

COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of an Inquorate Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE
Held in the Community Room on Tuesday 11th October 2022, commencing at 7.30pm.**

PRESENT: Cllr E. Bune (Acting Chairman)
Cllrs L. Austin
Mr D. Scarff

Also Present: 7 members of the public.
No members of the press were present.

Prior to the start of the meeting the Clerk made the attendees aware that this meeting of the Planning Committee was not quorate, 4 Committee members are required. This means that no decisions could be made, however comments on the planning applications listed within this agenda could still be made and forwarded to the Planning Authority for their consideration as the decision makers.

Cllr E. Bune Chaired the meeting.

OPEN FORUM:

Five members of the public spoke in objection to pl/ap 22/02467/Full Rosemary, School Lane, Cookham. In principle, whilst in favour of the house being rebuilt, they felt this should be achieved in a manner that was more sympathetic to the area and size of the plot.

Two members of the public spoke in support of pl/ap 22/02553/Full 114 Broom Hill, Cookham.

The Committee agreed to move pl/ap's, 22/02467/Full and 22/02553/Full to the top of the agenda.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies received from Cllrs C. Aisladie, M. Barnes, B. Perry, J. Perry, P. Roe and I. Wernham. Cllr I. Herd did not attend.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

None.

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

Appeal By: CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd c/o Agent: Mr James Reilly C/O Mr Gallivan
14 Inverleith Place Edinburgh EH3 5PZ

Site Address: Verge At Junction of Mill Lane And Sutton Road Cookham Maidenhead

Proposal: Application for determination as to whether prior approval is required for proposed 5G telecoms installation: H3G Phase 8 15m high street pole c/w wrap-around cabinet and 3 further additional equipment cabinets.

Plns Ref: APP/T0355/W/22/3299971

RBWM PI/ap: 21/03688/TLDTT

Appeal to be decided on the basis of an exchange of Written Representations. Previously submitted comments have been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate and appellant(s). Further comments to be made to the Planning Inspectorate website at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> or by emailing west3@planninginspectorate.gov.uk Comments to be received by the Planning Inspectorate no later than 12 October 2022.

CPC Comment: 11/01/2022 – Objection. (see below)

RBWM Decision: Refused

Cookham Parish Council OBJECTS to the mast in this location, and considers that it should not be permitted because:

1. The applicant has rated its location by reference to the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Development in England. As an admittedly 'amber' site under that Code (see application documents), Appendix C is clear that the applicant should at Stage 3 (pre-application site specific community consultation) have written to consult the Ward Councillors and the Parish Council to obtain feedback prior to the application. Neither has been done. Accordingly the applicant is in breach of the Code on which it relies, and this should not be permitted.
2. Though the Parish Council cannot speak directly to this, it appears from the application (item 2, pre-application check list) that the applicant has also breached its obligation to consult the LPA officers at Stages 2 (a) and (b) as per the same code.
3. The Parish Council understands that Holy Trinity School was also not notified of the application, again in breach of the applicant's obligations, until after the application was made so has had little or no chance to respond.
4. The Parish Council considers that under the Code this should be assessed as a red site.
5. The failure to consult as per the Code means that the application is in breach of NPPF paragraph 115, which requires "the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development." This includes "(a) the outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college". No such evidence is presented, because no such consultation has taken place.
6. There is no evidence that the applicant has properly considered alternative sites, whether from a technological or planning perspective. On the contrary as set out above and below, it appears not to have done so. In those circumstances, this should not be permitted.
7. The application is also in breach of paragraph 113 of the NPPF which requires that: "the equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate." This mast is within a very few yards (well within the buffer zone) of the Cookham High Street Conservation Area, so that requirement of the NPPF is particularly relevant here. The mast is neither sympathetically designed, nor is there any attempt at camouflage. On the contrary it towers over the nearby dwellings (about 2.5 times their height) and is significantly higher than either of the (only two) nearest trees. It would be a blatant eyesore right at the entrance to the Conservation Area.
8. Similarly, paragraph 115 of the NPPF also requires that applications "should be supported by the necessary evidence ... (c) that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure ...". Again, no such evidence has been presented.
9. The mast would be in blatant breach of the Borough Wide Design Guide which requires in respect of utilities by Principle 9.4.2 that: "All such development should be designed in a high quality manner to ... minimise visual prominence." It would be undisguised and visually highly prominent in a way quite out of character with Cookham Village and the Conservation Area it would abut.
10. Policy QP3(b) of the Emerging BLP requires that new development "respects and enhances the local, natural or historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to ... height, skylines, scale, bulk, massing, trees ...". The point is emphasised in paragraphs 6.12.1, 2 and 3. This mast breaches that policy because it does none of those things. A disruptive construction like this is particularly offensive so close to the Stanley Spencer Gallery.
11. Paragraph 6.12.5 of the Emerging BLP specifically references the Cookham Village Design Statement ("the VDS"). Paragraph 13.3 of the VDS expressly states that "care needs to be taken to ensure that masts are blended into the landscape as far as possible"; Guidance G13.7 of the VDS is also clear that "Masts should always be visually integrated into their surroundings to the maximum possible extent. To that end they should ... Be designed in a minimalist way, muted in colour and accompanied by sensitive planting where appropriate." This proposed mast breaches all of those principles.
12. Granted its location within the buffer zone of the Cookham High Street Conservation Area, literally across the road from the Area, the mast appears to be a breach of policy HE1 of the Emerging BLP which states that: "The historic environment will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to its significance." Paragraph 11.2.1 aims at "ensuring that development proposals respect ... the sense of place. The historic environment is irreplaceable and meeting this objective is essential ...".
13. By the same token, this appears to be a breach of Emerging BLP Policy CA2. This requires that any development in a Conservation Area will enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the area. This mast for the reasons given could hardly be described as enhancing or preserving the area.
14. The application also appears misleading in that it is described as a 5G mast whereas in fact it will also transmit 4G. This is an important difference in terms of its range, and accordingly locational possibilities. It is also relevant to radiation issues: 4G being the subject of considerably more studies which appear to show it is safe than 5G which remains unproven and is the subject of significant research showing cause for concern (see e.g. Richard N Kostoff; Martin Pall; et al.). Having a substantial 5G transmitter so close to dwellings, especially bedrooms where occupants will be for a substantial period of the day, is significant cause for health concern and should not be permitted in the current state of knowledge.
15. On the other hand there is significant research which indicates that 5G radiation is harmful to bees and other insects (see e.g. Thielens, Bell, Mortimore, Greco, Martens & Joseph; Cucurachi; Sharma & Kumar; Kumar; Sahib). This mast would be very close to allotments, where bees are kept, so would be more than usually harmful to important species.
16. The cabinets at the base of the mast contain fans and other sources of noise which operate 24 hours a day. Having such cabinets so close to dwellings would be a nuisance in the legal sense, and detrimental to the health and well-being of the occupants.

CPC Comment:

11th October 2022 - The Committee asked if the Clerk would reiterate the objection with the Planning Inspector.

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
22/02467/FULL App date 13/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 12/10/22	Replacement dwelling with associated parking, landscaping and alterations to the existing access following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings. Rosemary School Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9QJ 10 Gallon Hat Ltd	OBJECTION: (See detail below)
22/02467/FULL - OBJECTION		
<p>The Parish Council objects to this application (though not in principle to a suitable proposal) because it is contrary to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The basic principle that a site must not be overdeveloped. 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. 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 and overlooking, especially but not limited to that from the patio and the rear balcony on the second floor (= third storey). 3. Principle 7.5.3 of the BWDG in that it is 3 storeys, an increase from a bungalow, which is out of context with the adjoining and adjacent properties; 4. 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 High Street (as it is, Cookham Village as it will shortly be) Conservation Area. 5. BWDG Principle 9.1, and in particular the preference expressed there for Figure 8b over figure 7 – this appears exactly to replicate what is proposed in this application for gates and front boundary treatment – which is described on BWDG page 80 as 'normally more appropriate as side or rear boundary. This can present a 'dead' frontage to a streetscape'. This application is for a high solid wall and gate facing a street without a pavement: it will be very 'dead' and create a tunnel effect. 6. 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 the appraisal notes that in School Lane 'buildings are lower' (page 30) yet this proposal is 3 storeys; one of the 'key positives' is 'diversity of historic buildings' and one of the 'key negatives' is 'insensitive new development' (ibid). 7. Guidance in the Cookham Village Design Statement, to be precise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. G6.16: Car parking should be arranged discreetly, avoiding visually dominant hard-standings at the front of buildings. Here virtually the entire 'front garden' is in fact hard-standing for 3 cars (there being no room for a garage). G6.18: Gates should generally be of an open design to create a welcoming impression and allow views through to the property, garden ... The use of tall solid gates should be avoided. Here the frontage is entirely solid brick wall, solid gates (both vehicular and pedestrian) and part of the rest of the wall. 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 occupy in effect the entire width of the plot. 		

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
22/02421/CLU App date 07/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 06/10/22 Comment extension agreed until 12/10/22	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the existing use of sleeping accommodation for seasonal agricultural workers is lawful. Kings Coppice Farm Grubwood Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9UB Mr Tom Copas	OBJECTION No documents identified, prove when the change of use took place.
22/02511/CLU App date 14/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 18/10/22	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the existing use of sleeping accommodation for seasonal agricultural workers is lawful. Kings Coppice Farm Grubwood Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9UB Mr Tom Copas	OBJECTION No documents identified, prove when the change of use took place.
22/02490/Full App date 13/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 11/10/22 Comment extension agreed until 12/10/22	Detached home office following demolition of the existing shed. Orchardleigh Cottage Bigfrith Lane Cookham SL6 9PH Mr James Phillips	No Comment.
22/02494 /FULL App date 12/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 12/10/22	Conversion of existing carport to provide habitable accommodation and storage. Marley Cottage Bedwins Lane Cookham SL6 9PU Mr And Mrs Babcock	No Comment.
22/02437/Full App date 13/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 12/10/22	Amended Plan Single storey rear extension, enlargement of existing dormer and alterations to hardstanding and fenestration. Eastleigh Worster Rd Cookham SL6 9JG Mr And Mrs Barwick	No Comment.
22/02549/LBC App date 26/09/2022 Comments to RBWM 24/10/22	Consent for single storey rear extension, internal alterations, replacement and alterations to fenestration, x2 new rooflight to existing roof, existing ridge tiles to be rebedded, x2 new canopies over entrance doors, alterations to external finishes, new ventilation for existing cellar, replacement roof to existing outbuilding, new patio areas, landscaping, new driveway, new and alterations to boundary treatment, widening of access, x1 new manhole cover and alterations to an existing manhole cover. Old Timbers The Pound Cookham SL6 9QE Mr And Mrs S Painter	No Comment.
22/02548/Full App date 22/09/2022 Comments to RBWM 25/10/22	Single storey rear extension, replacement and alterations to fenestration, x2 new rooflight to existing roof, existing ridge tiles to be rebedded, x2 new canopies over entrance doors, alterations to external finishes, replacement roof to existing outbuilding, new patio areas, landscaping, new driveway, new and alterations to boundary treatment and widening of access. Old Timbers The Pound Cookham SL6 9QE Mr And Mrs S Painter	No Comment.

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
22/02428/CPD App date 5/09/2022 Comments to RBWM n/a	Amended Plans – Not reconsulting Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed 7no. solar panels to the front elevation and 5no. solar panels to the rear elevation is lawful Woodwards School Lane Cookham Dean Maidenhead SL6 9PQ	No Comment.
22/02465 /CPD App date 5/09/2022 Comments to RBWM n/a	Amended Plans – Not reconsulting Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed 1no. rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion is lawful. 6 Roman Lea Cookham SL6 9BZ	No Comment.
22/02553/Full App date 19/09/2022 Comments to RBWM 1/11/22	1no. refuse store and 1no. detached outbuilding following the partial demolition of the existing garage. 114 Broom Hill Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9LQ Mr Jason Gallagher	No Comment.
22/02605/Full App date 3/10/2022 Comments to RBWM 1/11/22	New carport to the Coach House Mulberry House Church Road Cookham Dean SL6 9PD Mr Gary Stevens	No Comment.
22/02539/Full App date 3/10/2022 Comments to RBWM 1/11/22	Sub-division of the existing dwelling to create x2 dwellings incorporating a single storey side extension, alterations to fenestration, new decking and boundaries Genista Cockmarsh Riverside Bourne End SL8 5RG Rachel Oliver	OBJECTION There is not enough information to make a positive comment.

Application Number	Applications for Tree Works	Parish Council Decision
22/02450/TCA App date 06/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 06/10/22	T1 - Mulberry tree - reduce height by 1m and spread by 1.5m, T2 - Holly tree - reduce height by 2m, cut back low branches by 1m, thin out by 20%, T3 - Smoke Bush - reduce by 2m back to previous pruning points. Ashton Alleyns Lane Cookham SL6 9AE Emma Cook	No Comment.
22/02429/TCA App date 05/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 06/10/22	(T1) European Silver Fir - fell and grind stump. Fieldfare Startins Lane Cookham SL6 9AN Mr Arnold	No Comment.
22/02501/TPO App date 14/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 12/10/22	(T6 & T7) Quecus Robur X 2 - crown reduce by Xm to leave a height and spread of Xm, crown lift to Xm above ground level and tip reduce (033/2000/TPO). Street Record From Spring Lane To Bigfrith Lane Cookham Dean Mr McArdle	CPC note the recent change of address for this application and that it is not within Cookham Parish.

Application Number	Applications for Tree Works	Parish Council Decision
22/02403/TPO App date 26/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 26/10/22	Conifer - fell. (030/2020/TPO) Carisbrook Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean Maidenhead SL6 9AA Mr Stephen Wray	There is no Arboricultural report attached to this application. CPC query if the tree needs to be felled.
22/02410/TPO App date 27/09/2022 Comments to RBWM by 26/10/22	(T1) Cypress- crown reduce by approximately 3-4m to leave a height of 7-8m and spread of 3m. (027/2003/TPO). Herron Court Sandpipers Place Cookham SL6 9PF Sandpipers Residents Sandpipers c/o Agent: Mr C Burnard Cedar Park Tree Care	No Comment.

RBWM Decisions:

Planning Ref:	Planning Application	RBWM Decision
22/00291/FULL	Linger in Spade Oak Reach Cookham SL6 9RQ	Permitted
22/01567/FULL	103 Broom Hill Cookham SL6 9LJ	Permitted
22/01592/TPO	Harwood House Nursing Home Spring Lane Cookham Dean SL6 6PW	Permitted
22/01706/TPO	Riverdene Sutton Road Cookham SL6 9SN	Permitted
22/00855/FULL	7 Halfway Houses Maidenhead Road Maidenhead SL6 6PP	Refused
22/01634/CPD	Bedwin House Bedwins Lane Cookham SL6 9PU	Permitted Development
22/01978/TCA	Walnut Tree Cottage Sutton Road Cookham SL6 9SY	Application withdrawn
22/01377/FULL	Land to East of Mount Lodge Spring Lane Cookham Dean	Refused
22/02283/NMA	Bedwin House Bedwins Lane Cookham SL6 9PU	Permitted
22/01296/FULL	11 Burnt Oak Cookham SL6 9RL	Permitted
22/01456/VAR	Former Dean Fam Garage Alleyns Lane Cookham	Refused
22/01645/FULL	65 Westwood Green Cookham SL6 9DE	Permitted
22/01765/FULL	Jamesville 2 Gainsborough Cookham SL6 9DR	Permitted
22/01801/CPD	Rosemount 145 Whyteladyes Lane Cookham SL6 9LF	Permitted
22/01806//FULL	Hill Grove Farm Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9AA	Refused
22/01915/FULL	Larksmead Grange Road Cookham SL6 9TH	Permitted
22/02006/TCA	Thames Lodge Berries Road Cookham	Permitted
22//02007/TCA	Moor Cottage High Street Cookham SL6 9SF	Permitted
22/02283/NMA	Bedwin House Bedwins Lane Cookham SL6 9PU	Permitted
22/01285/LBC	Kings Arms, High Street, Cookham	Permitted
22/01284/Full	Kings Arms, High Street, Cookham	Permitted
22/01756/Full	55 Westwood Green, Cookham	Refused
22/01909/Full	Fairhill Cottage, Warners Hill, Cookham	Permitted
22/01910/CPD	6 Roman Lea, Cookham	Refused
22/01938/TCA	Frays Cottage, Dean Lane Cookham Dean	Permitted
22/01932/CPD	Silver Birches Startins Lane, Cookham	Permitted
22/02116/TCA	Lindworth High Street Cookham	Permitted
22/02132/TCA	Orchardleigh Cottage, Bigfrith Lane, Cookham	Permitted
22/02181/TCA	Wyx cottage, Startins Lane, Cookham	Permitted
22/02349/NMA	64 Westwood Green, Cookham	Permitted
22/01156/OUT	Oaklands and Hope House Station Hill	Refused
22/01787/LBC	Cromwell Cottage Alleyns Lane Cookham	Withdrawn

Planning Ref:	Planning Application	RBWM Decision
22/01786/Full	Cromwell Cottage Alleyns Lane Cookham	Withdrawn
22/01862/CONDIT	Land at Lower Mount Farm and to west of unit 2b and south of Long Lane Cookham (equine stable)	Discharge of condition
22/01927/Full	6 Southwood Road, Cookham	Permitted
22/02068/Full	Grahames, Dean Lane, Cookham	Permitted
22/02081/Full	19 Coxborrow Close Cookham	Permitted
22/01646/ADV	Kings Arms, High Street, Cookham	Permitted
22/01678/Full	Gantry House, School Lane, Cookham	Permitted
22/02162/TCA	Mickleham Cottage, Dean Lane, Cookham	Permitted
22/01251/Full	Whyteladyes Rose Garden, Dean Lane Cookham	Withdrawn
22/01955/CPD	Silver Birches, Startins Lane, Cookham	Permitted Dev
22/02088/Full	Cherry Tree Cottage, Cookham Dean Common, Cookham Dean	Permitted
22/02097/Full	4 Priory Cottages, Lower Road, Cookham	Permitted

6. 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 APPROVE A PROPOSAL TO WRITE TO RBWM HEAD OF PLANNING, MR ADRIEN WAITE TO CHASE UP THE QUESTION OF WATER POLLUTION AND OTHER OUTSTANDING QUERIES FROM THE SITE:

The Clerk was aware that Cllr M. Brar, in her capacity as Borough Cllr has followed this up with the Planning Authority. RBWM are apparently still waiting for clarification of several points. There was no further information.

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

No further update/progress.

8. TO CONSIDER THE BUDGET REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE NEXT FINANCIAL YEAR, TO BE CONSIDERED BY FULL COUNCIL AND THE FINANCE CMTE:

Cllr B. Perry had previously suggested a budget provision of:

- £7,500 for Planning Consultants in connection with BLP sites AL38 and AL37.
- £10,000 to be added to a reserve for future legal costs associated with challenges with reference to inconsistent planning decisions.
- £5,000 the continued work on the Neighbourhood Plan as this will still be in progress well into financial year 2023/24.

9. CHAIRMAN'S SUBMISSIONS:

None.

The Meeting closed at 8.45pm.