

COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of a Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Community Room at
Cookham Library on Tuesday 13th June 2023, commencing at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Cllr J. Edwards (Acting Chairman)
 Cllrs L. Austin, E. Bune, T. Caen, R. Kellaway, J. Moore and H. Pleming.

Also Present: There were approx. 50 members of the public present.
 Cllrs M. Howard, M. Brar and L. Tull
 No members of the press were present.

OPEN FORUM:

Further to the presentation by Bellway representatives at last week's Full Council meeting, Cllr M. Howard made a presentation outlining the history of the site with regards to the actions Cookham Parish Council has taken. This included the work that had been done and the consistency of the objections that had been given at every opportunity over approximately 7 years throughout all the stages of the Borough Local Plan process. During that time the Parish Council has engaged the services of a Planning Consultant to receive professional advice.

The Parish Council actively took part in the year long, Bellway Stakeholder Masterplan process and gave feedback at all stages.

It was noted that although investigations on the legality of some of the Boroughs decisions regarding the BLP and SMD processes appear to be taking place by a number of different parties, there would need to be a very strong case to halt the BLP, or any associated developments, due in part, to the significant financial implication.

Cllr Howard went on to explain how money from the development (S106 Developers contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy) would be used within Cookham to fund infrastructure projects. It is important that strong negotiation is needed to get the best outcome possible and enable the Borough, in conjunction with the Parish, to deal with some of the most crucial infrastructure issues.

Residents were urged to get involved with the Neighbourhood Plan process, as well as any further stages of the planning process or future reiterations of the BLP.

There was an opportunity for questions after the presentation.

This section of the meeting concluded at 8.30pm

The applicant of pl/ap 23/01193/FULL, Ratty's Hole, Spade Oak Reach spoke in support of his application and to give further information to its status as a dwelling.

On the approval of the committee, Cllr J. Edwards chaired the meeting.

1. APOLOGIES:

Apologies received from Cllrs C. Aisladie, B. Perry and Mr D Scarff

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Cllr R. Kellaway	pl/ap 23/01141/Full	Personal
Cllr J. Moore	pl/ap 23/01141/Full	Pecuniary
Cllr J. Moore	pl/ap 23/01373/Full	Personal

3. PLANS TO BE CONSIDERED AND DISCUSSED:

APPEAL :	
Appeal By:	David Howells c/o Agent: Boyer Planning Wokingham Crowthorne House Nine Mile Ride WOKINGHAM Berkshire RG40 3GZ
Site Address:	Station Court, High Road Cookham Maidenhead 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.
PINS Ref:	APP/T0355/W/22/3310141
RBWM PI/ap:	21/02331/OUT
RBWM Decision:	21/06/2022 – Refused
CPC Comment 23/8/21:	
The Parish Council objects to this application because:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	

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.

Submitted by email on 6th June 2023 – RATIFIED at the meeting 13th June 2023

Further Submission to Planning Inspector regarding additional evidence only:

Cookham Parish Council:

1. Repeats all its original objections to these plans (varied as appropriate in the light of the change from two terraced buildings to a single block – by definition more solid and bulky) for the reasons it gave before;
2. Specifically re-emphasises its objections to the ridge height of the proposed building which is over-bearing and inappropriate on this site for the reasons it gave originally, including also VDS 6.11;
3. In the light of the need to reduce the amount of parking spaces required (VDS 6.16) and allow for larger green frontage and green spaces within the site (see VDS original objections 4 and 5, varied slightly in view of the amended plans but still fully valid) objects to the number of dwellings within the proposal, which should be reduced to five hence permitting compliance with the VDS policies cited previously in those objections and with the BWDG.
4. In the light of the ridge height and bulk objections objects to homes larger than 3 x 2 beds and 2 x 3 beds. Dwellings of this size, besides reducing the bulk and height, would also make the dwellings as affordable as possible in view of the undoubted need for affordable homes in Cookham.
5. Points out the vital need, should permission be granted despite its objections, for the bricks and tiles used to match those of the existing terrace houses nearby or resemble others in the area – see in particular VDS policies 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.11.
6. We understand that this area was once used as a coal yard and request that appropriate investigation regarding decontamination of the site will take place.
7. Notes in respects of bats specifically that a 'desktop survey' is by its nature limited and this one seems to have been selective: the pictures in the report only show closeups of the more modern flat roof part of the building. Bats are very common in Cookham Rise: they can be seen out and about in many places in the Rise at dusk. There are, to the personal knowledge of commenting Councillors, bats living in some of the properties in, for example, Graham Road, which is closer than the 670 metres quoted in the report. Hence in order to be satisfied as to the absence of bats at the site, a full and comprehensive survey by an independent ecologist is required, and until this is done the position as to bats has not been adequately resolved. Hence permission should not currently be granted.

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 **on the additional evidence only**, 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 8th June 2023.

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
23/01193/FULL App date: 18/5/23 Comments to RBWM by 15/6/23	Replacement dwelling. Rattys Hole Spade Oak Reach Cookham SL6 9RQ Mr And Mrs Howard	NO OBJECTION
23/01192/FULL App date: 16/5/23 Comments to RBWM by 15/6/23	2no. front bay windows, single storey side/rear extension, first floor side/rear extension and alterations to the external finish and fenestration Longshaw 2 Lower Road Cookham SL6 9HF Mr And Mrs Harry Bond	OBJECTION on the grounds of bulk at the rear of the property and that the style of the front windows is out of keeping with the street scene and the adjoining property.
23/01265/FULL App date: 23/5/23 Comments to RBWM by 27/6/23	Single storey side extension with new canopy, first floor side/front extension and alterations to fenestration. Honeypots School Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9PQ Freya And Josh Young	NO OBJECTION

Application Number	Current Planning Applications	Parish Council Decision
23/01141/FULL App date: 31/5/23 Comments to RBWM by 28/6/23	Ground floor side infill, first floor side/rear extension, side/rear roof terrace on top of existing orangery with rear external staircase, 1 x front, 1 x side and 1 x rear dormer window, 1 x side rooflight and alterations to fenestration. Garage side extension and conversion with 2 x front dormer windows and 2 x rear rooflights. Landscaping, new steps, widened access and driveway. Wyx Cottage Startins Lane Cookham SL6 9AN Mr & Mrs Ronald	NO OBJECTION
23/01341/FULL App date: 30/5/23 Comments to RBWM by 29/6/23	Replacement of dwelling and annexe and relocation of vehicular access. Harwood Acre Spring Lane Cookham Dean SL6 6PW Mr Paul Spencer	NO OBJECTION subject to an archaeology survey and investigated as detailed in previous application 22/02981/FULL for this site.
23/01261/FULL App date: 24/5/23 Comments to RBWM by 30/6/23	First floor rear extension 8 Hamfield Cottages Lower Road Cookham SL6 9HQ Mr G Spencer	NO OBJECTION
23/01373/FULL App date: 7/6/23 Comments to RBWM by 5/7/23	New external staircase, hip to gable, raising of the eaves and 1no. front dormer to create accommodation within the roofspace of the existing detached garage. Grasmere Cedar Drive Cookham SL6 9DZ Mrs Doreen Webster	NO OBJECTION

Application Number	Notices for Information Only	Parish Council Decision
23/01335/CPD App date 31/5/23 No Consultation	Amended Plan: Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration is lawful. 1 Bass Mead Cookham SL6 9DJ Mr And Mrs Nicolle	
23/01388/CPD App date 6/6/23 No Consultation	Amended Plan: Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the 5no. two storey rear extensions is lawful. Hurst Place Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9AA Mr G Papazoglou	

Application Number	Current Applications for Tree Works.	Parish Council Decision
23/01075/TCA App date 19/5/23 Comments to RBWM 3/7/23	Ash - prune branches overhanging Dene Hollow, back to the boundary line. Willow Bank Cookham Dean Bottom Cookham SL6 9AR Mrs Rachel McEvoy	NO OBJECTION
23/01266/TCA App date 22/5/23 Comments to RBWM 21/06/23	(T1 and T2) Leylandii - Fell. The Grove Odney Lane Cookham SL6 9SR Mr Mills	NO OBJECTION
23/01296/TPO App date 1/6/23 Comments to RBWM 3/07/23	(T1) Deodar Cedar - fell.(005/1964/TPO). The Bower Stone House Lane Cookham SL6 9TP Mr Paul Little	OBJECTION on the grounds of not enough evidence that the tree is damaging the wall. Please refer to the Tree Officer.

Application Number	Current Applications for Tree Works.	Parish Council Decision
23/00949/TPO App date 19/5/23 Comments to RBWM 20/06/23	T1 - Robina - Reduce main stem down to fork and tip back other stem's by approx 1.5m - in decline. T3 - Walnut group of three - Fell. T4 - Pine - Fell - dead. T5 and T6 - Ash - Fell - dead. (004/2000/TPO) Darbys Church Road Cookham Dean SL6 9PR Mr Roberts	OBJECTION to felling T3 – Walnut Tree as not enough information has been provided. NO OBJECTION to other trees. CPC request replacement planting.
23/01249/TCA App date 30/5/23 Comments to RBWM 27/06/23	Silver Birch - remove; Crab Apple - remove and Apple Tree crown thin by 50%. Old Solomons Cottage Dean Lane Cookham SL6 9AF Mr Andrew Dorrat	OBJECTION to the felling of the Silver Birch and Crab Apple Trees. Not enough information has been provided and there will be a loss of habitat for wildlife.
23/01316/TCA App date 30/5/23 Comments to RBWM 28/06/23	T1 - Eucalyptus - Crown reduction by up to 33% as per line indicated on submitted photograph. Amberley 4 Vicarage Cl Cookham SL6 9SE Mrs Annette Garnham	NO OBJECTION

4. RBWM Decisions:

23/00813/TCA	Dean Cottage And Ivy Cottage Cookham Dean Bottom Cookham Maidenhead	Permitted
23/00567/TCA	Stone House Stone House Lane Cookham SL6 9TP	Permitted
23/00730/FULL	Orchard Cottage Station Road Cookham SL6 9BU	Permitted
23/00799/TCA	Crossways Kings Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9AY	Permitted
23/00767/FULL	Rosemary School Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9QJ	Refuse
23/00850/CONDIT	Old Timbers The Pound Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9QE	Approve
23/00914/FULL	2 Cliveden View Sutton Road Cookham SL6 9RD	Permitted
23/01037/TCA	Regency Cottage The Pound Cookham SL6 9QD	Permitted

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 have been no further communications regarding the planning application.

It has been noted by residents that since the trees and hedges have been removed that the area is now subject to surface water flooding.

7. 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:

The agenda for the next Maidenhead Development Management Committee panel has been issued today but does not include this application. The Clerk has queried this with the Planning Authority and has since received an email from the Head of Planning to say he is sending a letter to explain the situation, which was due after this meeting.

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

Since the last meeting representatives from Bellway and Turley have given their presentation to the Full Council Meeting on the 6th June. There were approximately 40 members of the public at the meeting. Following that meeting further questions had been raised on social media and Cllr M. Howard had spoken in open forum at this meeting.

It is anticipated that their planning application will be submitted to the Planning Authority around the end of June.

9. CHAIRMAN'S SUBMISSIONS:

None.

The Meeting closed at 9.20pm.