

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	Monday 15 th November 2021 4.30 – 5.00 p.m.
Venue	Video conference meeting
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Marjorie Clasper, Fiona Cryle and Jo Stickland
Secretary	Jane Simpson

Agenda Item		Action
	No apologies received.	
1.	<p><u>Meeting to discuss the response from Brianne Vally (BV) at the EA</u></p> <p>AC advised that she had written to EL for his input and was yet to receive a reply.</p> <p><u>Q1</u> - EA say Sumptermead and Southlea bunds are not officially registered. Sumptermead is shown as a flood defence on EA maps. BV believed that the importance of these historic features may be reflected in relevant Deeds of Covenant. It was agreed that FC would carry out title searches on Sandlea, Woollacombe and Poplars to obtain further information although, even if we discovered the existence of any deeds, an NP does not have the power to designate bunds as a flood defence. MC said that the links supplied by BV indicated that the bunds met the four conditions for designation by EA/RBWM.</p> <p><u>Q2/3</u> - The landowner is responsible for inspecting the condition of these bunds and legally and financially responsible for maintaining these bunds. Sumptermead was last assessed by the EA in 2020. There was no indication that Southlea is assessed.</p> <p><u>Q4</u> – BV advised that the question about recourse for not maintaining the bunds was outside her remit but suggested possibly getting advice on civil prosecution.</p> <p><u>Q5</u> – A Deed of Covenant(s) may be include details of who is responsible for the bunds and what these responsibilities entail. If there were a need to increase their height, it would usually involve putting together a case as per the flood and coastal erosion risk management appraisal guidance.</p> <p><u>Q6</u> - BV would support recording details of the bunds in the DNP.</p> <p><u>Q7</u> - BV was not aware of any plans to restore the Southlea Bund in future.</p> <p><u>Q8</u> – BV agreed that DNP should support the maintenance and protection of the existing bunds.</p> <p><u>Q9</u> – In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) new development should be directed to areas at lowest probability of flooding by applying a flood risk sequential test.</p> <p>BV advised that we might wish to include reference to Property Flood Resilience Measures. JSt. said we could add a link to this.</p>	EL

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>Q10 – It was agreed that AC would ask CB about the treatment of property boundaries. Gaps in walls, etc, are mentioned in the DDG, section 4.5. She would also ask whether what we had discussed could be policy or non-policy actions and where they would fit best in the DNP.</p> <p>Q11 – BV wasn't able to give us the data requested. FC felt that they should be able to and would look into this again.</p> <p>BV advised if we needed any further information to contact EA's Sustainable Places Team.</p> <p>AC advised that she had recently spoken with David Cannon. She thanked him for putting us in touch with BV and explained BV thought it was a good idea to try to protect the bunds in the DNP. He agreed this would be good.</p> <p>Now we have heard from the EA, all were happy for AC to send this information to CB to complete the draft Plan.</p> <p>AC summarised. We will forward the EA response and ask for advice on policy/non-policy areas. The EA supports DNP recording the bunds to raise awareness, and their maintenance and protection (A6, A8), so we will ask how we can include this and send the draft bunds appendix. We will tell CB that we are doing some initial research on historic Deeds of Covenant. We will also ask whether we can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support official designation of both bunds/banks; • support a review of the historic flood defence features (A7); • support the designation of key natural and man-made features such as watercourses, banks and drainage ditches, etc, which contribute to the management of flood risk. <p>We will also ask about encouraging the use of flood attenuation measures with a link to relevant documents; and about property boundaries. We will send the latest version of the DNP and our comments as agreed previously.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>FC</p> <p>AC</p>
2.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>JSt. advised that she had made a formal complaint to DPC as the contractors employed to clear the ditch of rubbish had just dumped it behind the scout hut which is unacceptable.</p> <p>AC had been in touch with Steve Miller who had suggested dates for a meeting. It was agreed that Wednesday 24th November 2021 at 4.15p.m. at Costa, Datchet, would be the most convenient. AC to advise SM and try and book a table. AC further advised that Steve was moving to Suffolk soon but it was hoped that he would be able to start it before he moved.</p> <p>It was very good news that DPC had agreed to see our presentation at 6.30p.m. on Monday 13th December before their PC meeting. JS gave her apologies and FC thought she might be away too. AC, MC and JSt. were able to attend and it was assumed DB and EW would be there anyway. Katy Jones said she would be sending notification out to Cllrs. on 29.11.21.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>AC had sent out the proposed Powerpoint presentation and '15-minute read' to the DNPSG for comment. FC said she would email a couple of points to add. All were happy with both.</p> <p>JSt. had heard back from Cllr. Christine Bateson who advised that David Coppinger was now the RBWM Cllr. responsible for neighbourhood plans. JSt has also written to David Coppinger to make further enquiries into our status and hopes to report back at our next meeting.</p> <p>MC confirmed that she had started the list of consultees and will circulate it soon so all can input.</p> <p>FC will have the Project Planner up to date soon to produce a list of consultees.</p>	<p>FC</p> <p>JSt.</p> <p>MC</p> <p>FC</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>Wednesday 8.12.21 @ 4.30 p.m.</p>	