

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	Wednesday 13 th January 2021 4.30– 5.35 p.m.
Venue	Video conference meeting
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Fiona Cryle, Marjorie Clasper, Jo Stickland and David Buckley
Secretary	Jane Simpson
Guests	RBWM Cllr. David Cannon and RBWM Deputy Mayor Cllr. Gary Muir

Agenda Item		Action
1.	<u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u> Apologies received from Ewan Larcombe	
2.	<u>Minutes of the previous meetings and matters arising</u>	
2.1	The minutes of the DNPSG meetings held on 9.12.20 (Monthly meeting), were agreed for accuracy and signed.	
2.2	5.4 AC had arranged a meeting with Sarah Harper, RBWM Conservation Officer for 11.00 a.m. tomorrow (14.1.20)	
2.3	5.6 AC had asked EL for his input with respect to the flooding aspect of the plan. Still awaited.	EL
2.4	5.6 The fishing lake site planning application was due to be determined on 20/11/20 but DC advised that it had not yet been determined.	
2.5	11.2 FC had sent a reminder email to Thames Water and was awaiting a response.	FC
3.	<u>Housekeeping</u> JS advised that there had been no correspondence and Forms of acceptance were still required from EL and JK. MC to talk to JK.	EL/JK/ MC
4.	<u>Datchet Design Guide update</u> Vicky Gibson has advised that the DDG has gone to the heads of Planning at RBWM and, all being well, will go to Cabinet in February for approval and adoption. DC thought it should sail through. He added that VG had praised the DNP team and Katy Jones. Ian Gillespie (Planning Policy) has left RBWM AC said that VG had asked that we comment on planning applications where the DDG is relevant so that the planning officers get used to the different character areas, etc, in the DDG.	

Agenda Item		Action
	DC said that DNPSG could get the monthly list of planning applications to do this. Any comments from DNPSG would be treated like all others, as a single comment with equal value to any other.	
5.	<p><u>Survey – What’s Important to you?</u></p> <p>AC reported that there had been 39 responses so far which gave good feedback, but asked DNPSG for support on social media to keep the post high up the news feed, she could only comment so many times on her own post. It was hoped that RBWM and DPC Councillors would respond. DB to remind DPC again. DC also said he would complete it. It was agreed to have 31.1.21 as an end date.</p>	All DB
6.	<p><u>Policy Draft</u></p> <p>6.1 <u>Feedback from all DNPSG members on draft</u></p> <p>DB had not had time to read the draft. Comments on v.2 still awaited from EL and DB.</p> <p>6.2 <u>1.10 Consultation List</u></p> <p>AC had emailed FC’s revised list and asked SG to send any comments. AC asked DB if he was concerned about the level of consultation. DB said not. MC spoke about the different ways we had engaged with residents, including leaflet drops to houses in the vicinity of the Character Assessments which invited people to accompany us. JS mentioned the information available in The Bridge. FC to check she had included that.</p> <p>6.3 <u>4.8 Downsizing and DAT 1</u></p> <p>The survey confirmed what the Downsizing focus group had said. AC will collate and summarise comments at the end of the survey period. AC said 3 people had offered to join focus groups but they had already attended the previous meeting. Only 1 paper response from The Link had been received.</p> <p>6.4 <u>6.3/6.4 Heritage/NDHA</u></p> <p>Meeting with Sarah Harper tomorrow. SH had applied for funding to establish a Local List of Non-Designated Heritage Assets. The survey had good nominations including monuments, library and St. Mary’s School. AC will produce a list of nominations at end of survey. It was thought that the DNP could include an action point (non-policy actions) for DPC to give more advice to parishioners about listed buildings to increase awareness.</p> <p>6.5 <u>7.4 Views</u></p> <p>AC requested more photos of St. Mary’s steeple from different viewpoints around the village.</p> <p>6.6 <u>7.7 Local Green Spaces</u></p> <p>AC to collate survey responses. We will need to add feedback to LGS forms. One or two other sites were suggested, including the Cricket Club, wooded area at end of Ditton Road, Thames Path.</p>	EL/DB All FC AC AC All AC

Agenda Item		Action
<p>6.7</p> <p>6.8</p> <p>6.9</p> <p>6.10</p> <p>6.11</p> <p>6.12</p>	<p>AC has reminded Andrew Clemens that he offered to provide information as to why the recreation ground was so important.</p> <p><u>7.27/7.28 Verges</u></p> <p>The survey had identified more of these. Photos please to AC.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <p>EL input and knowledge definitely needed here. DC agreed to send us a copy of the consultation to be sent out by RBWM on 15.1.21 asking for suggestions for flood mitigation measures in the absence of RTS Channel 1.</p> <p>FC advised that Brian Clews had said that the EA should be clearing watercourses like The Myrke. Riparian owners are encouraged to undertake work such as keeping watercourses clear and the last resort is for RBWM to undertake the works and bill them. FC asked DC about the Jubilee River EA survey – DC said he had a meeting tonight with them and would raise this and the structural survey of the Bank.</p> <p><u>7.40/7.41 Jubilee River BOA (Biodiversity Opportunity Area)</u></p> <p>FC queried whether BOAs are a recognised concept. TVERC includes the Datchet section of Jubilee River as a BOA on their website, with information on how to manage BOAs. FC spoke with George Fussey (Eton College) who agreed to look at the area and speak with FC. FC spoke to Brian Clews who thought Berkshire Local Nature Partnership was defunct. FC has contacted Prue Addison, Conservation Strategy Director BBOWT to find out more.</p> <p><u>8. Community Assets</u></p> <p>So far in the survey, residents seem very satisfied with play facilities on Rec, although, as in the previous Open Spaces survey, there were some requests for separate play areas for toddlers, perhaps of wooden/natural materials. FC mentioned the Wraysbury Play Area as an example of somewhere children learned as well as played. AC will collate results of survey.</p> <p><u>8.3 Cemex</u></p> <p>Cemex have submitted a variation to their planning application which includes a proposed new entrance to the restored site and permissive paths but this is still quite a way from the Riding Court road bridge. DB said DPC had requested an entrance closer to Riding Court in their response to the application. Advised DC/GM of our suggestion to have entrance closer to the village centre to link with NCN61. DC said that when Cemex extraction is completed, the site will be returned to its owners. AC asked if this meant it could be sold and was told it could be.</p> <p><u>10. Non-policy actions</u></p> <p>AC had circulated a first draft just before the meeting. All to look at and let AC have any additions.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>EL DC</p> <p>DC</p> <p>FC</p> <p>AC</p> <p>All</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><u>Draft Neighbourhood Plan V3 with maps</u></p> <p>(The text remains the same as V2 but with maps so folios have changed.) DNPSG very happy with maps produced – great enhancement – all same style and very clear.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
8.	<p><u>Feedback to CB</u></p> <p>Once survey closed and AC has compiled the results, we will be in a position to send feedback to CB.</p>	AC
9.	<p><u>DPC/Borough Councillors engagement</u></p> <p>AC had sent DPC an update in December and it was agreed this would happen monthly now to encourage engagement.</p>	AC
10.	<p><u>Questions for RBWM</u></p> <p>Waiting to hear back from RBWM Officers. AC had resent request for information to Ian Gillespie. Automatic response email said he was leaving RBWM and suggested contacting Tracy-Ann Cramp and Ian Motuel which AC did. Tracy has responded and says she will be in touch w/c 15.1.21, AC to nudge if not. DC asked us to contact our Borough Councillors should we not be getting responses from officers and they will chase them.</p>	AC
11.	<p><u>The Link</u></p> <p>AC advised that the deadline for the next edition is 19.2.21. Suggestions for article included: feedback from survey and asking for any further comments; link to our other surveys; update on DDG; links and information about Character Assessments on website.</p>	AC
12.	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>AC advised that the DNPSG had been asked to support an extension of Datchet Cricket Club. DCC would like an additional cricket pitch on the land behind them (HA41) with a large new pavilion. AC was told that the club had been in talks with Landsdown who had said they might be able to come to a deal if DCC supported their planning application. (It was queried whether this was Landhold Capital.) AC told DCC that support had to be community-led, there had to be evidence that residents wanted the land to be used in that way for the DNP to offer support, but the area is green belt land and has not been included in the BLP housing allocations. None of the responses to DNP consultations had mentioned the cricket club. DC said this would be because members were mainly from outside the village. It was agreed to see a planning application before commenting.</p>	
13.	<p><u>Dates of Next Meetings</u></p> <p>Thursday 14th January 2021 @ 11.00 am with Sarah Harper, RBWM Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Wednesday 10th February 2021 @ 4.30 pm, monthly DNPSG meeting. (Second Wednesday of the month as usual.)</p>	