

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 21 DEC 2022 AT 6.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

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

Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council) Arrived 6.40pm

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

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

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham)

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society) Left meeting at 7.02pm

Mr P Strzelecki (“PS”) (Cookham Footprint)

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

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham) Cllr Laura Tull (“LT”) (Cookham Parish Council) Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy)	Actions
2.	Approval of meeting minutes DS asked if he was correct in remembering that 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? WP agreed, NM to amend the meeting minutes of 29 Nov 22. Otherwise, 29 Nov 22 meeting minutes all approved by the WP nem.con.	NM
3.	Review latest draft from Troy incorporating revisions following meetings of 9 and 29 November completing review of Policies and Projects, involving (a) answering resultant questions; (b) review of text other than actual Policies and Projects. PS raised a question on what policy is and what are projects. WJP set the scene by advising the Neighbourhood Plan like the LBP will lay down policies which will be referred to by the LPA when they make planning decisions. The text underlying the policies sets the scene and gives the context for those policies and will be refer to by the LPA when interpreting what the policies mean. The projects are things which the WP raised as things which were desirable for the CPC to do which were not strictly planning matters. WJP floated the idea that it might be better to separate out the Projects section (created after the initial consultation) into either a discrete part of the document or into a different document, albeit presented in either case as allied to the plan. The WP will take Troy’s advice on this. If he considers this feasible, the WP will decide it at its next meeting proposed for 04 Jan 22.	JH

	<p>There was largely but not unanimously general support from the WP for separating the projects into a separate document. Projects would need approval by the Parish Council should they wish to approve them.</p> <p>DS - Project C(g) You ask how we should define “community-led and communities. DS personal suggestion is that we should not try. Instead, we should include the following “Any project would be required to benefit all residents of Cookham and be supported by the Parish Council and a simple majority of those voting in a special referendum of all Parish residents on the electoral register.” Democratic decision and everyone in the Parish would benefit from a go -ahead. As we do not know in what form a proposal might come forward, we just want to establish a principle.</p> <p>WJP asked the WP if they were happy to adopt DSs wording above. PS challenged the proposed “Referendum” clause, both WJP and DS stated that this clause was for projects and not technically part of the NP. PS then said if it’s not part of the plan then what are we doing discussing and voting on it in this meeting. PS said he was not happy with the fact that all projects would have to each go to a referendum. PS would like removal of ‘and a simple majority of those voting in a special referendum of all Parish residents on the electoral register.’ Removal of this phrase voted on by the WP. Two for and four against. WP does not agree PSs amendment. Include DSs wording as “Any project would be required to benefit all residents of Cookham and be supported by the Parish Council and a simple majority of those voting in a special referendum of all Parish residents on the electoral register.”</p>	<p>JH</p>
	<p>Cookham Society’s Feedback December 2022 Revised Draft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A number of the key policies (C-DP5,C-DP8, C-CI1) are awaiting input from RBWM. Do we have any idea when this will be received, and we will get revised draft policies?</i> WJP to check with JH. • <i>The whole document is still very long. Can we please have some tighter wording.</i> WJP to go back to Troy re length of document as nothing has changed. Could the underlying text be shorter in respect of the policies. LA felt that if we make the plan shorter it will mean the document will have to have things taken out and would then need a new rewrite and review. LA felt we need to be reasonable with this. WJP agreed. Context is needed to support the policies and there is a risk with removing supporting text. If text is removed it would need to be done very carefully, so as not to change the meaning. MH commented it needs to be easy to interpret/clear and concise as possible. • <i>Policy C-DP7. CS is asking for removal of PD rights on any new agricultural buildings not from existing ones. I believe this can be done and has previously been done as a condition.</i> Policy CDP7 – WJP suggested the wording “any such application must have as conditions, removal of PD rights” . WP agreed. JH to advise if this can be done. • <i>Para 3.7 last sentence needs to be altered to ensure our NP policies are applied as part of the judgement on PD “prior approval” applications.</i> 	<p>JH</p> <p>WJP</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>

<p>Agreed by the WP. JH to action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 4.15 Box 4 please add Roman Lea Add Roman Lee agreed by WP. JH to action. • Para 5.12 What competence and authority does the Parish Council have to advise this? Although I might, as an individual, agree with the sentiment I still do not think this should be in the NP. WP happy to leave this in the CNP. MH felt that the word <i>advises</i> should be changed to <i>encourages</i>. JH to change. WP agreed. • Para 5.15 No point in just carrying out a flood risk assessment. It must demonstrate something. WJP disagreed with this. He felt there is a need to carry out a flood risk assessment. WP agreed. • Appendix 8. We are looking for a minimum standard of provision of parking rather than a maximum. Levels of parking for residential development look fine. Not clear how the other requirements now work with the recent simplification of User Classes and the ability to change use without planning permission. Suggest JH to advise. Brief to JH from the WP is that it needs to be no lower than it is at the moment. WP agreed. JH to action. 	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>
<p>Wild Cookham Feedback December 2022 Revised Draft</p> <p>LA stated that the last draft only addresses green corridors with a map. LA feels it important to tell people what the green corridors are and has taken guidance from the Ascot and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan, where they have an eight-page section on green corridors. There is also a definition in this plan. LA has created a table to identify the green corridors which is advisory. He would also like a project for a small passage underneath the railway line. WP agreed with LAs proposal. JH to advise.</p>	<p>JH</p>
<p>Review of underlying text</p> <p>WJP suggested going back to JH and advise we do not want to alter the meaning of the underlying text, as we like the policies. However, if he feels able to shorten without altering the meaning it would be better. One way to shorten the text could be to separate out the policies and projects, which will be discussed at the next meeting. LA asked “If we did do a separate the document, would the 2nd document with the projects, be shown to the public?” WJP presumed it would be, but we need guidance from JH regarding this discussion and his advice will be taken. Could we also say that as a result of this process we have produced two things, not one and they need to be read together, albeit you would only be approving one one at referendum.</p> <p>MH commented as this is a document which will evolve over years, keeping the policies separate from the projects would help to add projects more easily without bringing the rest of the policies into discussion again. WJP agreed and said they are mutually dependent and supporting.</p> <p>WJP advised JH has advised that we can make minor tweaks to the CNP as time goes by. There is not a necessarily a need for a referendum for minor changes.</p>	<p>JH</p>

	<p>PS asked for additional words in relation to surface water to be added to relevant section p41 'and in particular with respect to safe access and egress.' WP agreed with PSs wording. JH to action.</p> <p>DS/PS/JH have had discussions on the specification on new buildings. Policy CDP8 - Change from <i>will be supported</i>, to <i>will be required unless under exceptional circumstance</i>. JH to amend and advise if possible.</p> <p>Can we adopt the interim sustainability plan? Waiting on response from JH.</p> <p>PS had already written to Troy and the WP before this to request an answer from Troy on: "Is the draft you have prepared on Renewable(Local Energy) less restrictive , neutral, or more restrictive than the existing NPPF and BLP in place at present?"</p> <p>LA, in response to DSs comment clarified the arrows were broad lines and not intrusions into peoples' gardens.</p> <p>MH commented that when we get feedback from RBWM on the draft CNP, we can then rigorously go through the policies with JH and check what has evolved over the last 2 years, reflects and is still what we wanted it to achieve.</p>	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>WJP asked SCS how she is progressing on her Appendix 5, Stanley Spencer work. SCS advised it will be ready by end of December as promised. She stated that the photo quality in the document is not the best, but the content is correct. All photos have been taken by SCS except for 2 or 3. SCS would like the document to be checked, to get it to the right standard for the plan. SCS would like people to review the document in detail. SCS recommended DS or Tom Denniford. WJP recommended Cordelia Ashwanden. WJP asked the WP to make any further recommendations for reviewers. WJP asked for the WP to read the document within the next week and then come up with some suggestions. WJP/SCS will then decide for the names put forward who to ask to review. WJP expressed his enormous gratitude for her dedication and knowledge for this document.</p> <p>WJP brought up the perennial of when are we going to distribute the draft CNP document to the landowners. PS asked if the RBWM have been sent the Oct draft or the Dec draft? WJP advised it was the post 09 Nov draft that has been sent. MH stated that the landowners or anyone else, have the opportunity to come to any of the CNPWP meetings to input/feedback as these are open/public meetings. Such input is equally valued and heard by the WP which must be both fair and seen to be fair by all parties in the village.</p> <p>Next steps suggested to which the WP agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make sure the website is up to date with documentation. Parish Clerk to assist NM. 2. WP to invite everyone who were originally invited to provide input/feedback and invite them to comment/attend a meeting, on the latest version of the draft CNP, pointing out this is a 'work in progress' document. This will be prior to a consultation period. 	<p>ALL</p> <p>NM</p> <p>WJP</p>

	WJP to send an email to everyone with the formal consultation process.	
5.	Date/time of next meeting Consider 4 Jan 23 just to discuss the policies/projects separate documentation. 18 Jan as a backup date.	

FINAL UPDATES MADE