

## Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

### Meeting Minutes

<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	Wednesday 6 <sup>th</sup> October 2021 4.30 – 5.30 p.m.
<b>Venue</b>	Video conference meeting
<b>Attendees</b>	Alison Crampin, Marjorie Clasper, Fiona Cryle and Jo Stickland
<b>Secretary</b>	Jane Simpson
<b>Guests</b>	Chris Bowden

<b>Agenda Item</b>		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b><u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u></b></p> <p>David Buckley and Ewan Larcombe</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b><u>Zoom meeting with Chris Bowden to discuss the Draft Plan and Regulation 14 procedure</u></b></p> <p>AC had forwarded CB the latest version of the draft plan, v7, and had requested a meeting for further advice.</p> <p>The following points were discussed:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Housing Needs</u></li> <li>ii. <u>Brownfield sites</u></li> <li>iii. <u>NDHAs</u></li> <li>iv. <u>Sustainable buildings</u></li> <li>v. <u>Hedgerows</u></li> <li>vi. <u>Bunds</u></li> <li>vii. <u>Regulation 14</u></li> <li>viii. <u>White Paper</u></li> <li>ix. <u>Layout design</u></li> </ol>	
<b>2.1</b>	<p><b><u>Housing Needs</u></b></p> <p>We had told CB that we were concerned that residents will not understand why we have focused on older-people’s housing and not, say, affordable housing or starter homes, and they may think it’s an omission. CB advised that it is a policy requirement of the Borough Local Plan to provide affordable housing and starter homes. These are not directly in the remit of the DNP which cannot duplicate what is already policy. He suggested that we add a sentence, perhaps after 4.10, to explain that this policy does not cover affordable housing/starter homes, etc, for this reason.</p> <p>DNPSG to draft something to send to CB for approval at next stage.</p>	All
<b>2.2</b>	<p><b><u>Brownfield sites</u></b></p> <p>FC asked whether we can request that brownfield sites are developed first. CB said national policy pushes these first. NP can’t say brownfield first. This will possibly also be covered further in the new planning regulations</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
2.3	<p>(currently postponed). AC said that, apart from infill, our greenfield sites tend to be in the Green Belt</p> <p><b><u>NDHAs</u></b>  CB had informed us that we have to contact all owners on the list. We explained that we had contacted them individually and publicised details of the NDHAs in the parish magazine and on the DNP website. We have also contacted and had approval from owners of proposed Local Green Spaces.</p>	
2.4	<p><b><u>Sustainable buildings</u></b>  We had asked CB if we have enough on new technology. We say at 7.38 that ‘development is encouraged to go as far as it can’ and mention heat pumps but should we mention other technologies specifically, or is the danger that technology advances so rapidly that it is better to keep it general?  CB said that an NP cannot require use of low-carbon building techniques, it can only encourage it. Similarly the refurbishment of existing buildings. Because of this, CB said having a policy would not make a material difference. He also advised that technology will probably overtake anything in the plan and national policy will also usurp anything we say. Also some things, eg battery storage, are not planning matters.  We mention heat pumps in the plan because gas boilers are going to be banned from 2025. CB said the increase in gas prices will possibly make it more difficult to sell places with gas boilers anyway, so the market may deal with the issue.</p>	
2.5	<p><b><u>Hedgerows</u></b>  We want to encourage the use of hedges and to protect them. MC said that hedges are being ripped out because of the work involved maintaining them or to create open frontages for car parking, etc. The Design Guide covers hedges in boundary treatments and as positive features, also planning regulations now require ‘biodiversity net gain’. Planning consent isn’t required for hedges. We looked at policy DAT2 B which refers to hedges and the DDG. CB said that the DDG covers this well and the DNP should just re-enforce the need to protect and encourage the planting and maintaining of hedgerows in keeping with the character of the village. CB said the wording of DAT2 was fine.</p>	
2.6	<p><b><u>Bunds</u></b>  We had sent CB background information about the bunds. He thought that we had good evidence and local knowledge and that there might be scope for a section on bunds and their importance but we need to speak to the EA to get their views. A policy might encourage use of bunds and the EA may have information to support this. It would be useful to ask the EA if the bunds are registered and if not, how they can be registered so that people can’t just take them out. FC suggested starting with Scott Salmon (CB said Jane Dawson at Old Windsor had a useful EA contact). AC said at the very least we would like to acknowledge the existence of the bunds in the text.</p>	
2.7	<p><b><u>Regulation 14</u></b>  CB reckons we are 90% there.  It was agreed to present DNP to both DPC and RBWM at the same time.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>We asked if we could give RBWM a deadline for a response. CB said we could but there's nothing we can do if they don't meet it. CB said if we finish the draft in the next three weeks, say, we could then send to RBWM and present to DPC. Given the time this will take, we discussed possibly going to Reg 14 in January.</p> <p><u>Statutory Consultees</u> At Reg 14 we have to notify Statutory Consultees. We need to ask RBWM for a list of SCs. We will have to draft an email to these statutory consultees. We discussed the role of DPC in this. The email should come from the DPC clerk. CB will help with the wording, if required. We will need to explain how to respond and provide a postal and email address as responses have to be written. Links to the DNP draft and evidence should be on the DPC website - this could be done as a link to the DNP website. It should also provide links to the DDG and other supplementary evidence. We should also notify all NDHAs, LGS owners, etc. We will need to create a list.</p> <p><u>Publicity</u> It was thought the next Link, copy deadline early November, was too soon but we could write about Regulation 14 and the timescale involved. CB said people often get confused about Reg 14 consultation and Reg 16 referendum so we could also explain that. AC said the deadline for the following issue was March.</p> <p><u>General consultation</u> The consultation should last for 6 weeks or 8 weeks if it covers holiday periods. We will need to ask residents to give their address or email address when they comment as RBWM will have to write to them at Reg 16. We will have to add a note about GDPR in our communications to say we will be sharing the data with DPC/RBWM, no other purpose, etc.</p> <p>AC asked if we should have a Google form as this would provide representations in an Excel document. CB said it doesn't have to be a form but if it is, it should be careful not to lead the answers, we should keep it simple. It would also be a good idea to ask if the respondent is a resident of the parish and their postcode. We should ask people to say if they like the DNP draft too.</p> <p><u>Strategic Environmental Assessment</u> CB said we should ask RBWM at Reg 14 for a screening opinion on the need for an SEA and Habitat Regulations Audit. AC said that had held up the Horton &amp; Wraysbury NP. CB thought that the DNP is not likely to have a significant impact on the environment.</p> <p><u>Next steps</u> MC asked if we were ready to go to Reg 14. CB thought we were. It was agreed to discuss way forward at our next meeting and plan the timetable. CB said he would make changes to the draft DNP in one hit, the</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
2.8	<p>last round of changes and any new ones following our talks with the EA. We should let him know our schedule so he knows when to expect it.</p> <p>FC asked if RBWM objected to much of the Old Windsor Plan. CB said mainly the flooding/Thames Water section.</p> <p>FC asked if anyone knew who had replaced Vicky Gibson to look after planning apps in Datchet, Horton &amp; Wraysbury. The group did not know but said we would ask DB.</p> <p><b><u>White Paper</u></b> AC asked whether we should worry about the new Planning White Paper which has just been postponed. CB said that it looks as if the 'zones' may be out and more importance will be placed on NPs. He advised to carry on, the DNP can be reviewed at a future date, if and when the new regulations are implemented.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>DB</p>
2.9	<p><b><u>Design layout</u></b> AC asked about the Billingshurst Plan and its layout. CB said to contact Greg Burt, Clerk at BPC, who could advise who did the desktop publishing work for them. CB thought that, if we decide to do this, it would be good to have the plan in this format before the Reg 14 consultation period so residents would see how professional it was and it would be slightly reduced in size because the layout would allow more words per page.</p>	
3.	<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b> Wednesday 13.10.21 @ 4.30 p.m. Other meetings this year – 10.11; 8.12</p>	