

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	Tuesday 8 th September 2020 4.30 – 5.55 p.m.
Venue	Zoom meeting
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Fiona Cryle and Marjorie Clasper Chris Bowden, Director of Navigus
Secretary	Jane Simpson

Agenda Item		Action
1.	<u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u> Apologies received from Jo Stickland.	
2.	<u>Meeting convened to discuss way forward</u> <p>The Steering Group convened the meeting to enable us to ask Chris where we go from here. AC had forwarded a resume of our progress and some of the Green and Blue documents to him (LGS matrix and forms) to him. Chris said he had looked through these and added comments and would send them back to us after the meeting.</p> <p>AC said we had done a lot of work but were having difficulties bringing it all together. CB said he believes the evidence we have accumulated is excellent and that we were at the stage where we could now start forming policies with his help. AC said that she had been looking at Billingshurst and Old Windsor plans, which CB helped with, and had started to construct the first three chapters. CB suggested we consider whether we wanted a detailed plan or a more concise one that had the evidence as a separate section. He advised he thought having the evidence as a stand-alone section would work well.</p> <p>AC asked how we brought the skeleton together. How did CB work with other groups? CB advised us to focus on issues; gather the evidence we can, then to send the information to him. He would then draft some policies for us to consider, based on the information provided, and would tell us where there were gaps in our information which we needed to fill</p> <p>Specific sections were then discussed.</p>	CB
3.	<u>Housing and the Built Environment</u> CB advised that the government's new White Paper which was out to consultation until October 2020 might have some bearing on local plans and	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>NPs. He also was concerned that RBWM's Local Plan was still not approved which could also affect our work. AC advised that the Datchet Design Guide was also on hold at RBWM. CB was OK with that.</p> <p>We discussed affordable housing and a Locality Webinar by Aecom which FC and AC had attended. This mentioned different types of affordable housing including the new 'First Homes'. It also explained that Local Plans often have a flexible tenure mix and NPs can use this flexibility to address housing issues. We discussed the proposed affordable housing allocation on AL39 and viability. CB said that with the various changes to policy in the pipeline but it would be tricky to get something on affordable housing into the Plan but that he would look at the evidence we had gathered.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Steering Group would assemble all the housing evidence and send to CB.</p>	DNPSG
4.	<p><u>Green/Blue Environment</u></p> <p>AC asked if we were going in the right direction with the matrix and forms. CB said we needed to distinguish between Local Green Space, Open Space and Green belt. We have the potential to designate local green space and open spaces. The green belt is already protected but there is still the potential to build on it and the best mechanism available to us to protect it is to designate it as local green space. He referred us to Para. 100 of the NPPF which indicates that we need to show why a site is 'demonstrably important/special' to the community to be designated as a local green space. It should be proximate to the community as well. We should also use evidence of this from our engagement with the community and surveys.</p> <p>Regarding the 'not too extensive in area' criteria, the Recreation Ground is a large space but it needs to be large to perform the many functions it does, eg football pitches. MC advised that the Sabatini land was private and owned by a Trust. The Trustees were also Parish Councillors. The rec is owned by DPC.</p> <p>CB felt we shouldn't worry about private open spaces in the green belt e.g. farmland, golf and cricket club, etc, and should focus on publicly accessible open spaces. We should consider if they are under threat. He thought school playing fields were difficult. JS advised that there were plans to build on a school playing field recently. CB acknowledged that was happening all over. An issue was that if they weren't available to the whole community we would have to explain why we thought that, notwithstanding, we wanted to include them.</p> <p>CB said that we should be getting comments from local people on their local green spaces. AC said we had this information from our first Like/Dislike survey, and other surveys. CB said there was probably more value in people offering information about Green Spaces spontaneously.</p> <p>AC mentioned green corridors and explained that we had received information from TVERC but that this was 15-20 years' old. He said we should send it to him when we send our documents. Green corridors were</p>	AC

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>tricky. He felt that net biodiversity gains could be achieved better from requiring friendly/sustainable features in designs on new developments and by preserving existing green space.</p> <p>CB said that Views are difficult to justify and ideally need a focal point, to be a view of something. Our proposals tended to be open views. We should also consider how likely it was that development might impact views of, say, the river front or village centre. MC put to him the case of the riverside - he said protection might be offered through a policy which seeks to ensure that development does not affect the tranquil setting rather than a 'views' policy. The Townscape Assessment records the views from the riverside and it is also mentioned in the Conservation Area Assessment.</p> <p>The castle is a good example of a focal point for a view.</p> <p>AC noted that Billingshurst had protected views of its church spire and CB said that was something DNP could look at.</p> <p>CB to send through his notes on this (which he did straight after the meeting).</p>	CB
5.	<p><u>Getting Around</u></p> <p>AC advised of the new Getting Around Survey that was just going out to the community which would supplement the work we have already done on Key Movement Routes and that in due course we would be able to send this to CB.</p> <p>AC said we had already had advice from CB on what we need to do with parking, that we need to look at RBWM's Parking Strategy to see whether it covers what we need.</p> <p>We talked about verges which are mentioned in the Landscape Character Study (RBWM) and the current government consultation on parking on verges. AC mentioned the design of a development in Slough which deterred people from parking on the grass verges. CB said a photo of this would be helpful.</p> <p>We discussed parking courts, how they can be a problem if they are not overlooked or too far from housing to enable people to use vehicle charging technologies, etc, but also whether having them close to housing would take away space for people. AC mentioned the developments in Datchet where there is no outdoor space for residents, only cars. CB said we should assemble the evidence and he could help us look at layout policies which might be effective</p> <p>Electric charging points were also discussed and CB said that there could be a policy on this.</p> <p>He also thought a policy based on layout rather than numbers might be more effective.</p> <p>AC explained that we also have some other policy ideas and we agreed to send it through with our other documents.</p>	<p>DNPSG</p> <p>(JSt/DB)</p> <p>AC</p> <p>DNPSG</p>

Agenda Item		Action
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p>	<p><u>Other Aspects</u></p> <p>AC advised that a Sustainable Survey had been sent out to residents using CSE questions and that the responses had been supportive. The River Thames Scheme for Datchet – Channel 1 – will not now be going ahead due to lack of funds so flood mitigation will be a major issue for the Plan. Ideally National Policies should require developers to build sustainably, it shouldn't be left to NPs as it is at the moment.</p> <p>AC said that we hadn't done anything specific on Community Assets, Leisure and Recreation facilities, (other than the Open Spaces survey) although CB had advised us what we need to do. CB mentioned the AL39 play area and asked what was needed there, what was missing from the village. With the Rec. being well stocked with equipment, we asked if this area could be designated as something else, could we look at other options, not just for children, covering different types of 'play' e.g. sensory area; community garden? Yes. CB mentioned LEAPS and NEAPS (see RBWM Open Spaces study). Furthermore the lack of allotments in the village – for villagers to use - was also an issue to raise.</p> <p>AC raised Non-Designated Heritage Assets List. RBWM has plans for a Heritage Policy but it isn't underway yet. AC asked whether this was something which could be submitted separately from an NP? CB said it would be good to have a fixed list tied to a policy in the Plan which could subsequently be added to. Caution needed to be taken with respect to privately-owned properties, whether all the property or just part was to be listed. We discussed the example of the chemist – was it just the façade or the whole building which was important? The evidence has to be watertight. CB thought it was the frontage but not necessarily what was behind.</p> <p><u>Businesses</u> – AC mentioned that we had looked at Datchet at Work in 2017 and done character assessments of the commercial areas. FC raised the subject of change of use, changing commercial to residential for example. CB's advice was to not make it difficult for ourselves, don't try to micro-manage. These days, high streets are changing all the time, especially with Covid, likewise office accommodation. Use classes changed on 1 September 2020 .There is more flexibility now with change of use, too, eg Offices/Shops/Restaurants but shop to residential still needs planning permission.</p> <p>CB thought we probably didn't need a policy.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p><u>Way Forward</u></p> <p>CB concluded by saying that we had broken the back of the evidence and that we were going in the right direction.</p> <p>CB confirmed he would email his latest notes for us to look at and action.</p> <p>During the next two weeks, Steering Group to look at where we are up to; assemble all our documents and send them to CB for him to do a draft a skeleton of Plan. He is busy for the next two weeks but could look at</p>	<p>AC</p>

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>something towards the end of the month. AC said we would look at what we have and give him a rough idea of when to expect it, with a view to CB providing a draft outline in October.</p> <p>AC asked CB to send us his invoice. (Received straight after the meeting.)</p>	
8.	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>Monthly DNPSG meeting, 4.30pm on 9th September 2020 – zoom meeting</p>	