

Meeting Notes

Date & Time	Thursday 7 March 4.15pm-5.45pm.
Venue	Costa, The Green
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Marjorie Clasper, Jo Stickland.
Secretary	Alison Crampin

Item	Description	Action
1 - 2	Apologies for absence and announcements JS had sent apologies for absence. No apologies received from other absent members. No announcements.	
3	Notes The notes from 19 February 2024 were agreed. AC took notes for this meeting in JS's absence.	
3.1	Matters arising We agreed to continue to keep an agenda and notes (formerly minutes) as a record of our progress to share with DPC. EL's petition regarding Wraysbury Drain had reached 1000+ signatures.	
4	Housekeeping	
4.1	Email: AC had checked datchetnp and dnpsg emails and disabled the automatic 'out of office' messages. We were copied into a letter from a resident asking Cllr Buckley about the overdue review of the Conservation Area Assessment. It also included a proposal for a Good Practice Charter for local businesses in the historic retail quarter of Datchet which is compatible and consistent with the aspirations, policy and guidance of our Design Guide and DNP. The resident asked whether DPC would be willing to broker such an initiative and conversation between traders and other stakeholders on behalf of the parish. As yet, we have not been copied into any response.	
4.2	Website: The group will update this as required.	
4.3	Funds: We plan to use the same financial regulations as for DNP. There has been no expenditure since last month.	
5	Status of group/adoption (Terms of reference)	
5.1	The ToR are on the agenda for DPC's March meeting on 11 March 2024.	
5.2	AC had contacted Cllr Susan Young, DPC Strategic Planning Group, to request that the DNP vision and objectives are considered in the compilation of the Strategy Framework. SY had responded to confirm that the DNP would definitely be a 'bible' for this process, and consultation with local community groups will be key to making it work.	

Item	Description	Action
<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>Delivery of objectives</p> <p>We discussed how to prioritise the delivery of the objectives, initiatives, policies, and non-policy actions of the Neighbourhood Plan, (low, medium and high).</p> <p>Conservation Area/Heritage We agreed that heritage was a very important issue and the protection of the village centre/conservation area (CA). This is strongly supported by residents. We briefly discussed relatively low-cost ways to increase awareness of the CA, eg added to street signs, leaflet explaining where the CA is and what it means.</p> <p>Prioritisation We graded the DNP policies low, medium and high based on current priorities although these will change as circumstances change and should be periodically reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAT1: Housing suitable for the needs of older people p27 LOW. This is applicable to larger housing developments such as AL39 and was taken into account in that application. • DAT2: High quality design and character p31 HIGH. This is frequently relevant and used in responses to planning applications. • DAT3: Shopfront design p33 HIGH. This is a high-priority at the moment as signage is being erected which does not comply with the DNP or DDG. • DAT4: Non-designated heritage assets p36 MEDIUM. DPC is currently reviewing their insurance. AC liaising with the clerk about insuring DPC-owned NDHAs (monuments). • DAT5: Views p40 MEDIUM. This may be relevant to the proposed orchard. • DAT6: Waterside activities p41 LOW. Subject to change. (Local Wildlife Sites) • DAT7: Local green spaces p47 MEDIUM. To be monitored. • DAT8: Provision for wildlife in new development p48 HIGH. This is frequently relevant and used in responses to planning applications. • DAT9: Roadway verges p49 MEDIUM/HIGH. It is hoped that DPC's new Lead Member for Highways will address this, with support from Wild About Datchet. • DAT10: Flooding, drainage, appropriate drainage solutions p52 HIGH. This is frequently relevant and used in responses to planning applications. • DAT11: Provision of community infrastructure p57 MEDIUM. The orchard project is supported by this policy. • DAT12: Key movement routes p60 MEDIUM. It is hoped that the new Lead Member for Highways at DPC will address these. • DAT13: Provision for cycle storage p61 MEDIUM. This also covers cycle storage in the village centre, village hall, parish office, etc. 	

Item	Description	Action
<p>6.4</p> <p>Non-policy actions/Chapter 10 We discussed which departments at DPC should be approached regarding the numbered non-policy actions: #1-9 Biodiversity, trees in the CA, etc - Grounds #10-22 Getting around/transport – Highways #23-27 Heritage – Planning #28-31 Flooding/bunds – Flooding #32-33 Planning (Enforcement/cemetery) – Planning #34-41 Streets/street furniture – Highways #42-43 Accommodation GRT/Boat dwellers – tbc</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>Procedure We would like to ask to meet Lead and Deputy Lead members of DPC departments in turn to discuss the policies and non-policy actions which are relevant to their department. As DPC is setting up a Strategic Planning Group to deliver a 3-5 year forward plan, it might be helpful to meet first with representatives from that group. If the DNP DMG terms of reference are approved, it was agreed that we should approach Cllr Susan Young.</p>		AC
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>Planning applications and enforcement issues Four applications are currently on the list for the March DPC meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 96 London Road (rear extension following previous side extension application) • Land at Datchet Common (road) • 6 The Avenue (pruning tree in Conservation Area) • Elder Tree Cottage, 23 High Street (two-storey extension in CA, in the setting of listed buildings) <p>JSt has been monitoring these and will be attending the DPC meeting, 11/3/24. The comments from the lead member for planning are not yet on the DPC website. Several DNP policies are relevant to these applications.</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>Two further applications had been submitted to RBWM on 6 March</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satis House (fell cedar with TPO – arboricultural report?) • 136 Horton Road (extension. See also application from 2013.) <p>7.3</p> <p>Enforcements JSt has created a list of enforcement issues from 2022 onwards so we can monitor their status/outcomes. It was noted that there are several which appear unresolved. We discussed the bund at Poplars and the planning appeals at Datchet Grill with reference to the DNP/DDG.</p>		
<p>8</p> <p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p>	<p>Working with DPC/increasing awareness This was covered under item 6 above. We are intending to submit notes of DNP DMG meetings to DPC prior to their monthly meetings so they can be circulated to councillors. If the group has issues or recommendations requiring attention, we can ask for these to be considered under ‘Working Groups’ on the DPC agenda.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p>Digital/paper records for archive We discussed delivery and collection of these, which might be relevant to future public displays or meetings, and which should be archived as</p>	

Item	Description	Action
	a public record. We agreed it would be useful to keep a set of reports on non-designated heritage assets, also copies of published leaflets. AC to collate and deliver documents for archive to DPC clerk.	
<p>10</p> <p>10.1</p> <p>10.2</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.4</p> <p>10.5</p> <p>10.6</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Meeting venue We discussed using the parish office again for meetings when the DNP DMG group is recognised officially. A councillor would need to be present with a key. If this is not possible, the other members will continue meeting in the village.</p> <p>Development in the CA We discussed planning policies governing alterations to the rear of houses in the Conservation Area. AC said that in a recent application in Buccleuch Road, RBWM Conservation Officer had noted the importance of the rear of buildings: ‘Conservation areas are not designated as a series of street scenes; private views of buildings, including those experienced by owners, form part of how the historic environment is experienced. Just because it is not publicly visible does not lessen the duty to preserve or enhance, under <u>section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</u>’.</p> <p>Zebra crossing AC said there had been complaints on social media about the new crossing on Horton Road. It was part of the 2021/22 Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). DPC was involved in the plan’s creation and subsequent consultations. Results from DNP’s Getting Around surveys were also submitted. Regarding the location, JSt said it is part of the Safer Routes to Schools initiative which is why it joins up with the cycle path/footpath by the Rec. Three of the top four LCWIP priorities, including the crossing, are in Datchet, the other two are High Street and Queens Road.</p> <p>Flood report DPC’s reports of January and February flooding events said the Myrke Stream had overtopped its banks but the group members who regularly walk beside the stream had not seen evidence of this. AC noted that DPC’s March flood reported, ‘It would appear that the new owner of Poplars has provided a temporary bund to the site which has currently allowed Southlea Road to remain passable during this recent river level rise.’ This was queried as the site is currently being reviewed by RBWM Enforcement. In January, water only started to flow through the breach in the bund when the level at Windsor Park rose above 4.9m. (Max 5.57m on 8/1/24.) In February, the water levels rose to 4.83m (26/2/24) so were unlikely to be high enough to establish whether a temporary bund was in place and/or working.</p> <p>Riverside We discussed the safety issues/trip hazard of moving the mooring rings from the riverside wall to the path. Also the proposal to change the posts which we thought would need approval by the Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Project planner We need to update this. It runs to Regulation 16, 2022.</p>	
	<p>The meeting finished at 17.45.</p> <p>Next meeting Thursday 4 April at 4pm Venue to be confirmed.</p>	

