

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	Thursday 29 th October 2020 - 4.00 – 5.25 p.m.
Venue	Zoom meeting
Attendees	Chris Bowden, Director of Navigus, Alison Crampin, Jo Stickland, Marjorie Clasper, and Fiona Cryle (latter part)
Secretary	Jane Simpson

Agenda Item		Action
1.	<p><u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u></p> <p>Apologies received from David Buckley.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Meeting convened to discuss way forward</u></p> <p>The Steering Group convened the meeting to enable us all to go through the draft Plan document and for CB to answer our queries.</p> <p>AC advised CB of our last chance to consult via The Link this year, deadline 7.11.20; there are 20 people happy to be part of a focus group; and DNPSG is compiling a list of questions for RBWM.</p> <p>CB re-emphasized the power of photographs which are always helpful making certain points. “Pictures say a thousand words”.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Draft Plan</u></p> <p>The following was discussed:-</p> <p>(i) 1.1 Plan period CB was happy with 2020 – 2033 as a lot of evidence gathering has taken place this year. Agreed.</p> <p>(ii) 1.10 Consultation CB thought less is more and suggested we don’t put everything in as the Consultation Statement will have full details. Have we done enough face-to-face consultation? CB said yes, we shouldn’t be worried about any lack of consultation. It just needs to be a brief list to remind the reader. We said we’d check if we’d missed anything significant. JSt. said the BLP had had no face-to-face consultations before publication. CB said that the community need to be involved as they will vote on the plan. Having sessions with the focus group would add to this.</p> <p>(iii) History This should be edited and made more succinct as per note at 2.1.</p> <p>(iv) 2.4 Profile of the Community. CB said descriptions of the key assets/issues of today need to be added here, good and bad, eg play areas, community facilities. Keep it succinct and use pictures – it doesn’t need a long list.</p>	<p>DNPSG</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>DNPSG</p>

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>(v) 3.1 Vision. Agreed the need to add measures to minimise flooding risk – trees a good point but it doesn't have to be mentioned here. The note in the text saying 'we need to do more work on community assets' was ours. CB thinks we have done enough, especially if we are planning to include something in The Link.</p> <p>(vi) 3.2 Objectives will need to be refined and reduced down once policies have been defined.</p> <p>(vii) Policy Headings – all happy with DAT1, 2, 3, etc...</p> <p>(viii) 4 Housing. CB thought a meeting of the focus group could bring out the specific local issues involved here. We can use Age UK or Dwell evidence. List priorities and explain why people want these facilities for downsizing.</p> <p>(ix) 5. Design and Layout. 5.2 Design and character. Summary of DDG. CB said he could do this – it will be about a page and a half of key points. AC advised that it was hoped that the Datchet Design Guide would be adopted before Christmas. DAT2B - CB happy to look at wording to include flexibility for boundary treatments to follow the pattern in the area. DAT2E We talked about trees planted in verges on unadopted roads being allowed to die. CB advised that this was more an issue of management of trees/boundaries/biodiversity improvements etc. Developers usually manage to sweep this under the carpet. Trees etc. on key movement routes are Highways' responsibility; whilst on unadopted roads it is the house owners' responsibility. We asked if this could be an action point for DPC to liaise with residents to look after trees. CB said it could be. DAT2F. CB agreed to add to the storage section – rubbish/recycling bins, bikes. (Pushchairs usually go inside)</p> <p>(x) 5.5 Shopfront design. No need for DNPSG to provide additional information. There is enough in DDG. CB happy to add materials to the list together with key points from the DDG.</p> <p>(xi) Commercial area design is addressed through BLP and amenity. The majority of issues about commercial areas being close to residential areas are to do with planning enforcement. CB suggested an action point for DPC to ensure RBWM is addressing enforcement issues. CB to suggest generic wording for this.</p> <p>(xii) 6 Heritage. CB explained that NDHA have a degree of heritage protection, at a lower level than national listing. We need to explain clearly what aspect of a structure is worthy of designation, with photographs. AC advised CB that we were in discussions with Windsor Neighbourhood Plan and Windsor & Eton Society who had included a list of NDHA, and that we had been approached by RBWM to work with them on a local list as they are submitting a funding bid. CB thought it was sensible to follow the Windsor approach. AC said that the Civic Voice toolkit estimated that a local list took about 18 months to complete and was concerned that this would delay the DNP. Instead she asked if the DNP could identify some assets and follow up with a more comprehensive local list outside the NP. CB said this was acceptable. AC said we could mention NDHA in The Link and ask people for their top 3 buildings of local significance. CB thought this was a good idea.</p>	<p>DNPSG</p> <p>CB</p> <p>CB</p> <p>CB</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>AC</p>

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>(xiii) 7 Green and Blue Environment. 7.1 Views. Agreed to produce photos and description of views of St Mary’s Church steeple. AC said that it was difficult to pinpoint an exact view as it could be seen from all around the village. CB said we should explain that in our description, it is not one view and the policy will apply wherever there is a view. We should list some good viewpoints - and talk about wide or narrow views - but explain there are several. AC remembered that Billingshurst had a policy on their steeple which could be seen from several viewpoints.</p> <p>(xiv) 7.3 DAT6 – full title of LGS Datchet Common <i>and Gravel Pits</i> will be used to avoid confusion with Datchet Common.</p> <p>(xv) 7.4 Local Green Spaces. DAT7A. AC explained that we had residents’ quotes on the proposed LGS but we would be informing residents of our proposed selection in The Link, asking people to tell us why those areas are special to them. AC said we are also approaching landowners, DPC, DRCT, RBWM, and asked what would happen if they did not agree. CB explained that the role of the council is to protect its assets for the community. CB said, for example, that LGS protection would prevent a future council from selling off assets at a moment’s notice if they decided they needed money fast. AC to send CB the link to LGS on DNP website. DAT7B. CB explained that ‘built development’ means above-ground structures. This will reduce the likelihood of any objections to the DNP from utilities companies who might want to lay pipes, etc, underground. LGS have Green Belt protection from development.</p> <p>(xvi) 7.6 Verges. We had asked about including ‘degradation’. CB advised this was usually due to parking on verges so not really a planning issue. It is not usually development that degrades a verge. We will include a question in The Link, asking residents to identify verges in need of improvement. It was also agreed to contact WAD for their input.</p> <p>(xvii) Rural Approach Routes. CB agreed that preserving green approach routes and maintaining the character of the landscape is a really important point. MC said this was mentioned in the Borough’s Landscape Assessment document – CB to look into this.</p> <p>(xviii) 8. Community Assets. CB said that we did not need a policy to protect community infrastructures as IF6 in the BLP already does this. We discussed the requirements on AL39 to provide allotments and a play area. CB said that we need to be clear as to what community infrastructure Datchet actually wants – what, where and why. We all agreed that the Rec. provided an excellent children’s play area so any new area would need to be complementary to the Rec. We could stretch this to include ‘play for adults’ but we already have a green gym. CB said a garden was not a play area. AC to include a question in The Link. We discussed ownership and future maintenance of these sites. Might residents have to pay a service charge and so these areas would be private? CB said maintenance of such areas would probably need to have a management agreement which DPC should ensure occurs. For example DPC might manage the allotments in the first instance but an allotment association could be set up.</p>	<p>DNPSG</p> <p>AC</p> <p>AC</p> <p>AC</p> <p>CB</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>AC</p>

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>(xix) It was also hoped that the Cemex gravel pit site which is being restored as parkland with lakes, would be open for public access and enjoyment and access to north Datchet, rather than a private site. AC said we are intending to ask RBWM for more details.</p> <p>(xx) 9. Getting Around. AC said that the unadopted Lawn Close is a key movement route from AL39 to key destinations but it does not have any footpaths. CB advised that unadopted roads are tricky as any enhancements would need agreement from every house in the street. We can show it as a key movement route but it would be unlikely that we could achieve many improvements. It is also indicated in the Borough's Cycle Action Plan as a cycling route. Another question for RBWM. DNPSG to send our Getting Around map to CB</p> <p>(xxi) DAT11A CB to change wording. DAT11C The latest stats on air pollution are a concern. AC said she would forward to CB the air pollution document. CB said he could carefully word something to say there are unsafe limits in places that people go. An NP is limited about what it can do. DAT11Cb We can encourage tree replacement. Maintenance becomes an action for the highways authority. We could look at introducing more resilient species of trees, or succession planting, etc. JSt explained that a lot of our trees have been susceptible to disease.</p> <p>(xxii) 9.2 Priorities for investment. Bike parking. We do not need to indicate specific sites, general is fine. CB happy with "close to key destinations" if we indicate which key destinations, eg village centre shops.</p> <p>(xxiii) Public transport. CB agreed that this is a difficult topic and advised that we should not make new bus routes a priority for investment as it will be a money pit. We could include 'improve bus service to Slough' as action point for DPC to support.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>AC DNPSG</p> <p>AC/FC</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Other issues discussed included:</p> <p>CSE survey. AC asked if we could include more of the sustainability measures which had been highlighted in our CSE survey. CB agreed. AC also asked if we could encourage developers to install heat pumps and low-carbon alternatives instead of gas boilers which will be illegal in new homes from 2025.</p> <p>Flooding/SUDS – CB said we should be able to add something on this. AC advised CB about problems with SUDS as there is groundwater flooding. She had made a note about this which CB said he would pick up from the evidence.</p> <p>RTS – we can add a note in support of this and a statement to support any flood improvement scheme.</p> <p>Policy Mapping – CB asked that we obtain from RBWM a G.I.S. Licence Agreement and once received CB will get the maps prepared. Question for RBWM.</p> <p>Appendix A - we do not need to prepare anything for this at the moment. It will include items such as the Design Guide, NDHAs, LGS, glossary, etc</p>	<p>CB</p> <p>CB</p> <p>CB</p> <p>AC</p>

Agenda Item		Action
	Invoice - CB will do some more work on the skeleton based on our discussions. No timing agreed. We invited him to submit an invoice but he was happy to submit it after this next stage of work.	
5.	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <p>AC to send CB documents mentioned above.</p> <p>Link Article</p> <p>Arrange a focus group to discuss downsizing for housing section of the Plan</p> <p>Ensure photos available for local green spaces, views, etc.</p> <p>Start compiling NDHA list after speaking with Windsor Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Start work on succinct summary of the History of Datchet and Profile. CB will add economics later.</p> <p>Obtain GIS Mapping agreement from RBWM.</p> <p>Questions to go to RBWM</p> <p>Let DPC know current position and that Reg. 14 consultation will happen early next year. DNP will be evidence-based and justified and will sit alongside local plan. If adopted it will also result in more 106 money for DPC.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>AC</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>DNPSG</p> <p>AC</p> <p>AC</p> <p>AC</p>
6.	<p><u>Dates of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>Heritage Assets Tuesday 3 November 2020 2.30pm- zoom meeting with Alison Logan to discuss NDHA</p> <p>Getting around Friday 6 November 4.30pm – zoom meeting DNPSG.</p> <p>Monthly DNPSG meeting 11 November – zoom meeting</p>	