

**COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL****Minutes of a Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Community Room at Cookham Library on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> April 2023, commencing at 7.30pm.**

---

**PRESENT:** Cllr B. Perry (Chairman)  
Cllrs L. Austin, C. Aisladie, E. Bune, and J. Perry,  
Mr D. Scarff

**Also Present:** Cllrs M. Brar and M. Howard  
There were 22 members of the public.  
No members of the press were present.

---

**OPEN FORUM:**

A number of residents voiced concerns over works at the Strande Park site that had happened over the Easter weekend. The block of garages had been demolished and numerous trees and hedging had been felled and uprooted. There were concerns, not only for the loss of resident's amenities and trees but also damage to protected species, nesting birds and wildlife. RBWM Officers have been to site and are due again in the following days to review the trees and breaches to the site licence. The Police have also been notified.

As the PC has no powers in this matter, residents were urged to promptly write to the Chief Executive of RBWM regarding matters concerning the site Licence and trees or contact the Police if they felt threatened or for illegal activity. The Parish Council will continue to push for a suitable resolution to the issues currently being experienced.

A resident spoke regarding the Appeal for pl/ap 22/01452/FULL Briar Cottage and Holmwood, Briar Glen Cookham to reiterate their objection to the application which had been refused by the Planning Authority.

A resident spoke in objection to pl/ap 23/00767/Full Rosemary, School Lane, Cookham.

**1. APOLOGIES:**

Apologies received from Cllrs M. Barnes J. Edwards and I. Wernham.  
Cllr I. Herd did not attend.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:**

None.

For the benefit of those present the discussion for Pl/ap 23/00767/FULL – Rosemary, and item 5, Update on the proposed development schemes for the land at Strande Park, where brought up the agenda to follow the review of the Appeal details for 22/01452/FULL Briar Cottage and Holmwood, Briar Glen, Cookham.

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

<b>APPEAL :</b>	
<b>Appeal By:</b>	Germain Homes Ltd c/o Agent
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Briar Cottage and Holmwood Briar Glen Cookham</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	x3 dwellings with associated parking and landscaping, following demolition of the existing dwellings.
<b>PINS Ref:</b>	APP/T0355/W/23/3315239
<b>RBWM PI/ap:</b>	22/01452/FULL
<b>RBWM Decision</b>	<b>Refused 22 November 2022</b>
<b>CPC Comment:</b>	<p>22/01452/FULL - <b>OBJECTION</b> on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is not an "accessible" site under RBWM's parking and Highways policies because the train service, contrary to the comments by Highways, is actually only 1 per hour.</li> <li>2. It is overdevelopment of site, and being two storeys will dominate and be out of keeping with the surrounding single storey housing.</li> <li>3. The proposed houses will overlook neighbouring properties, especially from the dormer windows which are now much closer to the boundary than in application 20/02193, and on the same level as the ground floor windows in adjoining properties. This is a serious privacy/overlooking issue in breach of the Borough Wide Design Guide.</li> <li>4. It is contrary to VDS guidance in section 6.9 which is opposed to 'garden grabbing' (see page 26: "It is important that new developments involving several dwellings should be well spaced ..."et seq., and box 24 on page 46)</li> <li>5. It is contrary, specifically, to VDS policies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.6 (not 'adequately spaced' and designs (especially but not limited to height) which do not 'relate in a vernacular manner to the neighbouring' area);</li> <li>6.7 (not 'modest scale and discreet design');</li> <li>6.8 ('spacing [not] follow[ing] the pattern of building in the immediate and nearby area'</li> <li>6.16 ('avoid .. visually dominant hard-standings in front of houses');</li> <li>6.19a ('Existing hedgerows forming residential boundaries should not in general be uprooted'); and</li> <li>6.21 ('Except in exceptional circumstances, front ... gardens should be included within new developments. To each side of a house space for greenery should be characteristic of the neighbourhood and proportionate to the building frontage').</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. The junction of Briar Glen with High Road is dangerous and use should not be increased, and there are serious concerns about emergency services access.</li> <li>7. There will be damage to trees.</li> </ol>
Appeal to be decided on the basis of an exchange of Written Representations	
<p>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 <a href="https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk">https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a> or by emailing <a href="mailto:RT1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk">RT1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk</a>. Comments are received by the Planning Inspectorate no later than 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2023.</p>	
<b>CPC Comment 11<sup>th</sup> April 2023:</b>	
The Cmte wished to reaffirm its original response to the Inspector. Clerk to send.	

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
23/00767/FULL  App date 24/03/23. Comments to RBWM 27/04/23	Replacement dwelling with associated access and parking. Rosemary School Lane Cookham SL6 9QJ 10 Gallon Hat Ltd	<b>OBJECTION</b> (see below for detailed response)
<p><b>23/00767/FULL - OBJECTION</b></p> <p>The proposed dwelling is in effect the same size as that opposed as overdevelopment in application 22/02467, its floor area having been reduced by only about 10m<sup>2</sup> in about 400m<sup>2</sup>. The same objections of overdevelopment therefore apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The height, depth and breadth, of this building and its general mass relative to its own site and the Conservation Area 'type' is excessive, out of character and detrimental to the site, the neighbours' amenities and the Conservation Area.</li> <li>2. Principle 7.5.2 of the BWDG, in that it will have a significant negative effect on the amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring properties due to mass, width relative to the part of the site near the road on which it sits, and overlooking.</li> <li>3. Principle 7.6 of the BWDG in that (a) it does not reflect or integrate well with the spacing, height, bulk or building footprints of the existing buildings; and (b) its bulk, scale and mass adversely impacts the street scene, local character and neighbour amenities; especially in the Cookham Village Conservation Area.</li> <li>4. It is too high and large properly to pay respect to the building styles, materials and colours of the highly important 'village core' of the Conservation Area, as specified in the Conservation Area Appraisal Document approved by Cabinet on 29 September (pages 18- 22), nor to the significant non-listing buildings there (pages 24 – 26) to which it is very close. Specifically that appraisal notes that in School Lane 'buildings are lower' (page 30) yet this proposal is very close to the highest building in the road; and one of the 'key negatives' is 'insensitive new development' (ibid).</li> <li>5. Guidance in the Cookham Village Design Statement, to be precise: G6.1: new buildings should fit comfortably in their surroundings: - the width of frontage, depth and height should be in keeping with other buildings in the area; a new building should respect the general building line/set back from the road and the spacing of buildings which characterise the area. This building is too wide, too high and too deep (and generally too large) to do this. G6.8 : The spacing of buildings should follow the pattern of building in the immediate and nearby area. This comes far too close to boundaries on both sides. G6.16: Car parking should be arranged discreetly, avoiding visually dominant hardstandings at the front of buildings. Here virtually the entire 'front garden' is in fact hardstanding for 3 cars (there being no room for a garage). G6.19a: Existing hedgerows forming residential boundaries should not in general be uprooted. G6.19b: Hedgerows are a very suitable boundary ... and are preferred over solid board fencing ... Hedgerows may be attractively combined with wooden picket or post and rail fencing; this echoes closely the BWDG Principle 9.1 referred to above. G6.21: ...To each side of a house, space for greenery should be characteristic of the neighbourhood and proportionate to the building frontage. In this application the building and its patios, though an improvement on the previous application, are still too wide for the plot, with especial reference to the single storey 'wing' to the east.</li> </ol> <p>The plans relate the building to the overall size of the plot. This is misleading because most of the garden is set right at the rear of the site, well away from the proposed building, which is to the front where the site is narrow.</p> <p>The building thus remains too wide relative to the width of the garden at the point where it is sited; the roof (especially in view of/associated with the chimneys) remains too high – and the apparent height viewed from the road and neighbouring properties is emphasised by the (new) gable ends with the chimneys; and the proposal's depth on the site is excessive relative to neighbouring properties. All these objections, though general, apply particularly to this location within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>If despite objections the application is approved, then the dimensions and volume should be reduced and the following points implemented. We agree with Highways' comments. It is essential, not least as to materials for this, that the BAP and BLP requirements for drainage and biodiversity preservation and gain are also fully implemented. LLFA comments should be obtained and implemented.</p> <p>Post and rail fencing and gates, with proper hedges behind them should be used on the road frontage. It is important that the Cypress be preserved and any trees damaged/removed replaced in accordance with the arboricultural study.</p>		

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

There have been no further communications regarding the planning application and therefore there is nothing further to report.

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

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
23/00535/Full App date 03/03/23 Comments to RBWM 06/4/23. Extension agreed until 14/04/23	4no. rear rooflights. Field Cottage Church Road Cookham Dean SL6 9PJ Mr James Anderson	CPC has <b>NO OBJECTION</b> but hopes that the Conservation Officers concerns are taken into consideration regarding the roof lights.
23/00596/FULL  App date 08/03/23. Comments to RBWM 11/04/23 Extension agreed until 12/04/23	First floor front/side extension, single storey rear extension with roof lanterns, garage conversion with ramp and step access, 7no. rooflights, alterations to fenestration and 2no. gates with parking area. Skylark Cottage Poundfield Lane Cookham SL6 9RY Mr And Mrs Lucazeau	<b>OBJECTION</b> Overbearing relative to neighbours property and over development generally. The maximum height should be 22.5 mtrs as shown on the plans. There is no sign it contributes to biodiversity or references the bio-diversity action plan of the BLP. CPC wish for a condition that it should not become a separate dwelling if approved.
23/00729/FULL  App date 22/03/23. Comments to RBWM 25/04/23	Alterations to fenestration to rear elevation and 2no. rooflights to existing rear extension following part removal of existing rear element. Marley Cottage Bedwins Lane Cookham SL6 9PU Mr And Mrs Babcock	<b>No Comment</b>
23/00730/FULL  App date 22/03/23. Comments to RBWM 26/04/23	Single storey side/rear extension, alterations existing roof of the existing single storey rear extension and to fenestration. Orchard Cottage Station Road Cookham SL6 9BU Emma Quayle	<b>NO OBJECTION in principle</b> but the Cmte would be unhappy if approval was given if there was overhanging into the next door property from gutters and eaves.

Application Number	Notices for Information Only	Parish Council Decision
23/00660/CPD For information only. No consultation.	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed single storey side extension is lawful. Hurst Place Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9AA Mr G Papazoglou	
23/00662/CPD For information only. No consultation.	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed 3 x 2 rear extensions is lawful. Hurst Place Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9AA Mr G Papazoglou	

Application Number	Current Planning Applications Spheres of Mutual Interest	Parish Council Decision
<p>22/06443/FULEA</p> <p>Comments to Buckinghamshire council by <b>09/04/23</b> Circulated prior to meeting</p>	<p><b>AMENDED/ADDITIONAL PLANS</b> have been received in respect of the above proposal which is a Major Application and is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Full planning permission for production space and supporting buildings for screen-based media and associated services/industries. The development of approximately 168,718 sqm GEA total floorspace comprising : sound stages, workshops , office accommodation, studio hub associated outdoor space such as backlots and unit bases; entrance structures and reception; security infrastructure, mobility hub; cafes; parking; bridge; incidental supporting buildings; associated infrastructure; public art; upgraded vehicular access onto Marlow Road; new cycle and pedestrian accesses; a new cultural/educational/recreational building; a new community building and associated landscaping, publicly accessible recreational land and ecological and environmental enhancements/habitat creation.</p> <p>Land Adjacent South Side Marlow Road And A404 Junction Westhorpe Park Little Marlow Buckinghamshire</p>	<p><b>Response sent via email to Bucks CC 6/4/23:</b> Cookham Parish Council has considered the changes made to the application but reaffirms its decision to <b>OBJECT</b> on the basis of its original points.</p>

Application Number	Current Applications for Tree Works.	Parish Council Decision
<p>23/00204/TPO</p> <p>App date 03/03/23 Comments to RBWM 10/4/23.Extension agreed until EOB 12/4/23</p>	<p>(T1 &amp; T2) Hornbeam - Remove Ivy. (T3-T19) Ash - Fell infected trees. (T20) Sycamore (dead) - Fell. (T22) Sycamore - Fell. Hazel - Coppice. (003/2009/TPO) Woodland At Junction of Long Lane And Spring Lane Cookham Dean Maidenhead Mr Phil Sermon</p>	<p>CPC do not positively object but do wish to comment that felling trees with ash dieback is not the recommend method of dealing with the problem in all cases.</p>
<p>23/00497/TPO</p> <p>App date 13/3/23 Comments to RBWM by14/4/23</p>	<p>Identical works to T1 (Hornbeam), T2 (Walnut), T4 (Horse Chestnut). Crown reduce height by 2m, leaving approximately 10m. Reduce spread by 4m, leaving approximately 8m. Provide 3m clearance from shed. (016/2007/TPO) Ms Venessa Montero Wychwood, High Road, Cookham SL6 9JF</p>	<p><b>No Comment</b></p>
<p>23/00595/TPO</p> <p>App date 07/3/23. Comments to RBWM 25/4/23</p>	<p>T1 - Beech - Fell. (005/1964/TPO) Silver Birch Stone House Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9TP Mr Philip Bittan</p>	<p>Do not object in principle provided the Tree Officer is content that the tree is diseased, otherwise we object. We request that a replacement tree is planted.</p>

Application Number	Current Applications for Tree Works.	Parish Council Decision
23/00594/TCA App date 07/3/23 Comments to RBWM by 10/4/23 Extension agreed until 12/4/23	(T1) Conifer - Fell. (T2) Conifer - Fell. (T3) Dead Ivy Covered Tree - Fell. (T4) Oak – Fell Melmott Lodge The Pound Cookham SL6 9QD Mr Jon Savage	<b>OBJECT</b> There appears to be no reason for felling these trees (apart from T3). T4 Oak – Request that a TPO is put on the oak tree due to the important role it has in the street scene and conservation area. If allowed, we request replacement with native species, semi mature trees.
23/00679/TCA App date 15/3/23 Comments to RBWM 25/4/23	Atlas Cedar - Prune to reduce lateral crown extent by approximately 3m on southwest, northwest, northeast, southeast, and aspects. Remove deadwood and stubs left over from previous pruning. Two rubbing branches in crown interior represent a potential weak point. Remove sub-dominant crossing stem to address this defect. Regency Cottage The Pound Cookham SL6 9QD Mrs Lilian Dubois	<b>No Comment</b>

#### 4. RBWM Decisions:

22/03391/Full	The Bosket Halldore Hill, Cookham, SL6 9eX	Permitted
23/00032/Full	7 Halfway Houses, Maidenhead, SL6 6PP	Decline to determine
23/00037/Full	Ashton Alleyns Lane, Cookham, SL6 9AE	Permitted
23/00063/TCA	Byford, Berries Road, Cookham, SL6 9SD	Permitted
23/00089/CPD	Hurst Place, Bradcutts Lane, Cookham Dean, SL6 9AA	Permitted
23/00187/Full	Cherry Stones, Grange Road, Cookham, SL6 9TH	Permitted
23/00217/TCA	Wyx Cottages Startins Lane, Cookham, SL6 9AN	Permitted
23/00229/Full	Chapman Orchard, Winter Hill, Cookham, SL6 9TT	Permitted
23/00244/CONDIT	Cherry Tree Cottage, Cookham Dean Common, Cookham, SL6 9NZ	Approved
23/00389/CPD	1 Overton Cottages, Kings Lane, Cookham, SL6 9BA	Permitted
23/00498/NMA	114 Broom Hill Cookham SL6 9LQ	Permitted
23/00387/TCA	Pound House The Pound Cookham SL6 9QD	Permitted
23/00212/Full	Oak Cottage, Graham Road, Cookham, SL6 9JQ	Permitted
23/00218/Full	Hamilton Lodge, Dean Lane, Cookham, SL6 9AF	Refuse
23/00268/Full	Inglenook, Lower Road, Cookham, SL6 9HW	Permitted
22/02810/Full	Riverdene, Sutton Road, Cookham, SL6 9SN	Permitted
22/03414/TPO	Round Copse, Alleyns Lane, Cookham, SL6 9AE	Permitted
23/00045/CONDIT	Old Timbers, The Pound, Cookham, SL6 9QE	Approved
23/00049/ CONDIT	Duncryne 5 Vicarage Close, Cookham, SL6 9SE	Approved
23/00059/TCA	Five Elms, Popes Lane, Cookham, SL6 9NY	Permitted
23/00113/Full	2 Pound Farm Cottages Terrys Ln Cookham, SL6 9RU	Permitted
23/00242/CPD	Mickleham Cottage, Dean Lane, Cookham, SL6 9AH	Permitted
23/00299/Full	Grasmere School Lane, Cookham, SL6 9QJ	Permitted

**6. TO DISCUSS RECENT CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING 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 CONSIDER NEXT STEPS:**

A response from the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority are now on the planning portal. The EA has objected to the development and have asked for further information; however, it is unclear whether they are full aware of the retrospective nature of the application and the potential damage already caused.

Approval was given for Cllr B. Perry to draft a letter to the RBWM Chief Executive, and cc the Head of Planning, to seek immediate refusal of the application and to refer to the retrospective nature of the application, the damage already done and previous correspondence on the matter.

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

The Stakeholder Masterplan Document (SMD) was approved by RBWM Cabinet on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2023 despite contrary representation from Ward Borough Cllrs, Troy Planning + Design on behalf of CPC and a member of the public.

**8. CHAIRMAN'S SUBMISSIONS:**

There were no submissions.

The next Planning Committee meeting will be on 2<sup>nd</sup> May.

**The Meeting closed at 9.25pm.**