

**COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL****Minutes of a Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Community Room at Cookham Library on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2024, commencing at 7.30pm.**

**PRESENT:** Cllr J Edwards (Acting Chairman)  
Cllrs, E. Bune, T. Caen, R. Kellaway and H. Fleming  
Mr D. Scarff

**Also Present:** There were 8 members of the public present.  
No members of the press were present.

In the absence of Cllr Perry and in her capacity as Vice Chairman, Cllr J. Edwards chaired the meeting.

**OPEN FORUM:**

Several residents spoke in opposition to pl/ap 23/03209/Full - Briar Cottage and Holmwood, Briar Glen, Cookham. There are still considerable concerns about this new application which does not address issues highlighted in the previous applications for this site: 20/02193 (withdrawn) and 22/01452 (refused).

The applicants of pl/ap 24/00003 - Trelawney Jobs Lane Cookham, spoke in support of their application. The applicant had sought pre-planning advice, had adapted his plans and then been told by the Planning Office that the application wouldn't be support due to Green Belt issues. In general Cllrs were in agreement that the application site is hidden, and the building change would not be overbearing.

**1. APOLOGIES:**

Apologies were received from Cllr C. Aisladie, L. Austin, B. Perry and J. Moore,

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:**

Cllr J. Edwards	23/03209/Full	Personal
	24/00197/Full	Personal
	24/00055/TPO	Personal
Cllr R. Kellaway	24/00170/Full	Personal

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

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
23/03209/Full App date 27/12/23 Comments to RBWM 01/2/24 Extension for comments 14/2/24.	Construction of 3no.dwellings with associated parking and landscaping following demolition of the existing 2no.dwellings. Briar Cottage And Holmwood Briar Glen Cookham Mr Mark Longworth	<b>OBJECTION</b>  (see below for detailed response)

**OBJECTION - 23/03209/Full**

It has considered this further application, again for three houses, on this plot. Though it notes the changes, it does not consider that the application addresses satisfactorily (basically because it is still quite simply trying to cram too many dwellings onto this plot) the objections raised by this Council to the previous application and the reasons for refusal of that application given by RBWM, which were upheld on appeal. Accordingly, this application should be rejected for similar reasons.

(Continued on next page)

**OBJECTION - 23/03209/Full (continued)**

The Parish Council notes that the Inspector, when rejecting the appeal against the previous refusal (App 22/01452 – ref APP/TO355/w/23/3315239), noted in paras 4 and 5 that: “A significant feature of the appeal site is the established garden with many trees and shrubs which together with the comfortable distance between the existing dwellings creates a green, verdant, and spacious appearance which is compatible with the existing character at this end of the road and makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area.” This backs up many of the following points.

Basically, the proposal is simply over-development. In para 9 of the cited report the Inspector said that “the proposed development would appear unduly cramped on the site, would not sit comfortably in its surroundings, and would undermine the existing spacious character. As a result, plots 2 and 3 would appear as discordant features that would look harmfully out of place”. Despite the changes, the same is true of the current application. This too backs up many of the comments below.

The Parish Council also notes that the Fire Authority is not satisfied that the access meets ADB B5. Unless and until RBWM is satisfied that it does, this application should be rejected for that reason alone.

The Parish Council considers it plain that this proposed development will not “positively contribute to the place[ ] in which [it is] located, contrary to ALP Policy QP1.1 but on the contrary would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and so would conflict with Policy QP3 of the ALP which seeks to ensure that new development respects local character (see below).

The Parish Council notes that ALP paragraph 6.12.5 notes expressly that: “... The local importance of design and the need to respond to an area is something that is very important to residents as demonstrated in the Cookham Village Design Statement [“the VDS”] ...”. The general policy/guidance in the VDS is specifically applied to Cookham Rise by G8.1. The Parish Council considers that this dense development contravenes:

VDS G6.1 (it will not ‘sit comfortably in [its] surroundings’ which single storey and are not dense; nor does it “respect ... the spacing of buildings which characterise the area”);

G6.4 (it does not “respect the rural or semi-rural character of Cookham and avoid ‘creeping urbanisation’);

G6.6 (in that ‘new developments involving several dwellings should be adequately spaced, with attractive layouts ... that relate in a vernacular manner to the appearance of neighbouring parts ...’ which these three are/do not);

G6.8 (“The spacing of buildings should follow the pattern of building in the immediate and nearby area” which this development does not);

G6.11 which is a similar requirement to “match the style of other buildings in the ... area”;

G6.16: the parking design is not “discreet” and does not avoid “visually dominant hard-standings at the front of houses”; and

G6.21: The site plan shows no front gardens for plots 2 and 3.

For all those reasons and generally, the proposal also does not comply with ALP QP3.1, especially (b), (e), (h), (i), (k), (m).

No ecology report has been produced for the application.

The Parish Council sees no evidence that there is any biodiversity gain on this site from the plans, contrary to ALP Policy NR2 1(a), 3, 4, 5, and considers it plain that this proposal not just does not but cannot meet Monitoring Indicator 9 which requires that “All developments to result in biodiversity net gain (at least 10%)”.

(Continued on next page)

**OBJECTION - 23/03209/Full (continued)**

The Parish Council notes that in the cited appeal decision, the inspector also stated that the proposed development would conflict with Policy QP3 of the RBWM Borough local plan 2013-2033 and also the principles 7.1 and 7.6 of the BWDG. It would also be at odds with the Cookham Village Design Statement and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character (It is noted that since the appeal decision, the NPPF has been updated and this now places a greater emphasis on high quality design for new development). In the Parish Council's opinion, all of this remains true of the new application.

The site lies in an area at medium risk from surface water flooding: see [www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk](http://www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk), RBWM strategic flood risk assessment 2017 and Paras 165 et seq. of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 states that inappropriate development in areas from a risk of flooding should be avoided. Plots 2 and 3 in particular appear to be affected.

The Parish Council considers it a fallacy to suggest that there are currently two dwellings on the site. Briar Cottage is, it considers, merely an annex to Holmwood. In that respect, Briar Cottage does not have its own vehicular access and has no defined curtilage; nor can it operate independently of the main house, Holmwood.

Further, the Parish Council remains concerned by highway safety in that the junction of Briar Glen with High Road is already dangerous because of the haphazard parking of cars near the junction. The addition of significantly more vehicles using this junction can only make the situation more dangerous.

Finally, the Parish Council understands that the plans attached to the application show the site as incorporating some of land which in fact belongs to a third party. If so, the application is misleading and incapable of complying with any basis on which it is presented.

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Current Planning Applications</b>	<b>Parish Council Decision</b>
24/00003/FULL App date 08/1/22 Comments to RBWM 05/2/24 Extension for comments 14/2/24	Raising of the eaves and ridge to create a new first floor with 2no. rear Juliet balconies, external staircase, and changes to the external finish to the existing detached garage. Trelawney Jobs Lane Cookham SL6 9TX Mr David Bateson	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>  Provided this building remains ancillary to the main dwelling.  The Cmte asked for this application to be 'Called in' to Panel if Officers recommendation was Refuse.
23/03123/FULL App date 08/1/22 Comments to RBWM 06/2/24 Extension for comments 14/2/24	Single storey side extension with chimney, access ramp to sunken courtyard. Winter Hill Barn Winter Hill Cookham SL6 9TW Mr K Wood	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>  but CPC request that wildlife friendly lighting is used.
24/00129/FULL App date 15/1/22 Comments to RBWM 14/2/24	Two storey front extension, single storey rear extension and enlargement of existing dropped kerb. 139 Whyteladies Lane Cookham SL6 9LF Mr Evans	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
24/00154/FULL App date 22/1/22 Comments to RBWM 20/2/24	First & second floor side/rear extension and 1 no. dormer to the balcony door Wyx Cottage Startins Lane Cookham SL6 9AN Mr & Mrs Ronald	<b>NO COMMENT</b>

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
24/00190/FULL App date 22/1/22 Comments to RBWM 21/2/24	Alterations to fenestration to include 1no. rear Juliet balcony. Fieldfare Startins Lane Cookham SL6 9AN Mr And Mrs W And S Arnold	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
24/00170/FULL App date 19/1/22 Comments to RBWM 22/2/24	Installation of 32 no. PV panels Delta House Terrys Lane Cookham SL6 9RR Mr Peter Read	<b>NO COMMENT</b>
24/00197/FULL App date 29/1/22 Comments to RBWM 26/2/24	Relocation of front entrance door, two storey side extension and alterations to fenestration. The Retreat 10 Lower Road Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9HF Mr A Sprules	CPC wish to draw attention to the block plan as it appears to be inaccurate. The neighbouring property is close to their boundary, and changes to this property will reduce the space between buildings further, contrary to VDS guidance G6.8 – visual spacing.
24/00169/VAR App date 19/1/22 Comments to RBWM 20/2/24	Variation (under Section 73A) of Condition 2 (Materials as specified and tile type) and Condition 3 (Approved plans) to substitute those plans approved under 22/02255/FULL for Single storey side extension, raising of the eaves and ridge to create a new first floor with a new front entrance canopy, replacement garage roof and alterations to fenestration, following demolition of the existing single storey side element with amended plans. Brinsddale Terry Lane, Cookham, SL6 9RZ Mr and Mrs Elliott	<b>No Objection</b> on condition that the size of the house will not increase to more than that of the approved plans.  CPC feel this application is unclear and that variations should be clearly and specifically identified.
24/00050/VAR App date 05/1/24 Comments to RBWM N/A	Variation (under Section 19) of Condition 7 to substitute those plans approved under 23/00854/LBC for the Consent for essential maintenance including re-painting of steelwork, structural bearing replacement, structural strengthening, re-waterproofing, re-surfacing and expansion joint replacement with amended plans. Cookham Bridge, Sutton Road, Cookham Mr Simon Lymn	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>  We would like to remind RBWM that we request that comprehensive research is done to establish the original colour of the bridge and that it is repainted in that original colour.
24/00022/PDXL App date 09/1/24 Comments to RBWM N/A	Single storey rear extension no greater than 6.00m in depth, 3.00m high with an eaves height of 3.00m. Rose Cottage Kings Lane Cookham SL6 9TZ Mr And Mrs T And J Wilson	<b>RBWM Decision 13/2/24 -</b> Prior Approval Not Required

Application Number	Notices for Information Only	Parish Council Decision
24/00105/Condit App date 11/01/24 Comments to RBWM N/A	Details required by Condition 5 (RAMS) and 6 (Biodiversity enhancements) of Planning Permission 23/02554 for New front entrance, single storey rear extension, part two storey, part first floor, part single storey front/side/rear extension with Juliet balcony, garage and loft conversion, 2no. rear dormers and alterations to fenestration following the demolition of the existing conservatory. Ainsdale 12 Sutton Close Cookham SL6 9QU Mr And Mrs S Peet	n/a

Application Number	Current Applications for Tree Works.	Parish Council Decision
24/00055/TPO App date 10/01/24 Comments to RBWM 08/02/24 Extension requested.	(T.2) Ash - Large limb overhanging garden to be reduced back to form pollard knuckle. (004/2000/TPO) Darbys Church Road Cookham Dean SL6 9PR Mr Michael Andrews. Tree Officer replied that a TPO is not required.	NO COMMENT
24/00301/TCA App date 2/02/24 Comments to RBWM 05/03/24	(T1) Eucalyptus - Crown reduce by approximately 4m (as shown) Ridgemount, Church Road Cookham Dean SL6 9PJ Julie Sneddon	NO COMMENT

#### 4. RBWM Decisions:

23/02853/Full	Ebury Cottage, Station Road, Cookham, SL6 9BU	Permitted
23/02551/TCA	Moonbeams Cottage, Hill Lane, Cookham, SL6 9NX	Permitted
23/02554/Full	Ainsdale, 12 Sutton Close, Cookham, SL6 9QU	Permitted
23/02711/Full	Cherry Bank, Maidenhead Road, Cookham, SL6 9DB	Permitted
23/02673/CONDIT	Green Banks Stone House Lane Cookham SL6 9TP	Approved
23/02975/CPD	Autumn Orchard Sutton Road Cookham SL6 9SY	Permitted
23/03002/TCA	Saddleback School Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9PQ	Permitted
23/02539/Full	Silver Birches, Startins Lane, Cookham, SL6 9TS	Permitted
23/02951/Full	Coney Meadow, Spade Oak Reach, Cookham, SL6 9RQ	Refuse
23/02883/Full	Round Copse Alleyns Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9AE	Withdrawn
23/02539/Full	Silver Birches, Startins Lane, Cookham, SL6 9TS	Permitted
23/02964/Full	Orchard End Maidenhead Road Cookham SL6 9DA	Withdrawn
23/02907/TPO	Siskins, Church Rd, Cookham Dean	Permitted
23/03028/CONDIT	Old Timbers, The Pound, Cookham (Condition 11)	Approved
23/03029/CONDIT	Old Timbers, The Pound, Cookham (Condition 6)	Approved
23/03177/CPD	Hurst Place, Bradcutts Lane, Cookham Dean	Refused

#### 5. TO RECEIVE ANY UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES FOR THE LAND AT CANNONDOWN ROAD (BLP SITE AL37, PL/APS 23/02022/OUT AND 23/02019/OUT) AND TO CONSIDER ANY FURTHER STEPS:

The developer has notified the council that revised plans have been submitted. Nothing yet has been updated on the RBWM planning website by the Planning Authority. The Clerk will update Cllrs as an when the notification arrives.

There was nothing further to report.

#### 6. 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 was nothing further to report.

#### 7. TO PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON HEAVY GOODS VEHICLE LICENCES AT THE LOWER MOUNT FARM SITE:

There were no further updates.

After a discussion regarding the background to this item and the length of administration time it takes, a proposal to take no further action and remove this item from subsequent agendas and was approved by majority.

#### 8. CHAIRMAN'S SUBMISSIONS

None.

The meeting closed at 8.35pm