

COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL**Minutes of a Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Community Room on Tuesday 10th January 2023, commencing at 7.30pm.**

PRESENT: Cllr B. Perry (Chairman)
Cllrs L. Austin, C. Aisladie, M. Barnes, E. Bune, J. Edwards, I. Herd and J. Perry,
Mr D. Scarff

Also Present: Cllr M. Howard
There were 8 members of the public.
No members of the press were present.

OPEN FORUM:

Four members of the public spoke in objection to pl/ap 22/03327/Full - White Place Farm, Sutton Road, Cookham.

Pl/ap 22/03161/Full and 22/03162/Full - The Arcade, High Street, Cookham: The applicant spoke in support of his application and one member of public spoke in objection.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies received from Cllrs I. Herd and I. Wernham.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

None.

For the interest of members of the public present, Cllrs agreed to move pl/ap 22/03327/Full - White Place Farm, Sutton Road, up the agenda and to consider pl/ap's 22/03161/Full and 22/03162/Full - The Arcade, High Street, Cookham under Chairmans Submissions, also at the start of the meeting.

8. CHAIRMAN'S SUBMISSIONS (part 1):

Pl/ap's 22/03161/Full and 22/03162/Full - The Arcade, High Street, Cookham.

These applications had been received after the closure of the agenda, but as the applications are of interest to the community, it was discussed. The comments by date for the applications are 2nd February, which is before the next Planning Cmte meeting on 14th February. The details will be ratified at the next Planning Cmte meeting.

The Cmte requested that both applications be called in.

3. PLANS TO BE CONSIDERED AND DISCUSSED:**APPEAL:**

Appeal By: David Howells Sorbon Estates Limited, Sorbon Aylesbury End,
Beaconsfield HP9 9JF
Site Address: Station Court, High Road, Cookham SL6 9JF
Proposal: Outline application for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the erection of 8 dwellings.
Plns Ref: APP/T0355/W/22/3310141
RBWM Pl/ap: 21/02331/OUT
RBWM Decision: 21/06/2022 – Refused

Appeal to be decided on the basis of an exchange of Written Representations. Previously submitted comments on the planning application will be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate and appellant(s). Should you wish to make additional comments, you can do so on the Planning Inspectorate website at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> or by emailing west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk. Comments are received by the Planning Inspectorate no later than 19 January 2023.

(contd)

CPC Comment 23/8/21:

The Parish Council objects to this application because:

1. the pitch of the roofs is too steep resulting in too high a roof line. This is because what is sought is in reality a three storey dwelling. Such a roof height/line fails to 'respond to the size, shape and rhythm of/' is out of keeping with the area which is bungalows along the railway line and is contrary to Borough Wide Design Guide ("BWDG") 6.5.1, 7.5.2 (& paras. 7.17 and 7.18) 7.6 and Village Design Statement ("VDS") G6.1;
2. it would obstruct/detract from views of Area of Special Local Significance C2.1 (VDS Annex C.2);
3. it is contrary to Guidance G11.1 of the VDS which requires that any proposal which may have an impact on any of the approaches to Cookham Of which the railway is one (see Box 45 page 61 of the VDS) does not detract from that approach;
4. it is contrary to the BWDG 6.3 and 7.1 because it has no new open space and/or green infrastructure;
5. it has parking bays along the front of the length of the entirety of one building and part of the other contrary to BWDG 6.7 and 6.8 in several respects, as well as BWDG 6.35 and also to VDS G6.16;
6. and the two terraces are not 'adequately spaced' from each other contrary to VDS 6.8 and have no greenery between them contrary to G6.21.

CPC Comment: 10th January 2023

The Committee reviewed its previous response and decided to send revised comments to the Planning Inspector due to amendments needed following the adoption of the Borough Local Plan.

Revised Submission:

The Parish Council stands by its original objection to this application. However, it has noted that the two blocks in the original application have been changed, and the Borough Local Plan adopted. It would therefore re-phrase them as follows:

1. the pitch of the roof is too steep resulting in too high a roof line. This is because what is sought is in reality a three storey terraced set of dwellings. Such a roof height/line fails to 'respond to the size, shape and rhythm of/' is out of keeping with the area which is bungalows along the railway line and is contrary to Borough Wide Design Guide ("BWDG") 6.5.1, 7.5.2 (& paras. 7.17 and 7.18) 7.6 and Village Design Statement ("VDS") G6.1 and is quite out of context;
2. This means it is substantially too bulky and massive in every way for its context.
3. it would obstruct/detract from views of Area of Special Local Significance C2.1 (VDS Annex C.2);
4. it is contrary to Guidance G11.1 of the VDS which requires that any proposal which may have an impact on any of the approaches to Cookham, of which the railway is one (see Box 45 page 61 of the VDS), does not detract from that approach;
5. For the same reasons, it is contrary to the LPA's adopted Plan Policy QP3.1.f which requires that it retains important local views of historic buildings or features and makes the most of opportunities to improve views wherever possible;
6. it is contrary to the BWDG Principles 6.3 and 7.1 because it has no new open space and/or green infrastructure;
7. it is contrary to BWDG Principle 6.4 bullet 3, as well as VDS G6.1 as well as G6.4, in view of its disproportionate length and height contrasted with the bungalows in Peace Lane which is adjoins;
8. it has parking bays along the front of the length of half the building and the road leads directly into a car park which takes up the entire building width (at the north end), in both cases contrary to adopted Plan Policy QP3.1.i because it is not designed to minimise the visual impact of traffic and parking, as well as BWDG 6.7 and 6.8 in several respects, as well as BWDG 6.35, and also to VDS G6.16; and
9. It is contrary to BLP Policy QP2.2 in that it fails to incorporate innovative, exemplar quality green and blue infrastructure at both ground floor and upper levels, and to Policy QP3.1.in that it does not: ... j. Protect trees and vegetation worthy of retention and include comprehensive green and blue infrastructure schemes that are integrated into proposals; k. provide high quality soft and hard landscaping where appropriate; and/or l. provide sufficient levels of high quality private and public amenity space.
10. It is contrary to para. 6.12.2 and QP3.1.b in that it fails, in the context of the points made in paragraphs 1 – 5 above, to meet the criterion that all development, redevelopment and conversion should demonstrate design excellence and *respond positively to its context* (our emphasis) and does not respect and enhance the local, natural or historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to urban grain, layouts, rhythm, density, height, skylines, scale, bulk, massing, proportions, trees, biodiversity, water features, enclosure and materials.

APPEAL :

Appeal By: Mr Langton
Site Address: Tythe Barn, Dean Lane, Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9BB
Proposal: Detached triple garage with habitable accommodation in the roofspace and external staircase following the demolition of the existing garage
Plns Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3306528
RBWM PI/ap: 22/00248/FULL
RBWM Decision: Refuse (16/6/2022)

Appeal will be decided on the basis of Written Representations. RBWM will send copies of all comments made to them about the application before it was decided to the appellant and the Planning Inspectorate. As this appeal is proceeding under the Householder Appeals Service there is no opportunity for you to submit further comments.

CPC Comment: No comment (8/3/22)

CPC Noted: 10th January 2023

| Application Number | Current Planning Applications | Parish Council Decision |
|---|---|--|
| 22/03327/Full App date 20/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 18/1/23 | Demolition of existing equestrian and agricultural buildings, erection of 30 new equestrian stables, relocated feed and agricultural storage barn, erection of 5 houses with associated works to improve footpaths and access. White Place Farm, Sutton Road, Cookham, SL6 9QZ J W Edwards Will Trust | <p>OBJECTION</p> <p>See detail below</p> <p>The Cmte requested that this applications be called in.</p> |
| <p>22/03327/Full – OBJECTION</p> <p>Building in the Green Belt should only be allowed in very special circumstances, CPC do not consider that there are any special circumstances, let alone very special circumstances, to justify this application in terms of meets those criteria. Furthermore, there are other reasons why this application should be refused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting of listed buildings • There is evidence of protected species on site (bats and badgers). • Privacy and overlooking issues • There is no evidence of grant of change of use from agricultural to equine. • It would now require change of use from equine/agricultural to housing which should not be granted. • Increased traffic at the junction with Sutton Road, which has poor sight lines as a result of the bend to the south. • There is no dry access across Widbrook Common or from Cookham Village in time of flood. • The drainage arrangements proposed are inappropriate to this site in view of the water-table, and ground-water and fluvial flood issues. <p>It has also raised questions about the provision of services/utilities.</p> <p>We also wish to mention two issues from the supporting documentation:</p> <p>(a) Although it is true that the applicant has attended a meeting of the Parish Council and displayed and discussed plans, which Councillors accepted informally had attractive aspects, the Council has not endorsed the scheme.</p> <p>(b) In paragraph 2.4 of the applicant's flood assessment, it is stated that "The closest watercourses designated as main rivers by the Environment Agency (EA) are ... , and White Brook located approximately 375m to the south, flowing in a south-easterly direction towards the River Thames." In fact the White Brook normally flows north-westerly to join Strande Water into the York Stream. (It reverses in times of flood.)</p> | | |

| Application Number | Current Planning Applications | Parish Council Decision |
|---|--|--|
| 22/03161/FULL App date 28/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 03/03/23 | Demolition of an existing shed used for ancillary commercial storage and formation of a patio for use by coffee shop for ancillary outdoor seating area (Retrospective) The Arcade, High Street, Cookham, Maidenhead SL6 9TA Mr Jolyon Burgess | Objection in principle to development of the site on basis of noise and over-development in a conservation area; we would also object unless the normal requirements for parking, noise, toilet facilities and fire precautions are met. |
| 22/03162/FULL App date 28/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 03/03/23 | Change of use of existing building from ancillary commercial use to office space (Retrospective). The Arcade, High Street Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9TA Mr Jolyon Burgess | 1 CPC are not satisfied there is existing valid permission for this building in which case one needs to be sought; unless there is one, we object to this application. 2 If a permitted application exists, we would also object unless the normal requirements for parking, noise, toilet facilities and fire precautions are met. |
| 22/03286/FULL App date 09/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 09/01/23 Extension for comments to 12/1/23 | Single storey rear extension 7 Broom Hill Cookham SL6 9LH Mr Jamie Moore | NO OBJECTION However, CPC ask for a traffic and parking management plan, to restrict off site parking to one vehicle which should be parked correctly on the road with no obstruction of the pavement. The Clerk was asked to contact the PCSO Team regarding parking in Broom Hill. |
| 22/03303/Full App date 12/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 12/01/23 | Retrospective change of agricultural land to equestrian, stable building and associated hardstanding. The Walled Garden, Sutton Road, Cookham Mr Foster | CONCERN See detail below |

22/03303/Full – CONCERN

While the CPC has no objection in principle to a change of use to equestrian it wishes to be sure that this land remains in properly 'rural' use, in line with BLP Policy QP5: "proposals should not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land".

Due to para 149(g) of the NPPF (2021) a planning authority might – though the Council trusts that in the light of QP5, this one would not - regard the redevelopment of the buildings proposed here as not impacting n the openness of the Green Belt. Indeed there have been previous examples of this at Woodlands Farm (15/03388 & 18/01448) and Hardings Farm (20/01448) prior to the adoption of the new BLP.

Accordingly, CPC seek conditions to ensure that the equestrian usage is for private use only (no commercial use) and that if it is ever discontinued the construction must be demolished in line with BLP Policy QP5. It is confident that this can and should be done under NPPF 56.

Provided that such a condition is imposed, the Parish Council would have no objection to this proposal. Absent that, it would oppose it.

| Application Number | Current Planning Applications | Parish Council Decision |
|---|--|--|
| 22/03334/FULL App date 15/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 16/01/23 | Two storey front extension, single storey rear extension, alterations to roof space, fenestration and finish following demolition of existing elements Dyars Church Rd, Cookham Dean, SL6 9PJ Mr and Mrs Hall | NO OBJECTION provided that further Permitted Development rights are removed. |
| 22/03409/FULL App date 23/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 26/1/23 | Detached home office following demolition of the existing shed. Orchardleigh Cottage, Bigfrith Lane, Cookham, SL6 9PH Mr James Phillips | NO OBJECTION but request that the trees are retained. |
| 22/03289/FULL App date 03/01/23 Comments to RBWM by 31/1/2023 | Single storey extension. Roadways, Lower Rd, Cookham, SL6 9EJ Mrs R Barnett | NO COMMENT |
| 22/03435/FULL App date 30/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 1/2/23 | Detached outbuilding (retrospective) Englefield Pound Lane, Cookham, SL6 9Y Mr Johnathan Tyce | OBJECTION Obtrusive and inappropriate structure in a conservation area. Has potential for overlooking. |
| 22/03403/EIASCR App date 22/12/2022 Comments to RBWM N/A Decision date: 12/01/2023 | For Information: Screening Opinion from the Council under Regulation 6 (1) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 ("the EIA Regulations"), to confirm whether or not there is a requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") in respect of the residential development for up to 200 homes, with associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure Site B Open Field North of Lower Mount Long Lane Cookham Mr James Banks Bellway Homes GW Copas Trust and TA Family Settlement Trust | We appreciate that this application is for information only but hope the Planning Authority will require an Environmental Impact Assessment due to the size of the development. |
| 22/03282/NMA App date 09/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by N/A | Non material amendments to planning permission 22/02490/FULL for the resiting of the detached home office with a reduction in the footprint and alterations to the garden dimensions. Decision: refused 20/12/22 | |

Cllr Howard asked if item 5 could be dealt with at this point. The Committee agreed to the request.

5. TO DISCUSS PL/AP 21/02963/FULL - NEW POLY TUNNELS FOR REARING TURKEYS WITH ASSOCIATED FEED SILOS AND SUBSTANTIAL FORMATION OF ROAD CHIPPINGS TO FORM A NETWORK OF TRACKS AT LAND WEST OF SWITCHBACK ROAD NORTH AND NORTH OF NIGHTINGALE LANE MAIDENHEAD AND TO DECIDE UPON ANY FURTHER STEPS:

Further to the Planning Cmte meeting on 13th December: Cllr B. Perry had forwarded a copy of a letter to Cllr Haseler – Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport, Mr A Waite - Head of Planning and Mr T Reeves – Interim Chief Executive regarding the poor handling of this application, to Cllrs in advance of the meeting. Cllrs unanimously approved the contents. Clerk to format and send. See appendix, minute pages 3005 to 3006.

| Application Number | Current Applications for Tree Works | Parish Council Decision |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| 22/03360/TCA App date 19/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 20/1/23 | Felling trees specified on form Woodland bounded by Gibraltar Lane and Stone House Lane and Winter Hill Cookham Maidenhead. Matthew Andrews | NO COMMENT |
| 22/03412/TCA App date 23/12/2022 Comments to RBWM by 26/01/203. | (T1,T2,T3,T4) Conifers - take down to ground level and grind down stumps. Mallows Berries Road, Cookham, SL6 9SD Mr Davies | NO COMMENT |
| 22/03429/TCA App date 03/01/2023 Comments to RBWM by 31/01/23 | T1 - Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana species tree – fell April Dene, Warners Hill, Cookham, SL6 9NU Mr Donald Harris | NO COMMENT |

4. RBWM Decisions:

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|
| 22/02757/Full | Ripples Mill Lane, Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9QR | Permitted |
| 22/02834/Full | Moonraker Stone House Lane, Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9TP | Refuse |
| 22/02783/Full | 2 Cliveden View, Sutton Road, Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9RD | Application withdrawn |
| 22/02758/Full | 21 Southwood Road, Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9LY | Permitted |
| 22/02467/Full | Rosemary School Lane Cookham, Maidenhead, SL6 9QJ | Application withdrawn |
| 22/03012/Full | Cherry Stones Grange Road Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9TH | Application withdrawn |

6. TO RECEIVE ANY UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES FOR THE LAND AT STRANDE PARK (BLP SITE AL38, 22/00343/OUT), AND TO DECIDE UPON ANY FURTHER STEPS:

Further to the Planning Cmte meeting on 13th December: Cllr B. Perry to write to the Planning Authority to ask for clarification over flood escape routes from the Lightlands Lane, Strande Lane and Bass Mead area.

There was nothing further to update regarding the currently planning application.

7. TO RECEIVE ANY UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES FOR THE LAND AT CANNONDOWN ROAD BLP SITE AL37 AND TO DECIDE UPON ANY FURTHER STEPS:

There was nothing further to report.

8. CHAIRMAN'S SUBMISSIONS (part 2):

22/03410/Full – Whyteladyes Rose Garden, Dean Lane, Cookham

This application had been received after the closure of the agenda, the comments by date is 2nd February, and as it is a site of interest to the community it was discussed. Cllr Perry will consider a response for the Cmte to review for approval by email. The details will be ratified at the next Planning Cmte meeting on 14th February.

The Meeting closed at 9.40pm.



COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL

COUNCIL OFFICES, HIGH ROAD, COOKHAM RISE, BERKS SL6 9JF
Tel: (01628) 522003 Email: office@cookhamparishcouncil.org.uk
Clerk to the Council: Mrs Jill Gavin

Councillor Haseler – Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport
Mr A Waite - Head of Planning
Mr T Reeves – Interim Chief Executive
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Town Hall,
St Ives Road,
Maidenhead SL6 1RF

11th January 2023

Dear Cllr Haseler, Mr Reeves and Mr Waite,

Planning Application 21/02963/FULL: New poly tunnels for rearing turkeys with associated feed silos and substantial formation of road chippings to form a network of tracks, Land West of Switchback Road North And North of Nightingale Lane Maidenhead.

Cookham Parish Council is concerned about the handling of this application. I have been asked to write to you all to convey that concern and to ask that the matter be resolved promptly.

This application was lodged and validated on 6 October 2021. That is now more than 14 months ago.

It is a retrospective application. The application notice dated 4 October 2021 acknowledges expressly in response to question 5 that the work began on 1 June 2021. The polytunnels have therefore been in use for 18 months. This is two complete 'working years' for the rearing of turkeys for which the major sale period is the run-up to Christmas.

That is not however the full story: the first letter on the planning portal relating to this application is from Cookham Design Partnership on behalf of the applicants, and is dated 12 May 2021. That is effectively 20 months ago. For reasons which are not clear to us, this was not loaded onto the portal until 5 October 2021 and is there described as 'Notice of Decision'. My Council would be grateful for an explanation of both these aspects.

On 25 November 2021, Project Centre on behalf of the Royal Borough as Lead Local Flood Authority asked a number of pertinent questions, and recommended that until these were answered satisfactorily the application be not approved.

On 9 December 2021, Mr Michael McNaughton, Environmental Protection Officer, reported that:
"The current application does not include information on the following which will be needed for EP to provide further comment.

- How waste will be managed at the site
- What air handling/Climate control will be used in the poly tunnels i.e. plant machinery.
- What odour control procedures will be utilised.
- Information on whether or not the slaughter of the poultry will take place at the site or off site and the traffic implications."

On 9 November 2021, my Council strongly objected (for multiple reasons given in its comments) to the application. My Council's reasons for objection included:

"2. The land lies partly in a Zone 1 SPZ (Water Source Protection Zone) and the rest lies in a Zone 2 SPZ.. The very large number of turkeys envisaged on it will give rise to very substantial defecation/slurry issues. Pollution of water/the water table and the soil must be a serious concern. There needs to be full consultation with the Environment Agency and any other appropriate agencies, and generally proper investigation of the effects and whether and how they can be ameliorated/remediated. If appropriate, conditions need to be imposed to ensure that the quality of water is properly protected, to say nothing of preventing enduring

damage to (what is by the applicant's own admission inferior, so easily seriously damaged) land - if that is indeed possible. If it is not, the application should be refused.

"3. Associated with this are potential atmospheric and general pollution issues. These include potential asthmatic and other health hazards for passers-by/nearby residents. This too needs to be addressed."

In other words my Council's concerns (in part) to a significant extent paralleled the comments of the Royal Borough's own officer and agent referred to above. Public health and safety issues exist.

On 29 April 2022, my Council having noted amended plans, said that: "Cookham Parish Council wishes to reiterate its previous comments and request that until or unless all the issues and questions have been addressed and resolved the application should be refused."

On 14 June 2022, Project Centre again on behalf of the Royal Borough as Lead Local Flood Authority asked a number of pertinent questions, and recommended that until these were answered satisfactorily the application be not approved.

Since then, now more than 6 months ago, so permitting another season of turkey rearing, no further documents have been uploaded to the portal. My Council understands that the position of the Planning Department is that inadequate information relating to these matters has been supplied as yet and it has preferred to make no decision on the application until it has complete information.

My Council considers this to be quite inappropriate as a way of handling this application. It might be appropriate if the application related to a prospective application. In the case of a retrospective application, however, in effect doing nothing simply legitimises an existing construction and use which evidently requires permission and has not been granted it.

The absence of answers to the questions asked and points made by both the Flood Authority and the Environmental Protection Officer more than a year ago creates an inevitable inference that the applicant has been unable to answer them satisfactorily. The policy of waiting, presumably in the hope of obtaining satisfactory answers, has thus enabled the applicant to use a facility which it has evidently not been able to justify on flood, water safety and environmental protection grounds.

This is quite unsatisfactory as planning process. No satisfactory information having been provided, the construction and use should be promptly refused, and the subject of enforcement action since it has occurred for two seasons, over 18 months, without permission. It is quite wrong, and fails the public, to allow it to continue in the absence of the relevant approvals by Environmental Health and the Flood authority, and then the Royal Borough as Local Planning Authority.

My Council seeks an assurance that this application will now be determined promptly, and if refused in the absence of satisfactory reports from Environmental Health and Flood Authority, that enforcement action will also be commenced promptly.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Jill Gavin
Clerk to the Council

Cllr Bill Perry
Chairman of the Planning Committee
Cookham Parish Council

Cllr Mark Howard
Chairman
Cookham Parish Council

CC: Cllrs for Cookham Parish Council,
Borough Cllrs Brar and Clark
Mr A. Durrant – Executive Director of Place.
Ms E. Duncan – Monitoring Officer