

# **Windsor Neighbourhood Plan**

## **Minutes of the Forum Meeting held on Tuesday 10 February 2015**

18.30 – 20.30 in the Conference Room, York House, Sheet Street

**Present:** Claire Milne (Co-Chair); John Bastow (Co-Chair); Susy Shearer (Secretary); Alison Logan; Andrew Melville; Anne Taylor; Carole Da Costa; Nick Clemo; Margery Thorogood; Laura Rheiter (RBWM); Ian Church (RBWM); Brian Rayner; Helen Price; John Holdstock (**from Item 4**); Karl Phipp; Peter Kingswood

**Apologies:** Jane Daly; Brian Carter; Pauline Carter; Jane Carter; Malcolm Lock; Ian Bacon; Sue Kemp; Ingrid Fernandes; Trevor Robinson; Helen Price; Cllr Wisdom Da Costa; Cllr Natasha Airey; Hilary Hopper

### **1- Welcome and apologies**

**Claire** welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming to the meeting. Apologies were noted as above.

### **2- Minutes of the Forum Meeting held on 7 January 2015**

The minutes had been circulated for approval and were discussed during the meeting. They were agreed under AOB, after the meeting was declared “quorate” at Item 4. P: J. Holdstock S: A. Melville  
**Agreed nem con**

### **3- Matters arising (CM)**

- **Claire** confirmed she **and John B.** were currently **arranging a joint timetable with Windsor 2030** and that the **Chairs from the two NP groups had met**, although there were no clear conclusions to report as yet. **Both groups were either considering or in the process of appointing consultants and Windsor 2030 have already indicated their Plan will be written by consultants.**
- She also confirmed that the **draft outline WNP plan document has been shared with Windsor 2030 as a possible “joint” introduction** for both Plans. **Claire** said the present structure is based largely on the Thame and Ascot models. **The progress of this aspect would involve further meetings.**
- **Claire** stated the **WNP & Windsor 2030 shared “Communications Statement”** was now showing on the WNP website with **an agreed approach which would include the following:**

- a- *the principle of not participating in “blogs” or on other websites / discussion sites;*
- b- *the main methods of communication;*
- c- *a “Q&A” facility on the WNP website to answer all reasonable (and not vexatious) queries. (NB Names will not appear along with questions, in line with Data Protection.)*

#### 4- Project Plan update (JB)

**John B.** confirmed that **the WNP will seek consultancy support**, which could possibly add another month to the overall process. He referred to **“optimistic dates” for the WNP timetable**, saying the **aim was to submit the Plan to RBWM in late July 2015 and go to Referendum in late November 2015**, but that **BLP timetable and local elections could be delaying factors**. However, he said **it was crucial for the WNP to press on with its work and he was hopeful that the Plan’s evolution would continue at a steady pace**.

#### 5- Vision Consultation & Engagement update (JB)

**John B.** took the meeting through the **WNP Survey Analysis Document** (January 2015) he had compiled to provide a summary and initial interpretation of the data collected. This stimulated the lengthy and detailed discussion:

- **Claire emphasized that all choices set out in the survey were deemed to be important and that the “Vision” consultation provided the opportunity to see them in “priority order”.** **John H.** asked whether there was a **map to show the distribution of responses**. Explaining that Royal Mail could not provide a “post code map” per se, **John B.** had created a **map by post code sector** to accompany the survey analysis. **Anne** asked about the **balance between hard copies versus on-line responses**. **John B.** and **Claire** both **agreed this was an important question and confirmed a split of 25% (h c) and 75% (o-l)**. **Claire** took this to be a good sign that **word was reaching the wider community**.

- **“Top 4” priorities identified by the Consultation**

- a- **Parking**

**NB** **John B.** reported that of the 449 “free comments”, parking had generated 52 in total.

- b- **A better mix of shops, including more “independents”**

NB **John B.** gave an example of a resident's view that, with the new COSTA in Dedworth Rd, "all we need now are a green grocer, butcher and baker to make this a better place to live!"

c- **Cycling routes and facilities**

d- **Traffic routing, to include possible new "one-way" streets**

NB Arthur Road and Clarence Road were proposed as potential "in / out" routes.

- **Wording and numbering of questions, and rating of answers**

a- Comments were noted in relation to wording (**CDaC, JB for HP**) and numbering (**AT**) of some questions. **Claire** explained that **Survey Monkey will "override" in certain situations**, eg. there wasn't an option to answer the "Overview" question at the start of the survey so this had to be re-configured to appear at the end instead.

b- **Margery** was concerned about the interpretation of answers to several questions. **John B.** gave as an example a question where answers were rated between 2.2 and 2.7, suggesting that 2.7 merited a "higher status" than 2.2. **Anne** wondered whether the range was perhaps "too narrow" to make some responses sufficiently meaningful. **John H.** said "**third parties**" examining the results would include the **Inspector** who would be able to interpret subtle distinctions between responses in an equitable and appropriate way.

c- **John B.** indicated that **all the results were available on the WNP website** for anyone wishing to reconsider the analysis or re-interpret the data. He **had provided an analysis of responses by postcode** during this phase of interpretation, and that **analysis by age and other criteria would follow**.

d- **Susy** said it was helpful to see the **principal purpose** as the "**acknowledgement**" that **all statements** within each question **were considered high priority**, with the **further purpose** of attributing higher / lower "**value**" to help provide the **important "steer" towards potential policies and projects**. This was **corroborated** by **Claire**, who said the **Consultation had both clearly answered the question, "Are we on the right lines with this [vision]?"** and given a **very good indication of thinking about policy options**.

e- **John B.** confirmed that the **summary is now on the website** although the **analysis of the "free text" comments has not yet been uploaded**. It had been extremely important and reassuring, he said, to note that **out of a total of 330 returns, only one had been a "negative" response**. He also indicated, however, there had been a large number of comments on **major strategic**

*issues which could not be covered through Plan policies, eg. Park & Ride (CM).*

f- *On behalf of the Forum, Claire thanked John B. for his excellent and invaluable efforts in producing the analysis document, inviting Forum members to suggest and contribute further refinements if they wished to do so. John H., Andrew and Nick agreed to have an informal “second look” and Claire confirmed she would be very happy to provide access to the raw data for anyone needing to consult this.*

- **Strategic issues**

a- *John B. confirmed he and Claire had recently met with Stuart at Windsor Racecourse to discuss the situation vis-à-vis Park & Ride. He expressed concern that several proposals for P&R areas are so small and with such limited scope for provision (eg. 200 at the Racecourse*

*325 at Legoland) it almost seemed counter-productive to consider them – much larger facilities would be needed to make such services effective and viable. The fact remains that although P&R is outside the scope of the WNP, for a number of reasons it will be important to keep in touch with this issue (CM).*

b- *John H. suggested there was also an important issue of public expectation particularly on strategic issues, and that the WNP might be looked to by residents for potential guidance in relation to matters such as the BLP. Margery said that people responding to the WNP survey were expressing what they genuinely thought and felt on matters of local interest. Claire agreed that many residents would say this is what neighbourhood planning is really about, a potentially much bigger role in relation to transport, community issues, environment and infrastructure. Laura encouraged the Forum to seek the advice of Consultants who would be able to provide effective support and guidance regarding such questions and concerns.*

- **“Post-Survey” contact with RBWM and others**

a- *Alison asked whether the WNP would be writing to RBWM with the survey results. Claire said the “integrated” nature of the process meant that sensitive consideration of all aspects would be required and that it would be courteous to give Forum members the opportunity to consider these before sharing them with others. Laura indicated that the best time for the WNP to formally contact the Borough would be during the upcoming BLP consultation.*

**b- John H.** spoke of the **potential value in effectively “wearing two hats”**: **working alongside and sharing information with other groups** such as the **residents’ associations**, and with **Windsor 2030** who might be able to deliver some things raised in the consultation. Benefits of and difficulties inherent in such a proposal were considered. **Alison** expressed concern about the **implications of this for the WNP’s current resources**. **Andrew** concluded the discussion by saying it **was a good idea in theory** which **would require further debate**, but felt that it was **probably not the priority** at this stage. **Claire** confirmed she would

- **send the survey to all Councillors**
- **be in informal contact with Cllr Bateson**, with whom **Laura** was now meeting twice monthly to discuss relevant matters
- **give further consideration to the idea of “two hats”**
- **support preparation of a formal response by WNP to the BLP Consultation**

**c- Nick** said **WNP’s primary role was to deliver a robust plan**, noting the **particular importance of the TGs in turning the results into actionable policies** and projects. **Brian R.** said it was **vital to maintain the support of those who had responded** to the survey. **Margery** noted that **residents were clearly unhappy with certain things in the local environment** that the Plan might address, asking **if more could be done with the data to enable its wider consideration and application**. Bearing this in mind, **Susy** said **a running list of projects and non-policy aspirations** would be maintained throughout development of the Plan **to ensure as many of these as possible were captured for implementation in appropriate ways**.

- **SWOTS and policy writing**

**a- Claire** confirmed the **SWOTS** had now been completed and once again thanked all contributors for their excellent contributions. She said a summary document would be circulated shortly for information and quick reference.

**b- Claire** said that a **“Policy Writing Day”** was now organised with **Planning Aid** for **Tuesday 10 March** (Gardeners’ Hall, St.Leonards Rd )and hopes it will be possible to do a **preliminary selection of policy options** following this experience. She and **John B.** also confirmed they were **currently interviewing three consultants who had the right range of neighbourhood planning experience and expertise** and were awaiting submission of their proposals which would cover a good range of diverse issues.

6- **Finance update** (JB)

**John B.** circulated the **draft summary of expenditure to date**. Responding to a **query from Margery**, he explained that **some categories were simply “projections” at this stage** as there was insufficient information to enable them to be forecast. He and **Claire** also indicated the **WNP would apply for a DCLG grant of £7K**, explaining that **all Consultants would require budget confirmation in advance** for the engagement of their services. **The level of available funding would colour expectations and set the scope** of what they would be able to undertake and potentially achieve. **Rules for the operation of the WNP bank account** had also been agreed.

7- **CWNP for Business (Windsor 2030) update** (CM/JB)

No members of the Business Group had been able to attend this evening’s meeting, however **Claire and John B. hoped an update on progress would be provided in due course**. They said there had not been much to report recently, but could confirm that the **Business Group were experiencing many of the same issues as the WNP, including attracting volunteers**.

8- **AOB**

- **“Big Society Day” on Saturday 14 March in Peascod Street**

**Committee** to discuss having a shared stand with Windsor 2030, volunteers will be needed!

- **702 and bus services in general**

**John B.** highlighted the two issues: operating schedules (WNP can’t affect) and service provision (can). **Laura** will send to **John B.** the name of the RBWM Officer who deals with buses.

- **Sawyers Close**

**Claire, John B., Laura, Radian representatives and others** have met for a discussion. **No plans are even on the “drawing board” and any ideas are “aspirational only”**. Spatial planning for West Windsor in general is a priority and will be considered further.

- **Racecourse and other local businesses**

**Claire and John B.** have spoken with representatives and are hoping to speak with all businesses and landowners to explore issues and plans.

- **Forum membership**

*Anne raised the importance of continuing to publicize this and of encouraging more people to attend Forum meetings.*

*Claire thanked everyone for their valuable contributions to the meeting.*

9- **Date, time and venue of next meeting**

***Tuesday 24 March 2015 in the Conference Room, York House, Sheet Street 6.30pm-8.30pm***