

## MINUTES

### MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY THURSDAY 20 Jan 2022 AT 7.00PM at COMMUNITY ROOM, COOKHAM LIBRARY

#### PRESENT:

Cllr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)

Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Cllr Jane Perry (“JP”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)

Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham)

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	<b>Apologies for meeting absences</b>	<b>Actions</b>
	Cllr Martin Corker (“MC”) (Cookham Parish Council) Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council) Arrived at 5.50pm Cllr Ian Wernham (“IW”) (Cookham Parish Council) Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society) Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy)	
	<b>2. Approval of meeting minutes from 04 Nov 21</b>  The meeting minutes from the NPWP meeting on 04 Nov 2021 had been circulated and were approved by the working party.	
	<b>3. Review and approval of minutes of Large Landowners sub-group meeting 18 November 2021</b>  The meeting minutes from the Large Landowners subgroup meeting on 18 Nov 2021 had been circulated and were approved by the working party.	
	<b>4. Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda</b>  Cllr Ian Wernham has stood down from the NPWP due to moving from the area. Cllr Jane Perry has taken his place on the NPWP. JP was welcomed and officially introduced at the meeting.  LA requested an update on the follow up/next steps in relation to the Large Landowners meeting of 18 Nov 2021. WJP updated that overall, the landowners were delighted to have been invited to participate. Next steps agreed with them was the WP would revert	<b>WJP</b>

	<p>with their feedback on the information they have supplied to date. LA advised this should be an agenda item for the next meeting.</p> <p>WJP also advised he was still waiting for James Copas to provide him with a contact at Belway Homes.</p> <p>WJP has sought clarification of when the CIL money is allocated, bearing in mind the timescale of plan approval against planning applications compared with actual development. He understands that this matches actual development, though he retains doubts.</p>	<b>WJP</b>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Review of first draft Cookham Neighbourhood Plan and decision on next steps</b></p> <p>The main points which arose in the meeting on review of the first draft of the Cookham Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LA liked the draft; it was visually attractive and generally a good piece of work. However, he also liked the Ascot plan's structure which he felt was more easily readable and used for planning. Each objective should have its own section, rather than combining two sections. Thus on page 29, as an example, these two objectives are different: there is a connection, in parts, but they are not necessarily coterminous. Page 15 demonstrates the same point: structure should be differentiated from living.</li> <li>2. LA was keen to emphasise identity and design. While he fully endorses the Stanley Spencer heritage, he also felt that other sources should be used. For example, Brian Clews has written a book called "Birds and a Village" (the village being Cookham) which has interesting old photographs which can be contrasted with the same modern views. He feels it concentrates more on village life, including the shop windows, street furniture and so on, which is just as relevant as pretty views to what we are doing. Lars would like to see more visual examples of how Cookham was, how Cookham has changed and what we are trying to preserve and encourage.</li> <li>3. LA felt strongly that clarity is important so that policies will bite properly. He felt that they should be broken down into numbered paragraphs, like those in the BLP, so that there is logical through-flow.</li> <li>4. SCS strongly applauded the full incorporation of the Village Design Statement.</li> <li>5. SCS also applauded the use of more definite terms like "must" than the phrases such as "referred to" which one often finds in such plans. (The meeting endorsed that.) It was important that where phrases like "referred to" still appear, for example in Appendices 1 &amp; 2, they should be replaced with more definite terms such as "adhered to".</li> <li>6. SCS repeated her offer that the CNP could use (subject to appropriate attribution) as an attachment the complete schedule of Spencer's works which she is preparing for a new book she is writing on Spencer. She hopes to have this ready by April or May. This will be more comprehensive than the schedule to the VDS. We should consider using more than the "standard" Spencer views.</li> <li>7. For page 21 et seq. she will check references with the Stanley Spencer Gallery.</li> <li>8. SCS is concerned that discussion of the traffic in the Pound seems to have got lost in the process. She considers it most important. CD also raised the subject of the hazard of the Pound in respect of page 55. WJP explained once again that the traffic study suggested was intended to be our solution to this problem without falling into the trap which snared the previous attempt at a Cookham plan. Nevertheless SCS and CD felt that some reference should be made to the</li> </ol>	<b>SCS</b>

	<p>undoubted pedestrian and cyclist hazard posed by the Pound and the need to attempt to resolve it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. JP raised flood issues relating especially to paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18. She is not aware that the Station has ever flooded. It is Marsh Meadow, then the Moor, Strande Water and the Lightlands Lane area and open fields between Strande Water and the Thames which flood, with some wash over into cellars in School Lane, for example. The A4094 at and around the culvert on Widbrook Common is the last road into Cookham to flood, with the exception of the Causeway. The section on flooding needs to be more accurate.</li> <li>10. Thus there is flooding in Cannondown Road particularly under the bridge, but this is largely run-off from Whyteladies Lane rather than ground flooding making its way up from Lightlands Lane.</li> <li>11. JP agreed with LA in most of what he said. She also felt that there was repetition and hence superfluous wordage in the plan. (WJP understands it is likely that the Cookham Society may feel that the plan and its associated documents are too long.) She also agreed with SCS.</li> <li>12. CD felt that on the content page a sort of bullet point "index" showing what comes in each section would be helpful.</li> <li>13. CD also felt that Policy C-DPxx should include protection of community facilities in Cookham Dean as well as the other two Cookhams.</li> <li>14. CD agreed with JP about repetition, including relating to Stanley Spencer, which was not necessary.</li> <li>15. CD wanted more visual clues and in particular pictures. There is, for example, a 1937 picture of Cookham from the Moor which looks exactly the same as today. Repeating LAs' point she felt this is helpful in referencing the timeless qualities of Cookham which we seek to preserve and enhance.</li> <li>16. ND agreed with CD on more visual clues.</li> <li>17. ND also wanted reference to the creation of more spaces for families, including play areas, and improving existing such spaces. He accepted that this might be a project rather than a policy but the meeting agreed with him that this was worthwhile.</li> <li>18. CD and JP both expressed concern that there was little reference to accessibility. (JP has also expressed this concern in Council relating to swings for less able children in play areas, which links back to ND's point in para 17 above.) Reference needs to be made to accessibility to shops, clubs and pubs, as well as to "walking" routes accessible to wheelchairs, scooters and so on.</li> <li>19. The meeting wanted the diagram on page 20 expanded and given words to explain it.</li> <li>20. The meeting was concerned about the absence of a section on local green spaces and the green corridors sought by WildCookham. The green arrows on the "separation" map are no substitute for a discussion of green corridors: the purposes of the two are different.</li> <li>21. The meeting identified a gap in the VDS relating to building in gardens, as to both planning and design. This also involves the question of plot splitting. It felt that this should be dealt with in the plan. In principle the meeting is against this and would want it restrained.</li> <li>22. The meeting wants to consult a lady called Emily Tomalin about energy conservation and design of both buildings and developments, and renewable energy. WJP will do that and revert.</li> <li>23. Finally, although this is a pure drafting point in effect, we wish to be sure there is proper attribution of all the photographs used.</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>WJP</b></p>
--	---	--

	<p>The fact that various points were made on how to improve the draft does not detract from the broad welcome which the Working Party gave it. As a first draft, they were pleased with it.</p> <p>The Cookham Society were not represented at the meeting. We are aware that it is proposing quite a substantial commentary. Dick Scarff and Tom Denniford (a chartered surveyor expert in planning) will prepare this. WJP has asked for its production as soon as possible.</p>	<b>WJP</b>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Review of second draft Design Codes and masterplan report</b></p> <p>WJP shall be writing to Ben Castell and Giuseppe Verdone at AECOM to tell them how pleased the Working Party was with the design documentation. Subject to any views from the Cookham Society, and the few issues (including energy issues), the Working Party was happy with these documents.</p>	<b>WJP</b>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>No AOB raised.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Date/time of next meeting</b></p> <p>Wed 03 Mar 22. Community Room, Cookham Library.</p>	

Final Approved