

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 25 JUL 2023 AT 6.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

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

Cllr Laura Tull (“LT”) (Cookham Parish Council) check if was able to attend?

Cllr Anna-Louise Regan (“ALR”) (Cookham Parish Council) joined via Zoom left at 20.00

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

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham) joined via Zoom

Richard Campin (“RC”) (Cookham Footprint)

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

		Who
1.	<p>Apologies Cllr Jamie Moore (“JM”) (Cookham Parish Council) Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council) Cllr Laura Tull (“LT”) (Cookham Parish Council) Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham) Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy)</p>	
2.	<p>Matters arising therefrom and updates. WJP raised point 6 on his email to the working party 12 Jun:</p> <p>6. Jon repeats that Troy are reluctant to undo some of the changes made in line with the RBWM comments. He points out that these changes have been recommended by RBWM so that the policies in the Plan meet the Basic Conditions. Changing them will potentially raise expectations before RBWM then responds to the Regulation 14 consultation with similar changes and, if those changes remain unmade before submission, Troy feel that the Examiner will most likely include similar changes in their modifications before the Plan can proceed to referendum.</p> <p>WJP will discuss further with Troy against the background that the CNPWP chose its language for a reason and is reluctant to abandon it despite his comments.</p> <p>Local Green Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ CNPWP agreed by majority vote to relinquishing LGS protection for anything that is otherwise protected in accordance with Troy’s advice and remove them from the list. CP declared interest in one of the designated LGS, so did not vote.▪ CNPWP decided that if the land enjoys protection in a different way, in accordance with the list, these will be added with a paragraph to explain that these are all important local open green areas on which we would strongly resist any development. But we will only seek designation for any that don’t already have allotment, cemetery, conservation and/or green belt protection. Troy to action.	JH

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Troy to add to LGS list - The Paddock is White Land – so needs to be designated as LGS. <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WJP sent current draft to Landowners. 1 response from Chris Brown. No other responses. WJP to follow up. 	
3.	<p>To discuss and approve appendices.</p> <p>Appendix 1 – No feedback</p> <p>Appendix 2 - No feedback</p> <p>Appendix 3 – No feedback</p> <p>Appendix 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LA to provide ‘Who you register a local wildlife site with, and a brief paragraph detailing the process and criteria’. LA to circulate to the CNPWP. ▪ P28; Figure 2 better in the appendix, or alternative a cross reference the table in Appendix 4 to the Figure 2 Map. Please also check if this is the latest iteration of the map Lars provided. Troy to action. <p>Appendix 5 – SCS has done some final tweaks to the prior draft of this Appendix. CNPWP are happy in principle with the document and the copyright statement. RC raised that whilst this is a very informative document, it is rather long and very similar to the VDS, and queried what is the purpose of this being included in the CNP. WJP advised that the significance of Cookham in Stanley Spencer Paintings has repeatedly been recognised by planning inspectorate decisions and RBWM decisions, when considering applications to build in areas affected/featured in Stanley Spence Paintings. This has been quite useful to us in preserving the character and nature of Cookham. SCS advised that there is not a lot of common ground between the two documents, as the VDS has a listing of paintings, and one page on Spencer. Her document has another third more paintings listed and is more specific on building details and views.</p> <p>CNPWP agreed that Stanley Spencer should be included in the CNP from the very beginning. It will provide underlying information to assist people interested in planning. WJP advised CP’s concern has been noted, but the principle was agreed a long time ago and he was not wanting to deviate from the previous decision.</p> <p>WJP stated there is a fundamental difference between the VDS and this document. The VDS (Appendix 2) quotes it must be adhered to and this document (Appendix 5) says must be referred to. The VDS is a supplementary planning document, so Appendix 2 will stay as is. It is not planned as this document is laid out, to put the whole VDS in the printed statement, because it already exists formally as a supplementary planning document.</p> <p>SCS commented that it refers to the sensitive balance needed for a visual connection should be maintained where possible between a spencer painting and the present situation. Appendix 5 is a knowledge base.</p> <p>Appendix 6 – Discussed earlier.</p> <p>Appendix 7 – WJP to obtain a ‘map of areas of interest’. WJP to source. Take out heading ‘An incomplete list’ Troy to action. WJP to get formal approval from MAS to include their document in the CNP, check copyright also.</p> <p>DS asked a question on maps, and will all maps be in a digital format? WJP to speak to Troy re this, but in principle feels they ought to be. There may be some maps where this is not possible, as they are not created in that format. LA advised that this was discussed some time ago, and a licence is needed, but the CPC was not willing to pay for this licence. CNPWP agreed the maps should be digital so WJP will go back to Troy and the CPC if necessary, and see if we can do this. WJP to also investigate if we could use the BLP map and start with that.</p>	<p>LA</p> <p>JH</p> <p>WJP</p> <p>WJP</p>

	<p>Appendix 8 – LA asked about electric charging point in public spaces and is this included? It is in 9.11 page 55.</p> <p>9.9 paragraph – First sentence and note 37 needs to come out and replace by, ‘The Parish Council intends to retain the parking standards published by RBWM 2004 and does not intend to alter these, even if the borough does, unless it increases the requirement. Troy to action.</p> <p>Troy to action – Change Maximum parking standard to Minimum parking standard in the columns in Appendix 8.</p> <p>Troy to action- If the ‘use class orders’ are as per the permitted/general development order of year 2004, they should be interpreted accordingly. Note to be added to this effect.</p> <p>Appendix 9 – Neighbourhood spelling in paragraph one, needs correction. Hisotic should be Historic. Project 01 last sentence. Troy to action.</p> <p>Project 4 – LA to provide a short text for this piece and agree with DS.</p> <p>Project 8 – RC asked for some wording changes. In the first paragraph he asked for ‘small-scale’ to be removed. WJP advised that this was very seriously fought over previously, and this was the compromise from very opposing views. Cookham Footprint have had input to this previously. The reason it was put in was to avoid having large commercial energy projects in the area. No change to be made.</p> <p>RC also asked about the second paragraph, ‘schemes led by the community as a whole’ as he felt this was not likely or achievable. He asked for ‘as a whole’ to be taken out. WJP advised that point had been previously debated again and this was the compromise language agreed upon by the CNPWP at that time. No change to be made.</p> <p>Acknowledgments WJP to draft these and the foreword.</p>	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>LA/DS</p> <p>WJP</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Date/time of next meeting.</p> <p>Agreed for the CNPWP to keep free alternate 2nd and 4th Wed of each month, starting immediately. WJP will give everyone 2 weeks’ notice if a meeting will go ahead. Meetings won’t happen unless notified 2 weeks in advance by WJP.</p>	<p>WJP</p>