

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	11 October 2022
Venue	Zoom Meeting
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Fiona Cryle and Jo Stickland
Guest	Ian Motuel (IM), RBWM

Item		Action
1.	<p>Appointment of Nigel McGurk as DNP examiner IM believes he has seen a signed set of T&Cs. He will check and confirm.</p>	IM
2.	<p>Schedule We asked for the approximate schedule for the examination, cabinet approval, referendum and adoption, which Garry had promised.</p> <p>IM said it was difficult to ask the examiner to do the examination by a set date, giving the example of how they couldn't ask the government inspector for a finishing date on the BLP. We pointed out the differences between the BLP and DNP and commented that Nigel McGurk has already said he thinks it will take about eight days to do the examination. We suggested that RBWM might politely ask if it could be done by Christmas so that we can avoid crashing into the elections.</p> <p>Some examiners request a public hearing, particularly if there's a housing allocation or something contentious in an NP, but IM thought we probably wouldn't need one. This might mean a shorter turnaround.</p> <p>Once the examination has been done, RBWM will have a number of things to do before the referendum. They have to satisfy themselves the DNP is in order and meets all guidelines. Cabinet has to approve the proposal to go to referendum (see also item 4. below). They are required to publish information about the DNP 28 <u>working</u> days (ie 5½ weeks) before the date of the referendum. Then they are required to give 25 <u>working</u> days' notice that a referendum is taking place and the date of the poll. This will all have an effect on the overall timings and the schedule we are asking for. IM says they are still working on this and will have a better idea once the examination is underway.</p>	IM
3.	<p>Election and referendum dates The election will be in May 2023. IM is checking with RBWM's election team about purdah dates, etc, and what we can and can't do during that time. He said that some councils like to tie in a referendum with</p>	IM

Item		Action
	<p>local elections because they get a better response and it's cheaper. We made the point that doing it on the same day might be perceived as giving the NP a political link. We said we were keen to move quickly, not least because of AL39. IM said such a large planning application might take three/four months to process so we pointed out the elections are seven months away, leaving time for the application to be submitted and considered if we didn't proceed quickly.</p>	
4.	<p>Delegated authority IM said that the lead-in time for cabinet meetings is quite long (5/6weeks). In practice this could delay the DNP by up to two months. IM said there might be an option to ask for delegated authority to go to referendum after the examination without having to take it to cabinet. We asked for this request to be made.</p>	IM
5.	<p>RBWM comments on DNP IM noted that RBWM hadn't commented on the DNP. We reminded him that we had invited them to comment after Reg 14, as we were told it was unusual for a council not to comment on one of its own NPs, but that they had declined. He brought up Rebecca Raine's comments, noting that we hadn't taken them all in. (He did add that Rebecca thought the DNP was one of the best she'd seen.) We explained we'd taken in most of her suggestions and had given details in the Consultation Statement of what we'd left out and why. IM said RBWM may decide to comment but that it might be after the consultation has closed given Garry was off sick. IM didn't actually know if they could comment out of time. He hoped that Garry would be back next week to do that. If Garry doesn't return for a while, it will be left to IM to process the DNP and send it to the examiner. As it's a small team, this will no doubt result in further delays. We asked IM to keep us informed.</p>	IM
6.	<p>Representations RBWM has received two representations so far. We discussed the reasons why more people might not have responded. IM said people often wait until the last minute. We talked about Reg 16 being harder because people need to understand the 'Basic Conditions'. Our plan hasn't allocated any housing sites so isn't particularly contentious. Also an NP for a larger town, such as Windsor, would be likely to generate more comments than a smaller village like Datchet. RBWM doesn't have to prepare a consultation statement as we did for Reg 14. IM did not seem to think it would be an issue for the examiner that we hadn't receive many representations so long as the processes had been followed.</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>IM talked about the length of time it might take to process all the representations when the consultation closes and how they have to decide how to get them to the examiner. We pointed out that this was nothing they hadn't done before. (If there's only a handful of comments this really shouldn't be a reason to delay.)</p> <p>We asked if they would share the representations they receive. IM didn't see why not. One of the representations received mentions air quality.</p>	
7.	<p>Summary</p> <p>IM will check re the T&Cs; ask the examiner whether the examination can be done by Christmas; ask for delegated authority to proceed to referendum without waiting for a cabinet meeting; do a last push to try to get more responses to Reg 16; and let us know if/when Garry is back and if they are going to comment on the DNP.</p>	
8.	<p><i>(EL has told us there are four full council meetings before the elections where he could ask questions about the DNP.</i></p> <p>Dates of cabinet meetings, Dates of council meetings.)</p>	