

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 10 JAN 24 AT 6.30PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

- Cllr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)
- Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)
- Cllr Anna-Louise Regan (“ALR”) (Cookham Parish Council) **left meeting 19.30.**
- Cllr Jamie Moore (“JM”) (Cookham Parish Council) **left meeting 20.00.**
- Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Representative Stanley Spencer Gallery)
- Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)
- Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham)
- Richard Campin (“RC”) (Cookham Footprint)
- Jon Herbert (“JH”) Troy
- Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies	Who
1.	Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham)	
2.	Approval of minutes of meeting 29 Nov 2023 Accuracy of meeting minutes approved by CNPWP.	
3.	<p>Consideration of any input from received from RBWM to the latest draft of the Plan, in order to decide the correct final wording of the draft Plan</p> <p>JH advised he has a call with RBWM on Friday to pick up on comments and agree the digital mapping. JH will feedback following this meeting to the CNPWP.</p> <p>WJP expressed it would be highly desirable on order to maximise turnout that the CNP goes to referendum with a general election. Assuming this may be in Oct 24, time is tight, but our objective is still to meet this timeline.</p> <p>JH advised turnouts for CNP referendums are generally pretty good between 25 – 30%.</p> <p>MH and WJP said that the 70% likely turnout on a General Election day would be an even better endorsement.</p> <p>MH impressed that timelines are tight to make the October timeline, so now we need to now tie things up and promise on the smaller parts of the detail, as we must move forward.</p>	
4.	<p>Consideration of the language of/in latest revision of the draft Plan, with Appendices, issued by Troy Planning + Design in comparison with decisions taken by the Working Party, in order to decide the correct final wording of the draft Plan.</p> <p>JH advised the draft does not exactly reflect the wording that the working party meeting minutes reflect. Formatting of the draft has been acknowledged by JH.</p>	

<p><u>Review of items raised by DS from Cookham Society:</u></p> <p>P7 Policy Box, line 3. After permission insert “or prior approval”. Line 5 after development insert “without prior approval.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>JH needs clarification from RBWM on how they review prior approval applications, on his call with RBWM on Friday’s meeting. Depending on the feedback JH will amend accordingly.</i> ▪ <i>WJP stated that they do not want is for such things to go through because they are using the prior approval process which would not have gone through had we not included this phrase. CNPWP in agreement.</i> <p>P18 C-DP3 Gardens Policy Box. Because it deals with specific issues we have, we definitely still want para 2 as requested before:-</p> <p>2. Outside the defined settlement areas all proposals for new homes will be strongly resisted. In particular, the subdivision of existing housing plots and the separation of ancillary buildings to form independent homes will be prevented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>JH to produce some better wording and refer back to the CNPWP. Otherwise, the CNPWP would like to use the above wording.</i> ▪ <i>DS would like a clause in to say, ‘unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.’</i> ▪ <i>JH can add the wording in but would like it on record that he feels unconvinced this will not get through the formal consultation from RBWM and/or with the examiner. CNPWP in principle agreed to take the risk and would like the above wording to be included. JH to action.</i> <p>P24 C-DP6 Agricultural Development. Draft now shows similar wording in both text and policy. Was the intention to delete Para 2 from policy? -Totally disagree with the proposal to remove para2 from policy and replace with 5.8 and 5.9 in text. As requested before, text should include the widest definition possible for “whole farm.” Also as requested before we want sub-para 1(f) included in Policy. New para. 1(f) Any approval for new agricultural building will have a condition attached that requires removal of the building and re-instatement of the ground if the building is no longer required for agriculture. We strongly believe that we need a new section to follow Agricultural Buildings with wording as previously provided:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Need to define “whole farm.” DS to provide a definition to JH.</i> ▪ <i>JH to circulate wording as discussed in the meeting for this point.</i> ▪ <i>DS to send JH some documentation for review.</i> <p>Equestrian, Outdoor Sport and Outdoor Recreation Development in the Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The requirements of policy QP5 will be applied to all developments of these facilities. ▪ Proposals for any non-private development will be required to provide a satisfactory business plan to establish viability. 	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH/DS</p>
--	----------------------------------

<p>3 Any approval for new equestrian, sport, or recreation building will have a condition attached that requires removal of the building and re-instatement of the ground if the building is no longer required for the original purpose. Suggest in para 2 change non-private to commercial.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>CNPWP had a discussion with JH about this, with which broadly all concurred. JH advised against including it in the draft. He was nevertheless asked to suggest some wording and circulate to the WP for approval. [In email exchanges after the meeting, WJP drafted and circulated some wording, which despite JH's caveat was agreed by the CNPWP.]</i> <p>P35 Policy C-EN2b Green Corridors. As previously requested, “and curtilage” must be included after dwelling otherwise the garden could be considered as part of the green corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>JH wording agreed by CNPWP.</i> <p>P45 C-CI Local Green Space Designations. Remove Bell Rope Meadow and include The Paddock, Holy Trinity Church</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>CNPWP agreed to remove Bell Rope Meadow even though a letter has been sent to RBWM, but it is in Cookham Village Conservation Area.</i> ▪ <i>CNPWP agreed to include The Paddock, Holy Trinity Church. JH advised a LGS letter should be sent to the Church Commissioners.</i> ▪ <i>No official feedback from Westwood Green on this subject has been received to date.</i> <p>P53 Policy C-LI4 Local Renewable Energy Generation. The March 2023 draft was incorrect and has not been corrected here. I repeat our earlier comments:- This seems to have been changed from what the WP agreed. On the advice of the officer, the ban on commercial solar and wind power has been removed. (It is noted that Troy have not accepted all other officer comments!) We want the ban clearly re-instated even if it requires additional justification based on the very special value of the Green Belt countryside around Cookham for leisure, beauty, the Spencer connection, and anything else anyone can think of. I also thought that we agreed wording for renewables to be maximised for all new developments and for public consultation and approval being required for any community led schemes. (Project 08 is too weak) Please can we go back to what was agreed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The meeting minutes of Mar 23 which have been agreed by the WP addressed this point and MH/WJP did not want to reopen the discussion. At this moment in time no changes to be made. MH would like DS to send in a challenge on this point should he feel it has been recorded incorrectly and he feels there is a serious error.</i> <p>DS raised one more point on renewal projects and stated the meeting minutes from Dec 22 agreed wording to be included around defining a community. Project 8. Includes the wording ‘community as a whole.’ CNPWP were happy to leave this as is.</p>	<p>JH</p>
---	-----------

5.	<p>Approval of draft Cookham Neighbourhood Plan (as so amended if amended) for submission to Parish Council for approval and submission for Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>On a vote being taken, there were 5 votes in favour and one abstention, so the motion was carried nem. con.</p>	
6.	<p>AOB</p> <p>CNPWP agreed to remove Odney Club from Information Box 7 in the CNP, because it is privately owned not a 'public' asset.</p> <p>Over more than three years the CNPWP has worked together so well to achieve this. Whether or not the CNPWP has to meet again, WJP and MH wanted to record theirs and the Parish Council's gratitude to everyone, and to the organisations they represented, for their effort and engagement with the process in the interests of the people and Parish of Cookham, especially Jon and Nina with whom it has been a pleasure to work.</p>	

FINAL APPROVED