

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	Monday 19 th October 2020 4.30 – 5.48 p.m.
Venue	Zoom meeting
Attendees	Alison Crampin, Fiona Cryle and Marjorie Clasper, David Buckley (until 4.50) and Jo Stickland (from 4.20)
Secretary	Jane Simpson

Agenda Item		Action
1.	<p><u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Meeting convened to discuss way forward</u></p> <p>The Steering Group convened the meeting to go through the draft Datchet Neighbourhood Plan which Chris Bowden (CB) had forwarded. It was agreed that AC would then collate our comments on CB's document to circulate to DNPSG and then send to CB. We would then arrange a zoom meeting with CB to go through these.</p> <p>We started with general comments. JS said that flooding and sustainable items needed to be included. FC asked whether we ought to share this draft with DPC now. It was agreed to do some more work first.</p> <p>DB asked whether the Datchet boundary on the map, figure 1.1, was correct as he and EL had discussed whether Slough Weir was in Datchet. AC said the map had come from RBWM. The section of the Jubilee River in Datchet includes the bank alongside The Myrke stream, between The Myrke and Pockocks Lane, and both banks between Black Potts and Pockocks Lane. Documentation of the Beating of the Bounds would confirm.</p>	
3. 3.1	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>FC enquired whether we had carried out enough consultations. It was felt that we had and that the project planner would indicate this. FC to draw up a consultation/engagement process list from the planner (Section 1.10 Consultation). It was queried whether DNP had been at two Ellis Journey events. Project planner should confirm.</p>	FC
4. 4.1	<p><u>Local Context</u></p> <p><u>History of Datchet</u></p> <p>Agreed with CB that this needs to be succinct and include more recent history that shapes Datchet today e.g. 20th-century developments; traffic congestion; flooding and layout of village, linear infrastructure.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
<p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p><u>Profile of the community today</u></p> <p>Happy with CB's diagrams we've seen in other NPs. Agreed we needed to summarise the socio-economic assessment. As to the key assets, we need guidance from CB on this topic.</p> <p><u>Main issues and challenges in Datchet</u></p> <p>Flooding – while included in the BLP, which we shouldn't duplicate, we must indicate this is a serious problem here.</p> <p>We agreed we needed to do more on the infrastructure and community assets.</p> <p>AC had watched a Woodland Trust webinar which advised that the new White Paper has taken out a section regarding trees. We need to 'beef up' our biodiversity part. It was noticed that CB had removed the paragraph on the River Thames Scheme but it was felt it needed to be mentioned.</p> <p>Agreed to complete once the issues that the Plan is going to address have been confirmed – likewise the vision and objective sections.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><u>Housing Needs of Specific Groups</u></p> <p>From research, affordable and downsizing (this does not just refer to retired people) properties are required in Datchet. There is not enough evidence to prove Datchet needs affordable/social housing. It was agreed that the BLP catered for this aspect but it would be good to ascertain how many people in Datchet were on housing benefit. FC to see if this can be accessed from Aecom or it's a question for RBWM. The AL39 development is supposed to have 40% for social/affordable (25% first homes). JSt. advised that Arc4 will be redoing their survey for the travellers plan as instructed by the inspector of the BLP.</p> <p>DAT1 needs to include details of specific features downsizers are looking for. The Estate Agents had some comments on this. AC suggested that we ask CB if we could also use evidence from recognised sources, such as DWELL (Design for Wellbeing in Environments in Later Life), such as spacious living areas, storage, lifts, good light, low maintenance, low running costs, some outdoor space, flexible space adaptable for changing circumstances. MC thought Age UK could provide some relevant evidence or we could just recommend their standards. There is also the BLP which could have information on downsizing.</p> <p>See www.housinglin.org.uk/ assets/DWELL_DesigningWithDownsizers.pdf</p>	<p>FC</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p><u>Design and Layout of Development</u></p> <p>Agreed with all points but would like to see dustbin and recycling storage added.</p> <p>We need to discuss Policy DAT2 with CB. Suggest boundary treatments should be complimentary with street scene, follow the pattern in the area.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p><u>Shopfront design</u></p> <p>Agreed. DDG has info. We would like to add materials to the list in DAT3. To ask CB if we need to provide anything here.</p> <p>Also, do we need to cover Commercial Area design? HA41 European Property Ventures site included commercial area. We have concerns about commercial areas adjacent to residential areas.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Heritage</u></p> <p>We needed a clear picture on how best to cover NDHAs. JS to contact Alison Logan who had produced Windsor’s list and see if she would be happy to talk with us. MC said she would prepare a list of questions to send Alison before a zoom meeting was arranged. AC said to bear in mind the more we add to this list the more work there will be. Once buildings/items are identified, the owners will need approaching. If we cover this in the next issue of The Link, AC suggested that we start with the more obvious, uncontentious ones like the library and the monuments, so people get the gist of what we’re looking for, and we could ask for nominations.</p>	JS MC
8. 8.1 8.2 8.3	<p><u>Green and Blue Environment</u></p> <p><u>Views</u></p> <p>Views of Thames and Church spire agreed. We need guidance on scoping. Also photos</p> <p><u>Waterside Activities History of Datchet</u></p> <p>Ensure wildlife is protected on Datchet Common and the Gravel Pits. FC enquired about the LWS north of M4. Whilst there are watercourses it was agreed they were not deep enough for water activities. We also wondered about the future of the Cemex site.</p> <p><u>Local Green Spaces</u></p> <p>To send CB what we have. Consideration was given to combining sites with the Recreation Ground but they have different uses. We thought there could be benefits to combining The Cut and The Greens. To work on detailed evidence for each space and send to CB. With regard to Part B of the Policy JSt. said that very special circumstances were the same as Green Belt, eg education, recreation, community assets. FC queried ‘built development’, whether it should just be ‘development’. Seek CB’s view.</p> <p><u>Wildlife-friendly features</u></p> <p>We discussed whether listing specific features would be seen as minimum requirements, and thought this was perhaps better to leave as general requirements.</p> <p><u>Verges</u></p>	

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>We need to include specific verges, possibly Montrose Avenue, Ditton Road, Link Road, Montagu Road. Horton Road for wildflowers? (Ask WAD)</p> <p>Policy DAT9 Green verges along roadways should be retained... insert 'and not degraded' ...</p> <p><u>Projects for biodiversity net gain offset</u></p> <p>Wild About Datchet had proposed a wildflower bed in the Sabatini Land haha. This could be an issue for DPC to have as a project.</p> <p>With the White Paper cutting out trees and RBWM's Tree Policy lapsing we need to raise our game on this issue.</p> <p>Furthermore climate change issues need addressing in the plan – see responses to Climate Change survey and CSE recommendations.</p> <p>We agreed to ask CB about protecting the green rural approaches.</p> <p>Green corridors – it would be good to identify these but extra evidence is required to identify any specific route.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Community Assets</u></p> <p>Need to ask CB about specifying types of play areas as we don't want duplication. The Rec has excellent play facilities. It also has outdoor gym equipment so this can be removed from the Policy DAT10.</p> <p>Also clarity required on who would maintain new play areas/allotments if on land not owned by RBWM or DPC. 8.2 says we don't have any sites where additional facilities could be provided but it was thought a sensory garden, for example, on part of the rec might be possible. We discussed including more on Community Assets in the next issue of The Link.</p> <p>Ask CB about a Policy to protect community infrastructure, e.g. Cemex site and the wetland proposal. AC said she would add a request for more information on their planning application to her list of questions for RBWM.</p>	AC AC
10.	<p><u>Getting Around</u></p> <p>We suggested splitting walking and cycling paths. Enquire with RBWM/CB about cycle paths and key movement routes using unadopted roads.</p> <p>Look at ways to improve connections with North Datchet.</p> <p>Policy DAT11 amendment to A – 'Such routes should also ensure that access by disabled users, sensory impaired users and users of mobility scooters is secured.' Prams were mentioned but it was agreed that the mobility scooters aspect would cater for them.</p> <p>Advise CB of the new air pollution results and ask how they can be used. JSt. asked why Datchet isn't pin-pointed on pollution maps. FC said she would ask Feliciano.</p> <p>In Policies to change a.,b., to (i) (ii). Section C.b. includes provision of trees, etc. Who would be responsible for maintaining these, DPC?</p>	FC

Agenda Item		Action
	<p>AL39 is supposed to be 'well served by public bus routes/demand-responsive transport or other innovative public transport solutions'. Advise CB of the issues here.</p> <p>9.2 Ask CB if we need to specify locations for bicycle parking and what evidence is needed. Is it sufficient to amend text to 'Provision of better bike parking close to key destinations (named) ...</p> <p>It was agreed to hold a separate meeting to fully discuss the Key Movement Routes.</p>	
11.	<p><u>Non-Policy Actions</u></p> <p>This list to be completed – Actions for DPC and other lead agencies.</p> <p>11. Policies map. To ask CB for requirements for 'mapping layers' then DNPSG to ask Katy Jones about requesting these from RBWM.</p>	
12	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>AC advised that we will have to start thinking about archiving everything for DPC sometime.</p>	