

WINDSOR 2030

AGM - MINUTES

29 November 2016 – 7.00pm

Cinnamon Café , Windsor Royal Shopping Centre, Windsor

Present: Paul Roach, Cllr Jack Rankin, Jane Carter, Cllr Shelim, Sally Stevens , Dermot Whelan, Stephen LeBras, Ian Jones, Phil McMichael, George Bathurst, Chris Stevens, Rav Singh, Claire Milne, Graham Birth, Sandra Orlando, Richard Headman, John Bastow, Alan Davies, Donna Townsend

1. Welcome and Introduction

2. Apologies Ross Hargrove, David Jessy, Robert Paddison,

3. Minutes of last Forum 28 January 2016

4. Matters arising - none

5. Communications

- a. SS encouraged everyone to use and circulate the Windsor2030 website address and social media feeds. A new comms strategy has now been put in place to address some of the issues raised at previous steering group and the response times for the people using the contact email address.
- b. Q. JC raised concerns about not receiving a response to questions raised in September and November via the website.
- c. SS acknowledged there had been issues but it has been identified and plan put in place to respond to comms quickly and effectively in the future. All steering group members now receive information as it appears some correspondence is sent to spam folders.
- d. Members asked to try the website contact sheet again to make sure they were getting through.

6. Financial Report – to be circulated

- a. *Total of £7,578 expenditure to date, currently £12,412.89 still in account.*

7. Policy Update

- a. DW presented overview of plan to date and outlined the policy document handed out during presentation
- b. DW stressed the following points
 - i. It is a consultation document for the forum only at this particular stage and up for discussion and needed to receive comment back from members either during the meeting or privately. Once reviewed it will of course go to the wider public for formal consultation, but this version was the Forum's chance to give feedback to its Steering Group
 - ii. Focus of the plan was to ensure
 1. Local economic growth
 2. Quality experience, and
 3. Improved levels of service.
 - iii. Important that all policies were based on evidence and not just individual good ideas.
 - iv. Need feedback within the next 7 days for the copy to go back to the policy writers for a second draft.
 - v. Q SO Asked about the consultants and their background
 - vi. DW gave overview of the SBW and what they were commissioned to write the policies in compliance with prescribed guidelines and protocols – i.e. to take the work and make it a useable policy document. Further support will be commissioned to provide plans and illustrations for the document. No need for further reports at this stage as the plan does not make technical proposals (e.g. highways proposals requiring transport consultants).
 - vii. DW reminded members that the draft policy document was not a public document and requested that members treat it carefully and ensure that it was not released to a wider public until it goes through further scrutiny.
 - viii. Q. JB asked if the areas first highlighted in previous public consultations would be same. This ~~this~~ would help people shape their comments to the right zones identified.
 - ix. DW explained that the zones had not changed since that first meeting.
 - x. Q. JC asked if there were any allocations within the plan
 - xi. DW explained that currently there were not as the plan has chosen to not make detailed site specific allocations as it is felt that to do so would require technical expertise beyond the resources' and funding available –an example being housing allocations, which would require an assessment of housing need in order to provide a justifiable prescription on housing mix. RBWM don't have this yet available so it would make our plan open to challenge when it

comes to applications if it tried to take that approach. Instead it sets guidelines and parameters that can be referred to for most forms of development and in that way it remains flexible and robust. In response to a question about the coach park the same principle applies – the plan could not make allocations for the relocation of the coach park without having the technical evidence to back up the policy, and in this case that would be a significant transport and highways study. DW also explained that neighbourhood plans do not have to cover every policy category in the same way that a borough plan must.

xii.

xiii. PR to forward electronic copy to members for consideration

8. Any other business

- a. JC raised concern that no forum meetings had been held in 10 months.
- b. DW acknowledged that there were fewer meetings than expected but clarified that it was important that engagement with the forum had to be beneficial, based on worthwhile progress and did not waste volunteer's time. Holding such meetings for the sake of it may lead to interest falling away. Today's presentation was the first opportunity to present such progress and any sooner would have resulted in the need to go back to the forum with further changes that were still under discussion and review between the steering group and its consultant. DW also assured the forum that the progress made since the last Forum meeting did not require any decision-making that should be referred back to the Forum and was satisfied that the Steering group had conducted itself in the Forum's interest.

9. Date of next meeting TBC