

## Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

### Meeting Minutes

<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	Wednesday 9th November 2022, 4.00 – 5.00 pm
<b>Venue</b>	Datchet Parish Council Offices
<b>Attendees</b>	Alison Crampin, Ewan Larcombe, Marjorie Clasper and Jo Stickland
<b>Secretary</b>	Jane Simpson

<b>Agenda Item</b>		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b><u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u></b> Fiona Cryle and David Buckley	
<b>2.</b>	<b><u>Minutes and matters arising</u></b> 19.8.22 – Waiting to receive DB's Declaration of Interests Form 23.8.22 – nothing outstanding 11.10.22 – Schedule from RBWM still awaited and response to enquiries regarding purdah and option for delegated authority. AC will chase. These three sets of minutes were approved.	DB  AC
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>Housekeeping</u></b>	
<b>3.1</b>	An email had been received from Sangeeta Matta asking for speed restrictions in Slough Road/M4 bridge. JS to respond suggesting she contact RBWM Highways and DPC (via clerk). JSt. also advised of the numerous lorries using Slough Road constantly to remove soil from the M4 site.	JS
<b>3.2</b>	Finances remained static but we will need to pay CB soon for his advice, see 4.1.	
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>Response to Examiner/Stages to referendum</u></b>	
<b>4.1</b>	Having not submitted any formal representations to Reg 14 or Reg 16, IM and GT at RBWM had written a late response/representation. They sent it to DNPSG on 28 October, a week before the DNP and supporting documentation were due to go to the examiner, Nigel McGurk. This said DNPSG had not fully addressed the issues RBWM had pointed out pre-submission. Chris Bowden had advised DNPSG to write to GT referring him to the Consultation Statement where the issues had been addressed and to express concern that new matters had been raised which DNPSG had not had the opportunity to address. AC had done this and had said that DNPSG would also like to make a written submission to the examiner, explaining our position. On 7 November, the date the Plan was due to go to the examiner, RBWM had emailed to say they would revise their Reg 16 response and would ask NMCG whether DNPSG could submit a response. On 8 November, GT had written to AC to say that NMCG had advised that as a normal part of any examination he would write to the qualifying body giving us the opportunity to put any points forward, to provide a response to	

Agenda Item		Action
<p><b>4.2</b></p> <p><b>4.3</b></p> <p><b>4.4</b></p> <p><b>4.5</b></p>	<p>RBWM's representation and to answer any other questions that he may have. GT advised DNPSG to wait until NMCG writes to us before submitting a response.</p> <p>We are waiting for RBWM's revised response. In the meantime, DNPSG have drafted a document/statement responding to issues raised in their first draft response. This is in the format used for the Consultation Statement. It was agreed that, when AC receives RBWM's revised Reg 16 response, she will amend our document accordingly and send it and RBWM's response to CB for advice. She will then circulate CB's advice for DNPSG to agree next steps.</p> <p>Reg 16 responses were discussed. There had been only two when we spoke to IM during Reg 16. We had been told that one related to air quality. We did not know how many more had been received. IM had said he would ask if we could see the representations. In terms of process, it was agreed that we had carried out sufficient consultations and ticked all the boxes required.</p> <p>The timelines for the next stages were discussed. It is hoped that the examination will be completed before Christmas and that we can go to referendum before the Borough/Parish elections and the Coronation and bank holidays in early May, but this will need support from RBWM to achieve. AC to chase GT for a schedule of dates for the various stages after the plan and our response have been sent to NMCG.</p> <p>EL offered to put a question to RBWM Council meeting on 22.11.22 – What is the current status of the DNP and when will it go to referendum. This was agreed.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>AC</p> <p>EL</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Preparations for referendum publicity</u></b></p> <p>It was agreed that a leaflet would be required to distribute to all residents and AC said she would start to think about drafting one.</p> <p>JSt. advised that Old Windsor had paid £200 for delivery for theirs. It was thought that we could afford to have ours delivered.</p> <p>We would also need posters and it would be good to have a banner. It was pointed out that, if the referendum coincides with the coronation, we might be competing for banner space.</p>	<p>AC</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b><u>AL39</u></b></p> <p>EL asked what the DNP position on AL39 was. It was explained that the DNP cannot promote less development than the Local Plan.</p> <p>DPC had called an emergency meeting on 31.10.22 where residents and Parish Councillors raised concerns. The decision will be discussed at the council meeting on 14 November.</p>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b><u>The Link</u></b></p> <p>AC had emailed the Link article for comments. All were happy with it. AC will now send it to Sally-Anne.</p>	<p>AC</p>

<b>8.</b>	<b><u>AOB</u></b>	
<b>8.1</b>	AC had contacted Steve Miller to update him and advise that there might be changes required to the Plan in the early new year.	
<b>8.2</b>	AC advised that 29 Slough Road planning application still didn't include a flood risk assessment and the ecology officer had reported possible offences under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Habitats Regulations 2010 to the police. It was thought that a decision would be made shortly. <i>[Application refused 10 November.]</i>	
<b>8.3</b>	Hardware House appears to be being converted back to one shop which, it is believed, will be a hot-food take-away. It is not yet known what changes might be proposed to the frontage. DB has advised them to seek planning advice. AC had spoken to JK and thought there was not a strong heritage argument to preserve the building. It is hoped the UPVC windows might be replaced with a more appropriate material for the conservation area.	
<b>8.4</b>	The Petrol Station's former shop may be turned into a kebab take-away, next to the school. A planning application has been submitted. Traffic and health issues were discussed.	
<b>8.5</b>	A presentation regarding a proposal to turn Ditton Manor into a hotel will be made before the DPC meeting on Monday.	
<b>8.6</b>	The appeal by The Candy Box for retrospective permission for their roller shutters was refused and the DDG was mentioned by the planning inspector.	
<b>8.7</b>	EL advised of the proposed consultation about the Datchet to Hythe End River Scheme.	
<b>9.</b>	<b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b>  TBA.	