

Windsor Neighbourhood Plan

DRAFT Minutes of the WNP Group Meeting held on Thursday 17 July 2014

18.30 -20.45 in the Falder Hall, Windsor Methodist Church, Alma Rd

Present: Claire Mine (Interim Chair); John Bastow (Interim Co-Chair); Susy Shearer (Interim Secretary); Jane Carter; Ian Bacon; Brian Carter; Pauline Carter; Hillary Hopper; Vivienne Allen; Trevor Robinson; Nick Clemo; Andrew Melville; Helen Price; Malcolm Lock (to Item 5); Wisdom DaCosta (to Item 5); Margery Thorogood; Brian Rayner; John Holdstock; Anne Taylor; Sue Kemp (to Item 7); David Eglise; Alison Logan (to Item 10); Laura Rheiter (RBWM)

Apologies: Ingrid Fernandes; Jane Daly; Cori Mackin; Cllr George Bathurst; Peter Wilkinson; Marcia Malia; Antony Wood

1- Minutes of the Meetings held on 8 May 2014 and 12 June 2014

Minutes of both meetings had been circulated to all Group members and **Claire** asked they be approved:

- Minutes of the Meeting on 8 May: Proposer J. Holdstock, Seconder J. Carter, Agreed nem con
- Minutes of the Meeting on 12 June: Proposer, Seconder J. Carter, Agreed nem con

2- Matters Arising

- **Claire** had made enquiries with RBWM regarding the funding (~£2K) retained for a possible West Windsor NP and was awaiting a response as to whether it could be added to funding for the WNP.
- Further to the request at the previous meeting, **Claire** gave an update on the CWBNP roles and office bearers:

Chairman:	Dermot Whelan	(Westbeach Group)
Deputy Chair:	Jutta Staude	(Sir Christopher Wren Hotel)
Treasurer:	Ian Jones	(Cinnamon Café)
Secretary:	Paul Roach	(Windsor & Eton Town Partnership)

A query was raised regarding possible conflict of interest for Council employees undertaking any officers' roles. **Claire** agreed to confirm the policy and report back at the next Forum meeting.

- **John B.** had circulated a copy of those amendments and additional points which had been agreed for the Constitution. He confirmed, however, that the revised Constitution would not be published on the WNP website until there was full approval by the WNP Forum.
- **John H.** asked whether housing had now been excluded from CWBNP area and raised the question of residential areas such as Arthur Road and Duke Street. **John B.** indicated the boundary on the website was correct to the best of his knowledge and that those houses will be within curtilage of the WNP area. **Claire** noted that Sheet St is currently shown in the CWBNP area and planned to discuss with RBWM/CWBNP the possibility of including Park and Sheet Streets within the WNP.
- **Helen** praised the **Policy Writing Training Day** organised by Planning Aid and held at Legoland. Twelve Forum members had attended and agreed that the format of the presentation, relevant information and practical activities were excellent. **Claire** wished to thank **Stella Scrivener** and **Legoland** for their crucial support for this activity and said more sessions were being planned.

3- Chairs' update and discussion: Forum & Area Application (CM / JB)

- **Claire** confirmed the WNP Area Application had been submitted on 5 May 2014. The statutory consultation period began on 26 June and would conclude on 7 August 2014. The consultation link was on the front page of the RBWM website. **Claire** encouraged everyone to submit a response.

- Replying to the question of whether a comment which simply noted support for the joint Plan approach would be considered a sufficient response, **John B.** confirmed it would certainly be valuable to register such a view. Having looked at all the documents included in the consultation, **Helen** noted CWBNP had not provided any direct confirmation they were committed to working with WNP, and **John H.** referred to the precedent of the Central Milton Keynes NP. **Claire** and **John B.** agreed with the validity of this point and would raise it with CWBNP, and **Laura** suggested drafting a “Memorandum of Understanding” to help address this. **Hillary** stressed the importance of remaining on good terms with CWBNP to foster the best possible outcome for the town overall.
- **Laura** stated that individual comments would have the greatest impact but groups should also feel encouraged to make submissions, and RBWM would look at all positive comments. **Claire** and **John B.** indicated they would be preparing a submission as WNP Co-Chairs. **Susy** asked whether an extension of the Consultation period would be granted were it felt an insufficient number of comments had been received, and **Nick** asked whether respondents would be able to see all prior comments. **Anne** asked if there was any way to simply submit a single Plan, or whether RBWM might choose to progress only one of the Plans. **Claire** indicated that RBWM had preferred the matter of area(s) and Plan(s) to be resolved by the two groups. **It is still currently envisaged that both Plans will be considered, ultimately, as a single Plan covering the whole of Windsor.**
- **Jane C.** suggested it would be helpful if respondents commented on the Constitutions, the process of forming one Plan from two, and the possibility that all areas of the town be able to vote on the Plan for the centre of the town as it is used by all Windsor residents. **Claire** confirmed that Milton Keynes had deferred their Referendum in order to specifically clarify this process. **Jane C.** asked whether, if RBWM suggested a boundary change, the Plans would go out for further consultation. **Claire** confirmed these matters would be discussed with Phil McMichael (Chairman, WCofC) and CWBNP Officers, and **John B.** said that as much updated information as possible would be circulated to WNP members as and when it became available.
- It was noted that Windsor was slightly unusual in relation to many other areas whose Plans were already underway in that many of these were much smaller than Windsor. **Sue** advised that towns such as Stratford, Warwick and Leamington were starting to put businesses on a separate footing in order to consider their areas’ needs more effectively. There was general acknowledgement by the meeting that Windsor’s communities and needs were diverse and the task of addressing all of these in a single Plan could prove to be complex. **Claire** and **John B.** reiterated that having two NPs was neither an easy nor an ideal solution but was possibly the best way to ensure the process could move forward constructively.

4- West Windsor WNP Launch Event 7 July (WD)

- **Wisdom** confirmed 3,000 copies of latest WWRA newsletter containing an invitation to the WW Launch Event had been distributed, and the event had also been publicised on the WWRA website. He wished to thank **Rev. Louise Brown** (Dedworth All Saints’ Church), **Brian Whitely** (Planning Aid) and the **WNP volunteers** for their excellent support and for ensuring the event was well organised. **Wisdom** confirmed that 40 members of the local community had attended and 50 paper copies of the WNP Survey had been given out, with “drop boxes” set up in two locations. **John B.** confirmed that 9 online and 7 paper responses had been received to date from WW and **Claire** asked if all hard copies could be collected by the end of July. **+ACTION: Wisdom to ensure all survey paper copies from WW area are returned to Claire.**
- **Helen** said very good contact had been made with **Simon Warren** (Store Mgr, Tesco Dedworth Rd) and was hopeful there would be some good local press coverage of the event. **Claire** asked about WW business links. **Wisdom** said shops in the area had been very supportive, displaying posters and speaking with customers about the event.

- **Ian** expressed concern that sufficient **survey responses** may not yet have been received. **Claire** confirmed that a “**representative sample**” would be appropriate to show the “**whole picture**”, for which a total of 150 responses were needed in order to provide this, and that we were approaching that threshold. **Claire** reiterated that the point of the exercise was to understand respondents’ priorities, leading to the “**Vision**” and **potential policies**, so that we would be able to say with confidence, “**From these responses, this is what we think you want for your Neighbourhood Plan – is this what you really do want?**” The survey is a “**best endeavour**” **enabling device** to help WNP form its ideas prior to the very big consultations at the next stages of preparation.
- **John B.** indicated Windsor’s current population stands at ~30,000 with an electorate of ~22,000. Clewer N & S contain 9,800 of this total. **Claire** confirmed that the WW survey responses will feed into the existing summary and that it was becoming clear that WW main issues and observations were similar, or identical, to those already raised in the rest of Windsor. **Claire** also advised the benefit of giving a “cut-off” date at this stage was to enable Topic Groups to confirm respective policy priorities by the September target date, although evidence would continue to be gathered even after that point. **+ACTION: Claire to confirm definitive number of households in WNP area.**

5- **Topic Group updates, “Vision” and objectives** (TG Chairs)

- **Transport** (Chair: IB)

- **Ian** confirmed the Policy Writing training helped orientate the TG’s work and also thanked **Helen** and **John B.** for their extremely useful documents. Acknowledging concerns in relation to M3/M4 were of a strategic nature and outside the TG’s direct remit, he said TG was now concentrating on “aspirations”, eg. mitigating effects of residential /business traffic; cycling improvements (**Susy/Peter W.**); impact of HGVs (**Helen**); and implications of broadband (**Ian**).
- **John B.** said policies should relate to **key issues** and **Claire** reiterated that WNP can comment on major infrastructure but has no jurisdiction over its provision. **John H.** suggested studying the BLP to identify this so appropriate comments could be made. **Margery** supported this idea in relation to possible development sites, and **Susy** said it would be crucial to gather as much evidence as possible to support all WNP land use proposals.
- **Claire** said some ideas would lend themselves to “Projects” rather than policies (listed separately in the Plan) but at this point it was essential to focus on what can actually be achieved, adding that P&R was clearly important. **John H.** noted concern over the potential loss of the garden centres and also raised the Jubilee Bridge proposal.

- **Housing** (Chair: AM)

- **Andrew** felt the TG was now “finding its way”. Next meeting (29/7) would consider heritage issues. He thanked **Alison** for her excellent document setting out overarching NPPF, Borough and “nearest” NP policies for background and comparisons.
- **Jane C.** was undertaking some design studies and **Alison** was in contact with the M’hd group for Ward information and solid assessments of local areas. **Claire** asked for the TG’s visions and objectives by September. She suggested TG focus on its highest priorities and the **changes** it would like to achieve.

- **Business** (Chair: CM)

- **Claire** confirmed the group was starting to pull together its themes into a document which would cover aspirations and needs of local businesses and residents outside the CWBNP area.

- **Open Space (Chair: SS)**
- **Susy** said the TG had looked at strategic policies (NPPF, BLP) and was continuing to study other NPs' approaches to open space issues. She mentioned the TG's concerns regarding the roles of open space in the Home Park and the importance of preserving the Thames Path (National Trail) access, and **Jane C.** reiterated that Home Park served principally recreational and charitable purposes rather than business ones. **John H.** added that as Crown Land, it was outside the WNP's remit, and that Bachelors' Acre, also outside our remit, was protected by an Act of Parliament.
- **Claire** asked the TG to identify open space matters it felt should be discussed with CWBNP and to stress those things it thought would support open space provision and protection. She confirmed the Home Park was a Grade II Registered Park and felt it should be adequately protected under wider strategic policies.
- **Nick** asked for a WW representative to join the TG to ensure information and ideas relevant to the geographic area now included are adequately understood and covered in the WNP. **Susy** said WW open space required particular support as significant development will take place there which could have considerable impact on the general environment. **Claire** added this was similarly relevant to businesses in WW.

Laura encouraged all TGs to forward any questions to RBWM Officers for further advice.

6- Communications update (CM)

- **Claire** advised she had prepared a summary of all consultation activities to date and that the Inspector will require a "communications statement". She said a "survey report" will also be added to this evidence. **Helen** asked for confirmation that all press coverage has been noted.
- **John B.** stated it would be necessary for us to provide clear evidence we had contacted wide numbers of individuals in order for the Inspector to be able to conclude that "**all reasonable, intelligent efforts**" have been made to communicate with those living, working or owning a business in the WNP area.

7- Vision & Objectives (JB)

- **John B.** reminded members that "Vision Statements" needed to be short and punchy and the overall WNP Statement should be restricted to seven or eight points. Good grammar (**Anne**) and clear language were crucially important, and "Sympathetic" and "What we want / want to do differently" (**George Bathurst**) should form key parts of vision and policy wording. **Claire** mentioned the example of "simple statements" used in the Thame Plan. **Trevor** suggested there were many priorities in the current "Vision" (**Newsletter**). **Claire** agreed it should have clearer, more sharply focused sense of the priorities to provide the right "starting point".
- **Nick** asked whether there would be a single vision shared by both groups. **John B.** and **Claire** both agreed this was a laudable objective and would be invaluable in the process of working towards a cohesive "single" Plan.
- **Claire** said it was very important to finalise these by the next group meeting and to consult on the "Outline Plan" in September, when the main body of the Plan would be drafted and prepared for formal review in December. She thanked **Laura** for the hard copy of the Ascot Plan (approved final document) which was an invaluable resource and reference.

8- **Project Plan and “Next Steps” (CM)**

NB: Claire asked the Topic Groups to provide a list of their policies and projects at the next meeting (27 August) so these can be incorporated into the **Draft Consultation Document**. It is expected this will be **ready for printing by 16 September** and distributed at the end of September.

+ACTION: All Topic Groups to meet over the coming weeks to agree their preferred policy options, and TG Chairs to present these in written form.

9- **AOB**

- **Helen** suggested members keep records of their representation on various committees and forums. She said it would be very important to keep abreast of respective meeting agendas and minutes in order to make the most effective use of opportunities to be aware of / raise awareness of WNP-relevant issues and information. **Anne** said she regularly attends Windsor Town Forum meetings and hoped key issues relevant to NPs could be placed on its agenda on a routine basis. **Helen** said she'd found it very effective to raise issues through the WTF. **Susy** acknowledged the value of comments and advice both from RBWM Officers and other planning/heritage professionals. **John H.** mentioned the RBWM Community and Democracy list, and **Laura** said that the Big Society Panel provided especially useful resources for the neighbourhood planning process.
- **John B.** said copies of the latest newsletter had now been printed and would be placed in libraries, shops, GP surgeries, church halls and other public venues. It would also be available on the WNP website. **Ian** suggested also putting copies in York House and the Leisure Centre.
- **Claire** said more responses were still needed from young people and the “under-44s”.
- **John B.** had agreed with **George Bathurst** that he **would give a 45-minute presentation on the WLR at the beginning of the next meeting** on an “interest and information only” basis. To date, 18 WNP members had confirmed they would be attending. **John B.** said the CWBNP group would also be invited. Questions would be taken a fortnight in advance in writing, by e-mail or by phone. **This would be followed by a very short Group (Forum) meeting focusing on the WNP Vision and Objectives.**
- **Laura** indicated that the Report to Cabinet on the applications for the two Plans would be presented at its Meeting on 25 September. It was anticipated that designation of both areas would be approved then and that each group would be officially and legally recognised as a Forum. **Claire** said this timing would have an impact on the future community engagement schedule, with the September consultation shifting to October as a result.
- **Claire** mentioned that the Local Enterprise Partnership was involved in promoting the Langley to Heathrow “Link”.
- **Jane C.** stressed the importance of meeting with CWBNP but also of WNP's priority to focus on its own Plan. **Laura** said the Plan boundaries might need to be altered. **John B.** suggested there were plans which should protect Alexandra Gardens.

10- **Date and Time of next meeting**

Wednesday 27 August 2014, 6.30pm-8.30pm **Venue TBC**

Proposed schedule of WNP Meetings through December 2014 (Venues TBA)

- ***Tuesday 16 September***
- ***Thursday 9 October***
- ***Thursday 6 November***
- ***Thursday 4 December***