

**Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Meeting Minutes**

Date & Time	Thursday 14 th January 2021 – 11.00 – 11.52
Venue	Video conference meeting to talk about NDHA List with Sarah Harper, RBWM Principal Conservation Officer.
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Fiona Cryle, Marjorie Clasper,
Secretary	Jane Simpson
Guests	Sarah Harper and colleague Laura Smith

Agenda Item		Action
1.0	AC welcomed all to the meeting, advised SH of our progress with the DNP, and said we were seeking advice on the way forward with a local list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHA).	
1.1	<p><u>Sources</u> AC explained how DNPSG were sourcing NDHA nominations so far:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Character Assessments with residents. • From buildings/monuments/sites mentioned in the Conservation Area Assessment. • From local historian Janet Kennish, a DNP consultant, who has a wealth of information about Datchet which we are able to draw on. JK assisted with the 1995 Datchet Conservation Area Assessment and is the author of the Datchet History website. • We have a survey underway asking all residents for nominations. • The Datchet Village Society has a lot of members interested in the heritage of the village. <p>AC said we had spoken to Alison Logan from the Windsor NP and Windsor & Eton Society who are also doing a local list.</p> <p>SH said that there are some non-listed buildings of note, some in the Conservation Area, mapped on RBWM’s GIS system. AC had previously been in touch with Paul Temple who had produced GIS map layers for the DNP. SH suggested we contact him. SH to send AC details of map layers to request.</p> <p>SH said we should also look at the Historic Environment Register (Berkshire Archaeology). www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/chr/herdetail.aspx?crit=&ctid=97&id=4769</p>	
1.2	<p><u>RBWM overview</u> SH gave a brief overview from the RBWM perspective. There is no local list. SH had applied for government funding to pay for a person to coordinate this work throughout the borough but had not yet had a response. We talked about consistency in a borough-wide approach, with each area using similar methods for nomination. Windsor’s listings were discussed and we explained that we had based our info sheet on theirs for consistency.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
1.3	<p><u>Time frame</u></p> <p>We agreed that nominating NDHA for the whole village will be a huge, time-consuming task. It would also be difficult to decide when it was complete and it should be regularly reviewed.</p> <p>The time frame for the DNP was discussed and the amount of work which could sensibly be undertaken before the Plan was submitted, hopefully in the next few months.</p> <p>AC proposed that we include some NDHA in the DNP but continue to compile a Local List outside the DNP. SH agreed that more assets could be added later to a Local List, it could be a rolling programme, and an on-going project for the group or Parish Council.</p> <p>If the process continues beyond the DNP, SH said it would ideally be managed by one person, overseeing a group of people willing to undertake the work, ensuring each building is treated in the same way and tracking and recording responses.</p>	
1.4	<p><u>Publishing details</u></p> <p>AC said our survey is providing some interesting suggestions for NDHAs but a lot of residents don't seem to know about existing Listed Buildings.</p> <p>SH advised we advertise what we are doing, put details of NDHA nominations on our website, on DPC website, and social media, and try to get input from people and groups that had not been involved so far. We advised that the article and survey were in The Link, the quarterly parish magazine which goes to every household in the village, with supporting information and the survey on our DNP website.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Owners</u></p> <p>AC asked whether we should be contacting the owners of properties put forward. SH advised that it was not a legal requirement but was good practice. She advised us to write to owners and put notices on parish notice boards, websites, etc. Letters could be delivered by hand. SH advised if the grant came through then RBWM could help with this. SH referred us to Civic Voice's letter templates. She or LS would be happy to look at our proposed letter if that would be helpful. We should take owners' comments into account and they may have further information and photographs.</p> <p>We asked about the implications for owners. SH said NDHAs have no separate planning conditions. It makes no difference to permitted development rights but it would raise the profile of the building to both developers and Councils when applications come through, particularly for demolition. It would be a material consideration but does not give the property a higher level of protection like a listed building/conservation area/Article 4 Directive.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Process and training</u></p> <p>SH advised us to look at the guidance/toolkits from Civic Voice and the Hackney Society. SH used to work in Hillingdon and referred us to a community-led appraisal undertaken in the Harlington Village Conservation Area, www.hillingdon.gov.uk/conservation-areas. SH to send documents. NPPF is also a useful reference.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>AC said a Historic England video had been informative: www.youtube.com/watch?v=-i9On2oB81Q&feature=youtu.be.</p> <p>SH said it was important to have a consistent approach. She asked if we needed or intended to set up training sessions. Could we draw on the help of experts in the village? We would also need to draw up a brief of what we are looking for in an NDHA.</p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p><u>Information form</u></p> <p>SH said the form was a great start and made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OS map and coordinates required. Outline building in red • Say if it is in the conservation area. Add ward or parish details. • Indicate details of present physical condition and originality (what has changed from the original form). SH suggests looking at planning history but unfortunately RBWM records don't go back very far. • Add 'significance' (Description/History/Significance). Significance should be clearly stated in terms of NPPF, ie archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. See definition criteria at the back of the NPPF*. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence but also from its setting. (See link to NPPF, p4.) • Detailed history, beyond what is required for the NDHA, can be added as an appendix, with cross-refs to other information, eg Datchet History website. • SH suggested 'Monument or feature' instead of 'Monument or site'. This would cover war memorial scroll/plaque, bench, fountain, etc. • FC asked how old something has to be to be considered. SH said natural spaces and landscapes have to be historic. Man-made spaces might be a historic garden or park, or historic field pattern. In some areas WWII gun emplacements are recorded. Hackney includes wall paintings. Formal HE listing can only be considered after 10 years. • Add a section of feedback from residents • Include details of use. • Criteria – SH asked how we would do the scoring. It needs to be fair and objective and should not be too complicated. Maybe fewer numbers would make life easier. On the published sheet, it should be clear how an asset has been marked. • Images – these needed to be dated. Use as many photographs as possible, side and rear elevation as well as front. • All these forms/sheets should be filed in one place. • The published sheet can have less information than the nomination sheet but needs to show how decisions were made. • The selection process should be clear and transparent. Assessors will need to be able to answer questions relating to decisions. <p><u>Panel</u></p> <p>An overview panel should be set up to assess the information sheets/forms and ensure conformity in the decision-making process. This might include a RBWM Conservation officer, Borough Councillor, Heritage Champion and other local people with relevant knowledge, DPC, DVS, et al. NDHAs will</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>then go to Berkshire Archaeology to be added to the HER (Historic Environment Register).</p> <p>SH advised that RBWM has a heritage champion and will find out who it is at present. (Possibly Thomas Pugh-Cook, tbc.)</p>	
5.	<p><u>Conservation Area Appraisal</u></p> <p>MC enquired as to the present position with the update of Datchet’s CA Appraisal. SH advised it was in year 3 of the programme, started in 2018, but they were still working on year 1 and struggling. They have agreement from cabinet to work on a new appraisal for Datchet but there were not enough conservation staff to undertake the work. SH wondered whether this work could be handed to local groups to carry out, following the template with the assistance of conservation officers. It would be beneficial to have an up-to-date CA Appraisal for Datchet. SH said that the format and legislation had changed. Local groups could potentially take this forward. SH volunteered to email the recent template and said she would discuss this idea with colleagues to see if this is viable. DNPSG reacted positively to her suggestions.</p> <p>MC wondered about referencing the Conservation Area more in the DNP. SH said that the NP could engage with the CA and put forward a point of view. SH suggested looking at Cookham (Village Design Statement). MC mentioned better signage of the conservation area so people would know where it was. SH suggested having a map on our website along with posters up on noticeboards for people’s information. AC suggested this could be a non-policy action in the NP for DPC.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>4.30 p.m. Wednesday 10th February 2021 – monthly DNPSG meeting.</p>	

*NPPF, page 73

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

Setting of a heritage asset: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

Significance (for heritage policy): The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.