

Datchet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Meeting Minutes

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Date & Time | Wednesday 12th February 2020 4.45 – 6.15 p.m. |
| Venue | The Bridge, The Green, Datchet |
| Attendees | Marjorie Clasper, Alison Crampin and David Buckley With guests Robert Paddison, RBWM |
| Secretary | Jane Simpson |

| Agenda Item | | Action |
|--------------------|---|---------------|
| 1. | <u>Apologies for absence and announcements</u> Apologies received from Fiona Cryle, Ewan Larcombe, Jo Stickland and Janet Kennish | |
| 2. | <u>Minutes of Previous Meetings on the 15.1.20, 22.1.20 & 4.2.20</u> Carried over to the next meeting for approval. | |
| 3. | <u>Welcome to Robert Paddison</u> Unfortunately EL could not attend the meeting so another venue had to be found after which Robert was welcomed to the meeting. | |
| 4. | <u>Welcome to David Buckley</u> David was also welcomed to the meeting and was thanked for joining the Group. | |
| 5. | <u>Design Guide Update</u> The consultation period is from 25 th February to 7 th April 2020 and drop-ins have been arranged for 11.3.20 in the Village Hall from 3-8pm where a RBWM planning officer should be attending; and another on 21.3.20 11-1pm in the library followed by 1.30-3.00pm in The Bridge. AC sent off Link article and had also added it to our website. | |
| 6. | <u>Questions to Robert Paddison and general discussion</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. From an NP standpoint is there a difference between what we can promote in respect of privately owned land and publicly owned land?<ol style="list-style-type: none">(a) Not really but suggest encouraging landowners. New developments could be asked to meet certain requirements which could be effective in some ways. | |

| Agenda Item | | Action |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>2. Is there somebody at the Borough who could help us identify the significant trees in Datchet that are important by way of their age and/or species and/or location - so not just those with TPOs?</p> <p>(a) Helen Leonard is the Tree Officer but her team is very busy and short staffed. T It was agreed that trees 'with community value' could be included in the DNP so some protection would be given.</p> <p>3. RBWM's strategy with regard to trees covers a period that ends this year (2020). What is to happen going forward? What will its new strategy be?</p> <p>(a) RP agreed to ask Helen Leonard about this and email FC with her response but in the meantime we should just assume that the strategy is the same going forward.</p> <p>4. What can you tell us about the Borough's Cycle Forum? Or, who should we be speaking to about it?</p> <p>(a) RP advised that the Cycle Forum doesn't exist any more and the officer who was driving it, Gordon Oliver, has now left RBWM. A Cycle Strategy is in place until 2026 but RP thought the monies available were just for the Maidenhead Scheme. JS said she would speak to Susy Shearer who was on the Forum and find out more as she thought there was £5m available for cycle paths.</p> <p>5. Maps and mapping. Who should we contact at RBWM for copies or to see about creating new ones?</p> <p>(a) RP confirmed that Simon Mars has left RBWM so there was no one available to help. We advised that we had the basic maps and it was thought the way forward was to look at Magic Maps and seek Katy's help at DPC (Parish Online maps).</p> <p>6. Whilst we understand we cannot deal directly with the RTS scheme in our NP, route 1 will start in Datchet and we would like to understand a bit more about it. Is Caroline Richardson the best person to approach?</p> <p>(a) DB thought that, as RBWM were not in a position to give the £54m towards the scheme, it would not be going ahead. RP advised DNPSG to look at the planning consents that had been granted with respect to this scheme. DB also advised that the Crown Estate had given permission for RTS but subject to certain conditions. RP explained that Caroline was RBWM's Emergency Planning Officer and not involved directly in the development of the RTS.</p> <p>7. RBWM has declared a climate emergency. What can we do about this issue in our NP? Who do we talk to about it?</p> <p>(a) RP advised us to look at the NPPF, RBWMs new Borough Design Policy and other Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>8. Does RBWM have an Eco-Advisor?</p> <p>(a) Rebecca Anderson is the borough's Ecologist who deals with planning applications but she only works part time and is very busy. Cllr Donna Stimson is very involved in this subject and RBWM hopes to have a clearer policy on this by June.</p> | <p>FC to look out for</p> <p>JS</p> |

| Agenda Item | | Action |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| | <p>9. Datchet has a couple of Local Wildlife Sites. What is the significance of this? How do we protect them (they are being downgraded) and who do we talk to?</p> <p>(a) RP thought Local Designation is protected by the NPPF to help preserve and enhance such areas. We advised RP of the two sites – Datchet Common Gravel Pits (unauthorised airport parking) and at Upton Park. RP said he would make enquires and advise FC of the outcome.</p> <p>(b) DNPSG did not know exact perimeter of these sites. RP suggested asking BBOWT but DNPSG advised that they did not know either.</p> <p>[Matters arising: Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre has this information and has been approached. Information is available and costs £75-£200. FC has asked if Katy Jones at DPC has this information.]</p> <p>10. What, if anything, is the difference between a private road and an unadopted road?</p> <p>(a) Very few differences – no need for concerns as very limited powers in NP to address this. RP advised that RBWM does take them on if built to a set standard and suggested we looked at Eton/Old Windsor’s NP.</p> <p>11. What is the difference between an open space and a green space?</p> <p>(a) Green space more general, e.g. scrub land etc.; open space more formal. RP suggested that we also look at RBWM’s Green and Blue Strategy</p> <p>12. The Highways agency is currently upgrading the M4, altering and moving the bridges in the parish. Who owns the land on each corner of the bridge work that is currently fenced off to facilitate this? What will happen to this land, and the area where the old bridges used to be, once the construction work is complete? Will the hedgerows be reinstated?</p> <p>(a) RP didn’t know and suggested we contact Highways England. There is a National Infrastructure Register which might help.</p> <p>[Matters arising: We have been told that residents at The Myrke have been offered the opportunity to buy the land to extend their rear gardens – unconfirmed.]</p> <p>13. Will the new bridges have footpaths and or cycle paths?</p> <p>(a) See 12 above.</p> <p>14. Slough BC currently maintains some of the land north of the M4 which is within Datchet's Parish boundaries. Why? Which areas? Will that have any bearing on DNP?</p> <p>(a) RP said he didn’t know but suggested that a contract had been drawn up for Slough BC to do this. RP advised us to find the ownership of the land via the Land Registry – Parish Online.</p> <p>15. In the revised draft BLP policy QP3 is said to be Strategic. What significance does that have for our NP?</p> <p>(a) RP explained that QP3 is not part of the development plan yet. If DNP submitted before its adopted then it doesn’t have to be</p> | <p>FC to look out for</p> |

| Agenda Item | | Action |
|-------------|---|--------|
| | <p>taken into account – but if adopted then yes in general terms. An NP has to be in ‘general conformity’.</p> <p>16. CEMEX. The most recent map we have seen, showing plans for the land after extraction has finished is dated August 2014. Is there a more recent one available? Who do we talk to at RBWM about the land’s future use?</p> <p>(a) RP advised NP cannot be involved with mineral extraction but we confirmed that we were only interested in the land once completed. RP advised therefore we talk with Cemex and gave us some planning application numbers relevant to the site – 94/471893; 06/00684-5; 07/02388. He said this might be a project, requiring stakeholder engagement. [Matters arising: these planning applications relate to the Cemex site at Welley Road. For more information about the site after excavation is completed, see http://www.cemexcommunities.co.uk/datchet.aspx]</p> <p>17. Can you or somebody please explain the key to the map BLPSV-PC-025 Policy Map 3 – Windsor, Old Windsor and Datchet?</p> <p>(a) RP looked at the map and confirmed that not all commercial sites were on there (Riding Court missing). An area coloured blue denoted ‘centre boundary’ and as so policies TR1 to TR5 applied to this area. [Matters arising: TR5 applies to local centres. See attachment.]</p> <p>18. Burial space. Datchet will need some additional space for this in the coming years. If we mention it in our NP would it be classed as a Community Asset or Infrastructure?</p> <p>(a) RP advised that it could be both and Community Assets are very important – need to check the NPPF. The allocation of a new cemetery in the DNP could be a ‘project’ but of course it would need permission.</p> <p>Other discussions:-Re: AL39 – RP advised that the 1974 Agricultural Land Map to determine boundaries of Grade 1 Agricultural Land was as good as it gets. MAFF only interested in over 10 hectares.</p> <p>With regard to allotments/community use land – make the most of it and look at other local plan policies.</p> <p>We advised that we were aiming for an end date of September 2020 for the draft DNP to be completed. Mapping needed to be addressed, for example, for green corridors, and Character Assessments carried out could be appended to the Plan.</p> <p>RP suggested that we didn’t get too bogged down in ‘cul-de-sacs’ and should focus on what can be achieved in the Plan. He advised us to look at Eton-EtonWick/Old Windsor/Windsor/Horton & Wraysbury’s neighbourhood plans, but to take care with Ascot’s, and seek guidance from the NPPF.</p> <p>DB confirmed that the DNP could be a work in progress with additional policies being added in the future.</p> | |

| Agenda Item | | Action |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|
| | RP suggested that traffic issues be dealt with as a project. | |
| 7. | <p><u>Green/Blue Update</u></p> <p>AC to circulate the G&B document and all to have last input into it by 17.2.20 so that FC can send it off to CB next week.</p> <p>(AC to send DB The Link article on the Datchet Design Guide.)</p> <p>It was agreed that a tree survey might be necessary to ensure all significant trees are listed.</p> | <p>AC [done] All</p> |
| 8. | <p><u>Montrose Avenue Character Assessment</u></p> <p>AC had received all feedback and will update the document</p> | AC |
| 9. | <p><u>Date for walk around Ditton Park and land north of M4</u></p> <p>To be agreed at next meeting.</p> | |
| 10. | <p><u>Mapping</u></p> <p>It was agreed to speak with Chris about this aspect.</p> | |
| 11. | <p><u>Future Training and Consultancy Arrangements</u></p> <p>None discussed.</p> | |
| 12. | <p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>It was established that we need to talk to the Crown Estate regarding (a) their land in Datchet; (b) their climate change proposals and (c) RTS land.</p> | |
| 13. | <p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>4.30pm on 4th March 2020 at the DPC Office (as drop in session on 11.3.20)</p> | |
| | <p>2020 second Wednesdays are: 8th April, 13th May; 10th June; 8th July; 12th August; 9th September; 14th October; 11th November, 9th December</p> | |

From BLP Submission version, Local Centre policies:

9.12 Local centres

9.12.1 Local centres perform a more limited role, acting as the focus for convenience and service uses that serve their immediate community. The Borough's local centres are all different in terms of their size and the precise role they play in the life of their community, but in general they include a range of small shops serving a localised catchment. Typically they may include a convenience store, newsagent, sub-post office, pharmacy, hot-food takeaway or launderette, as well as various local services.

9.12.2 The local centres identified in 'Policy TR5 Local Centres' exclude small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance. The Borough's strategy is to ensure that local centres continue to provide a broad range of services for their local community, mainly serving specialist local needs or the immediate day to day needs of their local area.

9.13 Policy TR5 Local Centres

Policy TR 5

Local Centres

1. Development proposals for retail use within local centres (as defined on the Policies Map) will be supported, particularly within the primary shopping areas as defined on the Policies Map. Non-retail uses and services will also be supported provided the overall function of the centre and opportunities for customer choice are maintained.
2. The scale of development that will be appropriate in local centres will be determined by reference to the scale and function of the centre in question. Development proposals should not be of such a scale that they would elevate the centre to a higher level in the retail hierarchy.
3. Development proposals for residential use on upper floors in local centres will be supported. Where there is a considerable proportion of vacant property in a centre, residential or other uses at ground floor level will also be considered by the Borough provided that they would not adversely affect the function of the centre within the retail hierarchy.
4. Special considerations will apply in situations of sustained high levels of vacancy, for example where more than 30% of the units in a centre have been vacant for more than a year. Where there is a sustained high level of vacancy, preference will be given to active town centre uses. Residential or other uses at ground floor level will also be considered by the Borough where they do not negatively impact the character, and provided that they would not adversely affect the function of the centre within the retail hierarchy.
5. Local centres defined on the Policies Map will be supported to provide a broad range of services for their local community, mainly serving specialist local needs or the immediate day to day needs of their local area.