

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY TUESDAY 29 NOV 2022 AT 6.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

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

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

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

Cllr Jacqui Edwards (“JE”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham)

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Paul Strzelecki (“PS”) (Cookhams Footprint)

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery) Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham) Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy) Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council) Cllr Laura Tull (“LT”) (Cookham Parish Council)	Actions
2.	Approval of meeting minutes 12 May 22, 29 Jun 22 & 09 Nov 22 all approved by the WP.	
3.	Review of latest draft from Troy, including latest draft appendix by Dr Courtenay-Smith WJP started the meeting by reading through the points/updates sent back by JH/Troy, noted below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We have updated the draft Plan to reflect the agreed changes from the last meeting and have sent this to RBWM for (a) comment and (b) screening for SEA / HRA purposes.• The Cookham Society comments that were sent through subsequent to the meeting are all generally helpful and constructive. As the covering email to that notes, many of these were raised at the previous meeting. Where not, they will be reviewed alongside comments from RBWM once received.• In terms of the paper from Cookham Footprints we have asked RBWM to advise on how the NDP might phrase a policy that supports community aspirations but which also satisfies the tests of the Basic Conditions.• Linked to the above, the copy of the planning decision sent through makes reference to the RBWM Environment and Climate Strategy 2020-2025. In response to questions about this we note that the Strategy was prepared by the Council in response to its declaration of a climate emergency. It includes an Action Plan and measures for how these might be achieved. The Strategy does	

	<p>not comprise planning policy. However, the measures identified within it suggest that future SPDs might be prepared and which would help deliver the identified actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In respect of points about Renewable Energy submitted by Cookham Footprints, this is an area for the Working Party to agree on how they wish to proceed. Previous drafts have previously shown a policy, then a project, and now a combination of both. • In respect of comments received about the flooding policy in the NDP, these are, again, generally helpful. The policy could as suggested be separated to focus more on sustainable drainage and surface water issues, with wider fluvial flooding addressed through national and local plan policies. However, and as above, further advice has been sought from RBWM in their role as lead local flood authority. <p>DS shared a document he had been given titled RBWM Interim Sustainability Position Statement. MH forwarded to the WP the link to this document which is on the RBWM.gov.uk website. It has apparently been adopted by RBWM in March 2021. It had been referred to as a reason for refusing at least one planning application in Cookham recently. The WP agreed that since this is the RBWM and hence BLP position on sustainability, it could, should, and anyway had no option but to, adopt it for the CNP.</p> <p>It is necessary, however, to consider how the Parish can benefit from the the carbon off set fund. As it stands, the carbon sustainability fund is an RBWM fund.</p> <p>Send the RBWM Interim Sustainability Positioning Statement document to JH to review, confirm its applicability and appropriateness and advise how we can adapt it in relation to the Carbon Fund.</p> <p>PS asked where the re draft is from JH that has been sent to RBWM? WJP to ask for a copy from JH.</p> <p>PS has submitted some suggestions to JH and DS on the SUDS issue. DS & PS are agreed in principle and will produce some wording and present to the WP for agreement, and to JH for technical approval.</p> <p>PS asked the question ‘What is the CNP WP policy about micro generation in the village, either commercial or community led? What is the principle we are trying to support?’</p> <p>DS commented that we do not want the rural green environment of Cookham messed up.</p> <p>PS considered it most important that the Parish declare itself in favour of community led renewable energy initiatives. He and Cookham’s Footprint consider such generation to be the over-riding need of the world, the country and Cookham, in reducing carbon footprint. Cookham must lead the way and set an example of such schemes; its own carbon footprint is 50% higher than the national average. Surveys show that given financial incentives such as lower pricing, and even without them, people welcome renewable energy, without regard to whether they are for profit or not-for-profit. Lower energy prices and a better carbon/pollution profile would enhance property prices and make people happier to live in Cookham.</p>	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>WJP/JH</p> <p>DS/PS/LH</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>MH believed that solar or any other form of electricity generation is ok in principle, with the specific exceptions of local solar parks and wind turbines. To approve these would be too wide and open to interpretation. He was most concerned to ensure that the community positively approved anything of this nature which was done, defining community to mean those affected by each individual project, as well as the community of Cookham as such for what is done in Cookham. Profit-driven majors would not meet these important criteria.</p> <p>DS added visually we do not want wind turbines at all. The problem with solar panel parks is that if you start opening this opportunity, someone will be in there to do them.</p> <p>JE felt this is a plan which looks forward. Situations/technologies are changing very rapidly, and everyone is becoming more aware of the effect of climate change. There are also fast-moving issues with energy prices. She therefore felt that something in the plan that stops people doing things is not helpful when setting the agenda for the next 10 years.</p> <p>LA considered that it is very the clear the VDS and Stanley Spencer’s look and feel are particularly important to the WP. These are the key guiding values that have permutated this document. So, when it comes to solar/wind farms etc, there is only a small chance that these would be in accordance with the CNP; they would be going against the VDS and Spencer views. Solar farms as we know them today would not be acceptable. In the future they might be called the same but would look quite different and be more acceptable. We should be open to new technology that is benefiting the community and the environment but should hold true to the vision of the CNP.</p> <p>WJP reminded the WP that this is a planning document. This limits what can be contained it in.</p> <p>JP pointed out wind turbines are not environmentally friendly e.g., kill wildlife, especially when blades are turning. She agreed with DS and MH.</p> <p>Project C(g) page 61 MH reconfirmed that ‘community’ here must mean the most affected people. They must be the ones who agree to and lead any such development going ahead.</p> <p>WJP summarised. There had been no objection in the debate to Policy C-LI 4 as amended in this draft. Accordingly, this Policy had been agreed. WP agreed. The debate was about renewable energy initiatives, which is a reference to Project C(g) not to Policy C-LI4. The debate had been about in particular for-profit and non-profit organisations, the need for community involvement and approval, and the difficulty in defining what is meant by ‘community’ in that Project.</p> <p>WJP asked if the WP would agree to remove the word ‘non-profit’ in the final line of the second paragraph? This would open the project to all types of organisations, and thus allow profit as well as non-profit initiatives, making the point about open-ness to such projects sought by Cookham’s Footprint/PS while keeping the rest of the criteria? The WP unanimously agreed this and that this result satisfied the debate.</p> <p>WJP added that the WP also need to go away and consider how we want to re phrase or define ‘community-led’ and ‘communities’. WJP invited all the members of the WP to</p>	<p>ALL</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

<p>think about working/criteria we can use. These will be suggested and considered by email. To be done in 10 days.</p> <p>DS asked for paragraph 2 of Policy L-CI4 removed as this has been dealt with elsewhere. Also change the title to 'Local renewable energy generation'. The WP agreed.</p> <p>DS had sent in the Cookham Society's comments (Appendix A). The WP agreed to the points in the document - with the exceptions of the following:</p> <p>Project C(b) p25 – Request to restrict the policy to JUST the grounds and take out the Holy Trinity Church. The WP did not agree that the Church was necessarily beyond enhancement in protection. So 'Holy Trinity Church' should stay in.</p> <p>Project C(c) p32 – The WP agreed this is not a project in itself. But it wanted to retain it and move it to be somewhere between paragraph 5.3 & 5.8. JH to action.</p> <p>Policy C-EN2 p41 paragraph 2 (plants/practical). Change wording to – 'including replacement on site with semi-mature or equivalent planting'. WP agreed. MH suggested adding in a Project which identifies a piece of land for all the homeless trees to be planted. This could also be used to increase biodiversity. The WP agreed.</p> <p>Policies C-DP5a, 5b, and 5c pp27/28/29 – There was a specific discussion regarding the allocation sites, and it was agreed that the requirements for these would not be repeated as a summary in the CNP because they were already in detail in the site masterplans. BLP allocations of sites AL 363. 37 & 38. PS asked for wording to be added to say that the CNP would uphold statutory body input. Subject to JH review, The WP agreed to add the wording.</p> <p>C-AM2 p65 Rewrite paragraph 1 of CAM2 in the way suggested by Cookham Society (Appendix A) but not by reference to the RBWM parking strategy 2004, but by reference to an appendix containing the actual figures currently contained within the <u>poor accessibility</u> RBWM parking strategy.</p> <p>Traffic management p66 – MH commented that he could not see any mention of air quality/air quality measurement under traffic management. PS was also concerned that air pollution should be measured by the Parish Council since it appears that RBWM are unlikely to do this. WJP pointed out that a planning document cannot commit the Parish Council to expenditure. After debate, the WP agreed it sought a policy to ensure that new development must not significantly worsen air pollution within the Parish of Cookham.</p> <p>LA's paper of 11 Nov 22. Green corridors. LA has provided suggestions to JH. The map he circulated is of the important green open spaces, as he was requested earlier. Proposal 7 – Important Wildlife Sites: define a project to make Battlemead and Strande Water area as a local wildlife site, the project proposal has gone missing. WP agreed. Remind JH.</p> <p>WP unanimously agreed they have now completed review of the draft Policies and Projects, which are agreed, as varied at its meetings on 9 November and today. Next steps are to implement the decision made then and tonight. Troy to do all changes that have been requested and send back an updated version, as soon as possible.</p>	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>The next meeting will be to discuss the underlying text so far as necessary.</p> <p>DS asked as a preliminary that in the text, what is currently written as 'The Poundfield' should be referred to as just 'Poundfield', which would accord with normal usage, and is important. The WP agreed.</p>	JH
4.	<p>AOB No AOB.</p>	
5.	<p>Date/time of next meeting Proposal agreed to keep available for the WP every other Wed pm starting 7 Dec. Meetings will be decided upon/called on those evenings in advance if required.</p>	ALL

FINAL UPDATE MADE

Appendix A

Cookham Neighbourhood Plan

Cookham Society-Comments on October 2022 Draft – Policies and Projects only

Page16 Policy C-DP1: High quality, context-led design

Strengthen regarding tall buildings:-

In 2a add “height” after “scale”

Strengthen 2b by replacing second sentence by “Except in exceptional circumstances new buildings should not exceed two storeys ”

Strengthen on parking:-

Add as 2i “Parking provision should be sited so as to minimise its impact on the development and its surroundings”

In 2b at end of final sentence remove “and gables”.

Rephrase 5 to “The requirement for high-quality design applies to all development regardless of tenure. Affordable housing should be designed to ensure it is integrated into the proposal as a whole and the materials used for it should be similar to the general market element.

Possible additional clause – Exterior lighting add 2i “Proposals involving exterior lighting will need to demonstrate what steps will be taken to minimise light pollution”.

Page18 Policy C-DP2: Rural settlement character

1a Delete final word “boundary”

1d Change “where possible” to “ where necessary”

1g Suggest we require permeable surfaces wherever possible.

3 In first line delete “of”

Need to define “settlement areas” are they Cookham Rise and Cookham Village?

4 Suggest add “or prior approval” after “planning permission”.

Page20 Policy C-DP3: Back gardens

Suggest add 1g “parking spaces should be carefully screened from adjacent properties”.

Page 24 **Policy C-DP4: Heritage**

This policy covers every sort of development from a housing estate to a porch. We consider that this Policy is drawn far too widely, especially in relation to para1 which is not restricted to Designated (and non-designated) Heritage Assets. As para 1 is written at the moment we question whether it would be possible to comply with it in a meaningful manner.

Para 2 - First sentence needs to be either singular or plural not both.

Para 4 – This seems particularly onerous for every development.

Page 25 **Project C(a): ‘Roman Lea’ Conservation Area**

Needs to be reworded in the light of the new Cookham Village Conservation Area statement.

Page 25 **Project C(b): Holy Trinity Church**

The listed building status of the church is unlikely to change as the buildings have not changed with the recent archaeology. Archaeological remains are normally Scheduled, but in this case, there are only archaeological traces rather than remains. They may not be adequate for Scheduling. We suggest the Policy should be redefined to focus on the archaeological site.

Page 27 **Policy C-DP5: Design Principles – Site Allocations**

In addition to a Borough Wide Design Guide and a Cookham Design Code, for each of these three sites we already have an individual BLP proforma, and a Site Master Planning Study. According to 4.20 the policies in C-DP5 are just the key principles which are expanded in the Site Masterplanning Studies. As these studies are in Appendix 1, do we really need to summarise them again here?

If these Policies are to remain there are some points that need to be attended to .

Page27 **AL36 Gasholder**

1h Should we be asking for a tree survey by RBWM now and TPOs on anything worthwhile.

Page 28 **AL37 Lower Mount Farm**

1a This is not what Bellway are proposing - direct clash.

1g This needs to be clarified. Removal of some of existing hedging may be required to get best sight lines. It should be made clear that what we want is a

wide band of screening. We want to see as little of this estate as possible. The use of the word “open” should be avoided.

1h Is there any Ancient Woodland here? Is it not 20century screen planting of pit?

Page 29 AL38 Strande Park

1b Site is not large enough for a “network of paths ” besides to the east is private land and to the north is the road.

1f pre-emptive strike- owner has already removed trees!

Page 30 Policy C-CDP6: Local Employment Opportunities

No comment. Item 3 is key.

Page 32 Project C(c): Pesticides and herbicides

This does not belong in a section on agricultural buildings and probably not anywhere else in a planning document. We suggest this project is removed.

Page 33 Policy C-CDP7: Agricultural Developments

In the introduction to para1 “permission” should be changed to “planning permission or prior approval” and we question whether “operations and activities” can be included.

1e is not strong enough. It does not deal with the splitting of holdings or prior history of taking farm buildings out of agricultural use. We suggest an alternative:-

“ A robust business case will be required for the approval of any new agricultural building in the Green Belt. Any permanent or temporary agricultural building or mobile shelter for the use of livestock or poultry must be sited sufficiently far from existing dwellings to ensure that noise, smell and pest nuisance are avoided. Permitted development rights will normally be removed from new agricultural buildings and conditions attached to permissions to ensure removal of the building if the permitted use is terminated. In all cases the history of the present and previous enterprises will be scrutinised and where fragmentation has occurred to sever land from otherwise suitable buildings or change of use of otherwise suitable buildings has occurred, the new building will not be permitted. Unless overriding operational reasons can be demonstrated any new agricultural buildings should be sited adjacent to existing ranges of buildings and in such a way as to reduce their adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt to a minimum.

Para 2 should be removed. We do not think this is a planning issue.

Page 34 Project C(d): Design Review

Just another hurdle for developers. Do we really want to involve another group of architectural luvies? We suggest this project is deleted .

Page 37 Policy C-DP8: Sustainable Design and Construction

Suggest delete Paras 1-3 and replace with new Para 1 "All new development should be constructed to standards no less and preferably higher than, those set in the RBWM SPD Sustainable Design and Construction 2009. Where developments classified as Major or Minor in the SPD are proposed the potential for on site renewable energy generation should be fully assessed and where viable included to serve the needs of the development.

Page 39 Policy C-EN1: Biodiversity

We suggest that this policy should just reference the 2021 Environment Act and limit the repetition any of the requirements of the act.

This policy could be counterproductive if developers completely clear a site before putting in an application.

Page41 Policy C-EN2: Green infrastructure

Conflict between para 1 and para 2. Suggest including at start of para 1 "As far as practical"

Para 2 Suggest replacing "mature species" with "semi-mature specimens"

Page42 Project C(e): The Causeway

Para1 Line 5 change "to" to "along"

Page 43 Policy C-EN3: Sustainable Drainage

The logic of para 1 appears wrong. SuDS are designed to slow the flow of water from the area in which precipitation takes place into an area where flooding might occur. SuDS provide no benefit in an area that has flooded. Suggest just delete para1. Also change title to **Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)**.

We would actually prefer to see para 2 transferred to the design guide.

Page 47 Policy C-CI1: Settlement identity

“Cookham is defined by its green spaces” (VDS) is fundamental to our view of Cookham and this should be emphasised at the very start of the NP. However, we have concerns that this policy could open routes to unwelcome development.

Firstly, all Green Belt should be protected equally. This Policy seems to imply that some Green Belt is more important than others. This is a concept that has previously been put forward by one of our landowners and can be used to nibble away at the edges of the “less valuable” Green Belt.

Secondly, there is a fundamental difference between the Village and the Rise on one hand (Settlements excluded from the Green Belt) and Cookham Dean that has no defined boundary and is “washed over” by the Green Belt. They must not be treated equally either in the text or on a map.

Thirdly, one of the major planning problems we have in Cookham Dean is protecting it from infilling justified under NPPF149e. Providing a map with a settlement boundary on it would be a gift to would-be developers.

This needs to be very carefully rethought.

Page 50 Policy C-CI2: The Spencer Landscape

We suggest this policy is changed to:-

1. Development must protect the cultural value of the Spencer Landscape as described in Appendix 5, including views to and from it, and avoid causing harm to it.
2. Proposals which remove features that detract from the Spencer Landscape will be encouraged.

Page 51 Policy C-CI3: Public access to open space and the countryside

Suggest delete 2c, 2d and 3 as these are not related to public access.

Suggest delete Para 1 and add new 2c “maintain and if possible, improve access to the open space.

Box 6 which goes with this policy needs to detail owners and extent of public access available.

Page 54 Policy C-CI4: Local green space designations

Suggest that policy starts with “ In addition to the Poundfield which was designated as a Local Green Space in the BLP”

Para 6.28 and 6.30 appear otiose to us.

Page 56 Policy C-LI1: Local centres

In our view the characteristics of Cookham High Street and Station Hill are so different that they should be dealt with separately. Please can we have two policies which recognise the individual characteristics of each area.

Page 57 Policy C-LI2: Community facilities

Para 3 intro add after in the Parish “for Parish residents”.

3a add at start “where appropriate”

3f delete as covered elsewhere and replace with “be available primarily for local residents”

Page 59 Policy C-LI3: New green spaces

No comment

Page 59 Project C(f): Improvements to green spaces

No comment

Page 61 Policy C-LI4: Renewables

Heading. Replace with “Local Renewable Energy Generation”.

To avoid any doubt in para 1 after “Policy NR5 of the Local Plan” add “as amended by this Policy”

1c after navigation add “fish”

Para 2- delete as now covered under C-DP8

Page 61 Project C(g): Community-led energy initiatives

No comment

Page 63 Policy C-AM1: Active travel

Add "Where provision is sought for new footpaths and cycleways, they should provide separation of cyclists from pedestrians.

Page 63 Project C(h): New walking and cycling routes

We support this proposition in principle but have concerns about its inclusion in the NP because details may be controversial. Suggest that we should not try to define which routes we wish to promote. Better dealt with by a separate group.

Page 65 Policy C-AM2: Parking standards and design

Suggest delete Para1 and replace with "In regard to the RBWM Parking Strategy 2004, all of Cookham Parish is defined as an area of poor accessibility. The level of parking provision set out in that document, or any successor shall be the minimum quantum of car parking spaces to be provided in new development".

Suggest delete first sentence of Para 2 and replace with Car parking spaces for new homes, conversions or extensions should normally be provided on-plot and should be of sufficient size to accommodate modern vehicles.

Delete Para3 as now inconsistent with Para 2.

Page 63 Policy C-AM3: Electric-vehicle charging points

No comment

Page 67 Project C(i): Road improvements

As for project C(h) suggest we do not try to define road improvements in this document

Page 68 Project C(j): Rail and Bus services

No comment

Cookham Society

25/11/2022

FINAL UPDATE MADE