaces and have since succeeded in persuading RBWM that a piece of land they included in their NP but which RBWM included as a housing development plot in the original BLP should be removed from it.</p> <p>The Rec is identified in the 2019 Open Spaces Study and there shouldn’t be an issue in our designating it as a local green space. The Sabatini Land is wrongly identified in the study as Manor House Lane, Maidenhead (no 175 on the RBWM list of open spaces). They will have to correct this. Again, including it shouldn’t be an issue.</p> <p>PS recommended we speak with any landowners and seek their agreement before proposing anywhere.</p> <p>IG & PS said that if we feel the Rec and the Sabatini Land should be protected for the same reasons, and protection is the main issue,</p>	

Agenda item		Action
	<p>there is no reason why they shouldn't be proposed as one block of land given their proximity to one another. However, if we think they may have differing development potential it may be more appropriate to propose them separately.</p> <p>MC explained that DPC owned the Rec but a Trust owned the Sabatini Land. IG asked what the trusts' aims were. FC said they were to promote the communities recreational and leisure facilities.</p> <p><i>[DRCCT Charitable objects: The social, moral and physical well-being of the people resident in the village of Datchet and surrounding district. Activities: The upkeep and maintenance of the village hall for public benefit. Source: Charities Commission website]</i></p> <p>PS thought a matrix was a good way of presenting information but hadn't seen the attachments beforehand. She said we could use it to show how the two areas work together. BLP had strong policies on the protection of Open Space but if the community wished another 'belt and braces' layer it would make a stronger case.</p>	
Q2	<p>Additions to the Green Belt. The Borough published proposals on the Green belt in 2009 and 2013. What is the status of the proposals?</p> <p>PS said these documents have gone. RBWM has abandoned their 2009 and 2013 proposals to extend the green belt and tidy up its edges. They had since prepared Edge of Settlement analyses (about the contribution of Green Belt sites proposed for development). NPPF guidance is that alterations can only be made in the interest of BLP preparation. There will now need to be strategic reasons to get an extension of it.</p> <p>IG said DNPSG can use RBWM's 2009 and 2013 studies about the value of green space as evidence to support what we want to do, based on requirements laid out in NPPF.</p> <p>AC asked if RBWM had already spoken to the landowners about these proposed designations in 2009 and 2013. PS thought not.</p>	
Q3	<p>Affordable Housing: The definition has changed since the SHMA in 2016. What would the impact of the new definition of 40% Affordable be on the housing allocation AL39 (in terms of the ratio of intermediate/social/affordable rented etc.)</p> <p>AC said that now the definition has been broadened, "affordable housing" can include starter homes, discounted, shared ownership,</p>	

Agenda item		Action
	<p>etc.</p> <p>PS said once the BLP has been adopted, RBWM will produce an SPD which spells everything out. Until then the best info is in The Housing Topic Paper 2019. This says the tenure split should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-25% intermediate (this can include shared ownership). • 75-80% socially affordable rented i.e. social rent by a registered provider. Affordable rented is different. <p>Until the BLP is adopted, RBWM does not know what type of affordable housing would be on AL39 but they are likely to try and maximise the rented element. Ultimately it will depend on the layout of the site. They will press for 40% affordable housing, but the numbers won't be fixed until there have been pre-development discussions with the developers.</p> <p>PS observed the AL39 plot had quite a lot of constraints: buffer zones (M4), ground water, the preservation of grade 1 agricultural land. It was a large site but did not have large capacity because of these constraints. She recognised 80 was a lower density intended to reflect the local character and considerably less than the original 150 proposed due to the constraints.</p> <p>AC asked about the impact on new housing of the recent announcement regarding the RTS Channel 1 not going ahead. PS said the flooding projections used in the BLP didn't factor in the RTS (because the EA did not take it into account). RBWM is currently talking to their flooding experts WSP about the implications of the RTS decision.</p>	
Q4	<p>What is the status of the Borough Cycle Action Plan?</p> <p>PS said the infrastructure manager was on leave and so she hadn't been able to discuss this further.</p> <p>Some capital funding has been arranged but RBWM needs to re-evaluate this Plan because while it wants to support its objectives it can't afford them. They are also consulting on their Climate Change strategy document which includes a shift towards more bicycle usage.</p> <p>AC asked about incorporating cycling routes into the restored landscape plans for the Cemex site. IG recommended we should talk to the owners.</p> <p>PS encouraged us to think about safe cycle storage. Where would people want to cycle to and where would they need to store their bikes? IG spoke about development plans incorporating "pods" for each property to make bicycles easily accessible. He described a pod</p>	

Agenda item		Action
	<p>that had secure space for four bikes at one side, as well as space for dustbins and a shed.</p> <p>Both said DNPSG should focus on suggestions as to how to spend developers' contributions (CIL). AL39 would attract a contribution. They said we should identify our priorities, what is most important if funds become available, for example, secure cycle parking in the village – 3/4 secure parking areas.</p>	
<p>Q5</p>	<p>How do you think the Government's new planning proposals will impact on local development, especially AL39.</p> <p>IG was sceptical HMG would succeed in pushing through their plans in the time frame envisaged. It is only a White Paper at this stage and has to be implemented by an Act of Parliament.</p> <p>PS reminded DNPSG about the increased funding for NPs through Locality. (She had emailed before the meeting to say that Government Grants to individual neighbourhood planning groups in urban and deprived area has increased to £18,000. The funding will be delivered through the Locality Organisation. You can contact them through their website neighbourhoodplanning.org to talk about the funding and technical advice on offer.)</p> <p>AC to put this on agenda for next monthly DNPSG meeting to ask if Jo can investigate.</p> <p>IG commented that details have just published of the stage 2 BLP examination timetable. The first day of the hearing is 5 October. It is anticipated that AL39 would be discussed on 18 November, but this is only a provisional date. The meetings are virtual so members of the public can listen.</p>	<p>AC</p>
<p>Q6</p>	<p>We note that you (PS) will not be in your post much longer. Do you know who NP groups should refer to afterwards, and whether we could have more regular contact?</p> <p>RBWM is looking to recruit somebody to replace PS and Robert Paddison but until somebody is appointed, we should use IG as our point of contact. He made the point that given the announcement re the BLP examination he would be very busy, as would the rest of the planning team, and his time to help us would be severely limited. AC suggested that we collate any questions in one email after each DNPSG meeting.</p>	
<p>AOB</p>	<p>PS asked if any of DNPSG would be attending the examination</p>	

Agenda item		Action
	<p>hearings. She also asked if DNPSG were members of RRAG. AC asked if there would be an update to the RBWM tree strategy which runs to 2020. SG to ask Helen Leonard. <i>[HL later contacted to say the strategy will be reviewed this year for publication next year.]</i></p>	

Attachments

pp_green_belt_proposals_main_report2009
Green Belt Boundary Study Dec 2013

Matrix Local Green & Open Spaces blank
AC Recreation Ground 25.7.20 v1
MC Sabatini Land 04.08.20 v2