

## MINUTES

### MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 29 MAY 24 AT 7.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

**PRESENT:**

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

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

Cllr Laura Tull (“LT”) (Cookham Parish Council)

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

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Mike Copland (“MC”) (Wild Cookham) stand in for Lars Ahlgren

Jon Herbert (“JH”) Troy

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

		<b>Who</b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Apologies</b>                      Richard Campin (“RC”) (Cookham Footprint)                      Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham)                      Cllr Jamie Moore (“JM”) (Cookham Parish Council)                      Cllr Anna-Louise Regan (“ALR”) (Cookham Parish Council)                      Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham)                      Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Representative Stanley Spencer Gallery)</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Ratification of email approval of minutes of meeting of 10 January 2024 and subsequent email decision;</b>                      Inclusion of The Paddock at Holy Trinity Church to be designated as a Local Green Space, CNPWP agreed.                      Meeting minutes agreed by CNPWP.</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Consideration of responses to Regulation 14 consultation (documentation to follow).</b>                      JH gave some headlines in response to the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 responses to survey, lower than the previous surveys/consultations.</li> <li>• Limited response received from statutory consultees.</li> <li>• Key response from RBWM was received.</li> <li>• Looking at the charts, by far the majority of people were basically strongly in support of all aspects of the plan. BA slight exception was the Equestrian Development policy. Here while 60% (still a good majority anyway) strongly supported, 30% were not bothered either way. Even this, though, means that only a small number of people actually said they disagreed.</li> <li>• 100% of the responses to the surveys were from Residents.</li> <li>• Historic England wrote to say they were pleased to see the focus for heritage assets within the plan.</li> <li>• DS asked if we the surveys can be shared with the CNPWP. JH advised this is possible and can send. JH to action.</li> <li>• Church Commissioners provided a fuller response, but not specifically in relation to the Paddock at Holy Trinity Church to be designated as LGS, which was the</li> </ul>	<b>JH</b>

	<p>letter sent to them originally. Their response related primarily to Parcel C11 of the Green Belt between Cookham and Maidenhead, aka the Cemetery Field. The CNPWP have noted the response from the Church Commissioners. Having considered it carefully, the CNPWP considers that this is a very important piece of Green Belt. Therefore it did not wish to change the draft plan to facilitate development on this parcel of land. If anything the contrary is true: it considers, and believes that most Cookham residents consider, that this is a very special and much valued piece of green belt, due to its views, the views of it from paths and roads, its importance in the Spencer landscape and its vital role separating Maidenhead and Cookham as well as providing green infrastructure. It would thus potentially qualify as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Accordingly, while at this point of development of the CNP it does not want to progress this being designated as LGS, the CNPWP may want to consider a further iteration of the plan at an early stage so to designate it.</p> <p>JH advised some changes have been made to wording etc. and JH has circulated these comments and re sent an updated version of the CNP with tracked changes.</p> <p>There have been a few areas where changes have not been made and we need to agree a response to, with the CNPWP. Areas from both documents provided by Troy that needed review and input from the CNPWP are in the Appendix below.</p> <p>Additional Items discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equestrian development: the WP needs to clearly explain why it is important to put this in place. Explain what national guide says and what is happening in practice in Cookham. JH will take this away and review, to come up with a first part for this. DS to also update his original submission and then they can be woven together.</li> <li>• Agricultural development – DS has started to put together this paper. DS will continue to pull this together. JH will also do a first part for this paper as well, to put together with DS's.</li> <li>• WJP has submitted a paper to the Council to get approval to delegate power to the CNPWP to make final decisions on the remaining relatively minor matters/amendments.</li> <li>• JH touched upon the proposed designated LGSs. He advised he has had confirmation from the Local Parish for the Alfred Major to be designated. However no other formal confirmation from the other proposed sites. CNPWP have agreed nevertheless to progress with the proposed designated LGSs, no objections having been received.</li> </ul>	<p>JH &amp; DS</p> <p>JH &amp; DS</p>
4.	<p><b>Decision on changes to draft Plan in response to same.</b> JH email points reviewed. See email.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Consideration of and decision on robustness of CNP and evidence for it.</b> Waiting on papers for Equestrian and Agricultural Development. Subject thereto, JH was satisfied on this point. Accordingly, so was the WP.</p>	DS/JH
6.	<p><b>Approval of draft Cookham Neighbourhood Plan (as so amended if amended) for submission to Parish Council for approval and RBWM for Regulation 16 consultation, Examination and referendum</b></p>	

	Motion from the Chair: That the CNPWP approve the draft Cookham Neighbourhood Plan as amended by it this evening following regulation 14 consultation, subject to the further work required as agreed at this meeting, and agree to submit it to the RBWM for regulation 16 consultation and examination. CNPWP approved nem. con. (DS abstaining).	
7.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>WJP extended his thanks to Jon Herbert and all members.</p> <p>Agreed that JH will respond to the Church Commissioners re the draft Plan. More generally it was expected that CPC will also express its members views generally on the proposal.</p>	<b>JH</b>

FINAL APPROVED

## Appendix

### Troys Document: Responses to Comments 28 May 2024 CNPWP

<p>Section 7 Information Box 7</p> <p>Churches: Cookham Rise Methodist Church Council request that the Methodist Church be included under that name and the Wesley Hall as a separate hall on the premises.</p> <p>We note that the rooms at the Parish Centre and the Jubilee Vestry at Cookham Dean church, the parish room at the library and the three community allotments are also important local community facilities.</p> <p>The children's nursery provision at Park House, the Montessori school at the Scout hut and the Herries School are valued - should they be included?</p> <p>Dentists - Cookham Dental Practice and St Anne's House Dental Practice</p>	<p>List of facilities to be reviewed <b>**WORKING PARTY TO ADVISE**</b></p> <p>CNPWP agreed with all the points in the Section 7 Information Box 7.</p> <p>Also add in Cookham Pharmacy.</p>
<p>The EV section C-AM3 only deals with 'where electric vehicle charging is proposed', rather than there being a policy to develop a comprehensive plan to support and organise this properly in Cookham.</p>	<p>Reference to be added to important locations, including the station car park and local centre car parks in Cookham Rise and Cookham Village <b>**WORKING PARTY TO ADVISE IF LOCATIONS SHOULD BE SUGGESTED**</b> (this was previously discussed but no locations agreed)</p> <p>28 May - Discussed and no locations agreed upon by CNPWP.</p>

### Troys Document: Draft Cookham Neighbourhood Plan – RBWM Regulation 14 Representation Responses to RBWM 29 May 2024 CNPWP

<p><b>Policy C-DP1</b> Part 2 b)</p>	<p>As worded, the Council considers the Policy is too prescriptive (e.g. 'Except in exceptional circumstances, buildings should not exceed two-storeys in height...'). The Council would recommend holding to the more general point regarding prevailing heights and would recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan recommendations use the guidelines provided in the Council's Building Height and Tall Buildings SPD.</p>	<p>Second sentence of Part (b) to be rephrased to reflect the SPD, stating: 'Proposal for tall buildings, which are defined as those in excess of two-storeys, will generally be considered inappropriate and should reflect the prevailing context and principles established in the RBWM Building Height and Tall Buildings SPD'</p>
--	--	--

	Also, not clear what would constitute 'exceptional circumstances', recommend that this is removed.	28 May – CNPWP agreed with wording above.
<b>Policy C-EN2b</b> Part 1	'Except where relating to a house and it's curtilage, development must, wherever possible, maintain and enhance wildlife corridors...'. It is not entirely clear what this means? Not sure of the intention here, or the wording. Suggest this clause is removed or re-written for clarity.	<b>To be redrafted to say: 'As far as possible, development must maintain and enhance wildlife spaces and connectivity of green corridors.'</b>  28 May – Change to: Except where relating to existing houses and within their existing curtilages, as far as possible, development must maintain and enhance wildlife spaces and connectivity of green corridors. CNPWP agreed.
<b>Policy C-EN2b</b> Figure 3	It is not clear how the importance of each of the green corridors has been assessed and justified. Suggest this is more clearly justified/evidenced.	Table 1 and the text in Para 5.10 explains that the corridors follow woodland, hedgerows and watercourses to link major habitats. No further change required. <b>**IF POSSIBLE, WILD COOKHAM TO PROVIDE FURTHER JUSTIFICATION FOR IDENTIFICATION OF GREEN CORRIDORS**</b> 29 May – Mike to discuss with Lars to provide something additional, to be approved by the WP. Action. MC.