

## MINUTES

### MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 22 MAR 2023 AT 6.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

**PRESENT:**

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

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

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham)

Richard Campin (“RC”) (Cookham Footprint)

Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy) Left meeting 8.02pm

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

|           |   |  |
|-----------|---|--|
| <b>1.</b> | <p><b>Apologies</b><br/>           Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham)<br/>           Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council)<br/>           Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)<br/>           Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)<br/>           Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)<br/>           Cllr Jacqui Edwards (“JE”) (Cookham Parish Council)</p>   |  |
| <b>2.</b> | <p><b>Approval of meeting minutes 04 Jan and 08 Mar 23.</b><br/>           All approved by CNP with one amendment to 08 Mar minutes raised by DS which was accepted and has been corrected.</p>   |  |
| <b>3.</b> | <p><b>To consider and comment on the latest draft of the Cookham Neighbourhood Plan (Feb 23 V4)</b><br/> <b>DS and MH who were absent from the meeting had sent in comments for review. These were all covered and where the CNP agreed with the comments, the appropriate changes have been made and are included in the items below. Where the CNP did not agree, no action has been taken.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Typo 7.6 ‘Local’</li> <li>➤ 7.6 Add to figure 3 for ‘Illustrative purposes only, does not show settlement boundaries’ or words to that effect to deal with DS’ point. JH to word appropriately. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ 7.7 change sentence to: ‘Along these routes, the urbanising effect of development, either from new buildings (including temporary and other non-permanent buildings) or changes to highways, must be minimised. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P42 C-C13 LA suggested adding an extra point d) ‘Any increase in public access must take fully into account the possible impact on natural habitats and the wildlife in them and take steps to minimise the impact.’ CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ MH had sent in a comment on C-C13 regarding public access. He proposed adding an extra criterion that the land must be managed effectively and reflecting its historical use e.g., to make sure grazing does not become scrubland. JH advised this appeared unnecessary both in general terms and particularly in light of the Borough’s Bio-diversity Action Plan. No action to be taken.</li> <li>➤ 7.12 DS wanted the reference to Marconi removed as irrelevant. The CNP saw no harm in it.</li> </ul> | <p>JH<br/>JH<br/><br/>JH<br/><br/>JH</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 7.14 RC would like to discuss Spencer. He felt that many of his paintings were not accurate depictions of the countryside and that needed to be reflected in our approach. WJP said that SCS is the first to agree with this but he felt the right place to discuss this was when we reached appendix 5 and SCS's paper. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ Information box 6 change Bradcutts Land to Bradcutts Lane.</li> <li>➤ Box 6 - Add owners to the below sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Battlemead (omit 'Common) – RBWM</li> <li>○ Widbrook – National Trust</li> <li>○ Odney – John Lewis Group</li> <li>○ Sashes island – Change to 'Lock Island' - EA</li> <li>○ Rope Walk Meadow – Holy Trinity Church</li> <li>○ The Moor – National Trust</li> <li>○ Marsh Meadow – Copas Farms Ltd</li> <li>○ Cock Marsh – National Trust</li> <li>○ Harris – Woodbridge Nature Reserve – Cookham Parish Council</li> <li>○ Hardings Green - National Trust</li> <li>○ Old Cricket Green – National Trust</li> <li>○ Stonehouse Common – Cookham Parish Council</li> <li>○ Land at the junction of Bradcutts Lane and Terrys Lane – no registered owner</li> <li>○ Tugwood Common – National Trust</li> <li>○ Bigfrith Common - National Trust</li> <li>○ Winter Hill – National Trust</li> <li>○ Cookham Dean Common – National Trust</li> <li>○ Roadside verges in Cookham Dean – National Trust or RBWM</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ DS wanted the sites in the Green Belt removed and noted the RBWM officer views in support. JH explained the different purpose of LGS designation. In the circumstances, taking into account his explanation and the possibility of changes to green belt in the future (as in the recent BLP) the CNP decided to leave them in.</li> <li>➤ Take out yellow NOTE box from Information box 6.</li> <li>➤ C-CI4 - RC declared an interest as a co-owner of Hardings Green/Readings Orchard.</li> <li>➤ P44 C-CI4 1) List of designated Local Green Spaces in the Neighbourhood Plan – go out to consult the owners who are listed. WJP to action.</li> <li>➤ C-CI4 - RC advised 'Hardings Green Orchard' is actually 'Readings Orchard'; JH to change. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ C-CI4 m) JH to send pro forma to WJP for Penling Close.</li> <li>➤ P46 - Policy C-LI1 point 6: reword to 'Proposals shall provide car parking space in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix 8.' CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ Policy C-LI1: CNP noted DS' comments. Having discussed them, the effect of class E on planning, and the potential for changes to it, although it accepted the point in principle it did not consider any change to the actual wording useful.</li> <li>➤ Local centres: take out 'financial and professional services.' CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ WJP to send an email to the CNP to provide a list of 'Important local community facilities in the Parish' for box 7 P47.</li> <li>➤ P47 Policy C-LI2: Point 3b) add to sentence ' including provision for suitable, secure cycle racks/parking facilities.' CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P50 8.11 add 'Jul 2021' in before NPPF to indicate edition used. JH to action.</li> <li>➤ P50 8.12 take out the apostrophes around 'led by'. CNP agreed.</li> </ul> | <p>JH<br/>JH</p> <p>JH<br/>JH<br/>JH<br/>JH<br/>JH<br/>WJP<br/>JH<br/>JH<br/>JH</p> |
|--|---|---|

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Page 51 Policy C-LI4 wording has not been changed to what the WP agreed (as DS pointed out). JH advised that this is because we cannot impose a referendum, therefore it is not possible to include it. As we cannot do what the WP originally agreed, CNP looked again at this Policy and the section supporting it.</li> <li>➤ P50 - 8.14 – take out ‘all within’ in the first sentence, since for example heat pumps for a development could not be accessible to all within the community. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P50 - 8.14 – 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point change to ‘spend on the local community.’ CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P50 – 8.15 - Move to the project 08 as 8.15 is the wording within this project. replace ‘micro-scale’ to ‘small.’ CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P51 Policy C-LI4 RC would like to add text to 1a) The siting and scale of any proposed development must be appropriate to its setting and position in the wider landscape, referring to the qualities and characteristics of the built and natural environment set out in the VDS, Cookham Design Guidance and Codes, set against the benefits of the scheme. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P53 Policy C-AM1. Add (a) between ‘enhance’ and ‘existing’ the words ‘and enhance’ and (b) at the end of 1b) ‘, including particularly routes to community facilities.’ CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P53 Policy C-AM1. Insert in point 1 between ‘major development’ and ‘are expected’ ‘,because they require active travel access to community facilities,’. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P54 9.10. JH to check the date.</li> <li>➤ P55 Policy C-AM2 Point 1) MH had commented on a point that there was confusion on standards used in parking, which are set out in Appendix 8. WJP will discuss with MH what he meant here because the wording, especially in view of the amendment just agreed to C-LI1 point 6, seems clear.</li> <li>➤ P55 Policy C-AM2 Point 4) Change the last sentence to read: “<i>Raised edges, and kerbs, bollards, trees, and other landscaping, should be provided around areas of landscaping to protect them from over-running vehicles.</i>” CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P56 &amp; 57. The CNP felt that these paragraphs did no harm and should remain.</li> <li>➤ P58 – 10.4 – In the second sentence, add ‘Council’ after ‘Parish’. CNP agreed.</li> <li>➤ P59 - 10.5 – Comment to JH that the Parish Council would like to be involved in these discussions, but is this appropriate for the local plan? JH to advise.</li> <li>➤ LA reminded the WP that he had been asked at the last meeting to submit some text for Box 5, Biodiversity Action Plan. The wording he proposed was to add a sentence in Box 5 after that ending ‘where appropriate to proposals’: ‘It is recommended that the use of pesticides and herbicide be avoided within Cookham Parish on any public or private land to spare the environment.’ Objectives sentence to remain. CNP agreed.<br/>In view of the time, the meeting agreed that Appendices should be covered at the next meeting.</li> </ul> | JH<br>JH<br>JH<br>JH<br>JH<br>JH<br>JH<br>JH<br>WJP<br>JH<br>JH<br>JH |
| 3. | <p><b>AOB</b><br/>Since it seemed unlikely (though possible) that the WP would meet again before the local elections on 4 May (with the ‘purdah’ period starting next week), which meant that he might not be present at the next meeting, WJP thanked the working party group for all their efforts and said what a pleasure it has been working with them all.</p>   | WJP   |
| 4. | <p><b>Date/time of next meeting</b><br/>Next meeting TBC</p>   |   |