

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 29 JUN 2022 AT 6.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

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

Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)

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

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society) Left the meeting at 19.15

Mike Copland (MC) (Cookham Footprint)

Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham) Left the meeting at 19.20

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies for meeting absences	Actions
	Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council) Cllr Martin Coker (“MC”) (Cookham Parish Council) Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham) Roger Davies (“RD”) (Representative Cookham Footprints) Cllr Jane Perry (“JP”) (Cookham Parish Council)	
2.	Introductions WJP advised the group that he is Chairman of the Cookham Society as well as a Parish Counsellor but has nothing to do with the Cookham Society input, in relation to the CNP. MH is involved in Cookham’s Footprint but nothing to do with this input. MC, Chair of Wild Cookham. Initiator of Cookham Footprint, on the committee but no formal involvement. On behalf of Wild Cookham Mike has not been involved in the inputs from them to the CNP. WJP asked MH and MC if they hold a formal position at Cookham Footprint, MH no, MC yes, but it is still a very informal organisation at this point. WJP as Chairman does not see this as an issue. Aim of the meeting to review and feedback on the Cookham Footprint responses to the draft CNP, submitted Jun 2022.	
4.	Review of Cookham Footprints input/comments on the draft CNP	

WJP wants to keep the momentum going with the CNP and move on. WJP wanted to reassure Cookham Footprint that the WP is giving value to the points raised by themselves. All attendees were happy to proceed. Everyone was in agreement.

General Points

MC advised he has spoken with the Wild Cookham team, to check what their reaction to the Cookham Footprint document, submitted in June and they have confirmed they fully endorse it.

MC advised he was here principally to address, not the full range of comments in the document, but there is 1 particular point which the Cookham Society put forward, which is removing certain options that could be open to put in to the CNP, which Cookham Society wouldn't want to have taken out, so they are not even on the table. This is essentially the principal concern from Cookham Footprint on the response from the Cookham Society's response. Lars would equally share this view that we should not as this stage take options off the table.

MC continued with the following comments on two points which are detailed in the 'Cookham Society's response to the response document:'

1. MC wanted to mention a factual point: when dates are mentioned, we are talking about emissions not electricity, hence the dates are earlier. This 2030 date is the strategy/target that RBWM has agreed.

CF generally felt that this target was simply pivotal. Other concerns must be secondary in the light of the climate emergency. WJP asked whether it was right that summary the Cookham Footprint and Wild Cookham position is that it does not matter about anything else, it should all be secondary to this target. MC answered yes, though he does accept some problems with that. But at the end of the day when we look at all the challenges facing us, the one overriding them is the one to do with preventing massive environmental damage, species loss and ultimately dramatic effects on us.

WJP pointed out that this attitude appears to imply that it is Cookham itself that must bear an equal or greater share of that burden than anyone else, in that besides reducing Cookham's own emissions to the target, the CF/WC suggestion is that Cookham should further reduce by a share of a national figure. MC replied, we should bear in mind that Cookham has about a 50% higher use of energy than the national average and something like 10-15% higher than the RBWM average. MC would personally say that Cookham has a moral responsibility to do this, and certainly when structuring these plans, we should take account of this.

2. Cost of energy issue. There is a lot of interest and lots of expertise in the local energy group Cookham Footprint. There is a greater acceptance of things.

DS followed on with Cookham Society's response to Cookham Footprint and Wild Cookham's views in terms of the CNP. Firstly, they are very supportive of renewable energy generation on new buildings, and they want is assessed as part of the planning process and to instigate it is viable. Also supportive of retro fitting systems, primarily solar panels on existing building, provided they do not upset conservation areas and other important buildings. They would love to see hydro plant joining weirs.

	<p>DS continued, when it comes to the other two issues, the ones they say they do not want to see in Cookham:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wind turbines, these are noisy, and we do not have many areas which are reasonably distant from population. Not many decent/suitable places to put a wind turbine as it is not that windy in Cookham. If we have them in Cookham we need to be specific in saying, we want them and the BLP states we have to give areas of where they could be in Cookham. If we formally say that we would approve wind turbines, we have to formally get it through a public referendum and to get that through, the people of Cookham would worry that they don't want to see them and the effect on house prices. 2. Solar panels they are great if you have lots of sun. They only operate in the day and not a great contributor to the local requirement of electricity which is why the government is moving away from them and are going for green turbines. Do not make a great contributor to national power requirement. <p>MH said he hovered between the two opinions and does agree there is an issue. He felt Cookham Society's position is sometimes too conservative in its approach, he also does not necessarily go towards the wind turbine. A solution could be things we can push towards developers to make things happen e.g., all new houses need to be built with solar panels, water conservation. Houses have to generate enough power to power itself. Insulate to the nth degree.</p> <p>SCS added that in general and roughly speaking everyone is agreed on what should happen for new builds, and they are not a huge proportion of Cookham housing. She thought MHs suggestion on having an incentive for planning permission is a good point for example, if you want planning permission on your house it must have cavity wall insulation etc.</p> <p>SCS continued, are we getting to embroiled in today's solutions e.g., we do not want wind turbines, because we think about what they are like today. All these technologies will move fast, and things may not be the same. Should we be heading in the direction of not tolerating 'ugliness.' We are not cutting out solution that we are not prepared to accept 'ugliness.' We do not want to get to stuck with today's options in terms of how we say things.</p> <p>ND felt that perceptions change also and in time people will feel more comfortable with it.</p> <p>MH commented we need to balance things. If you want energy to use energy you must generate it.</p> <p><u>Policy Points</u> Please see Troy collated feedback document for policy comments.</p>	
5.	<p>AOB No AOB.</p>	
6.	<p>Date/time of next meeting TBC.</p>	