

MINUTES

MEETING OF VIRTUAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY 21 October 2021 AT 6.30PM

PRESENT:

Cllr Bill Perry ("WJP") (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)
Lars Ahlgren ("LA") (WildCookham)
Dr Shez Courtney-Smith ("SCS") (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)
Dick Scarff ("DS") (Cookham Society)
Cllr Martin Coker ("MC") (Cookham Parish Council)
Cllr Ian Wernham ("IW") (Cookham Parish Council)
Cllr Mandy Brar ("MB") (Cookham Parish Council) Joined the meeting 6 mins in.
Jon Herbert ("JW") (Troy) Left the meeting after 1hour 22mins
Ben Castell ("BC") (AECOM) Left the meeting after 1hour 22mins
Giuseppe Verdone ("GV") (AECOM)
Nina Milner ("NM") (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies for meeting absences	Actions
	Cllr Chris Doyle ("CD") (Cookham Parish Council) Tim Veale ("TV") (Save Cookham) Cllr Mark Howard ("MH") (Cookham Parish Council)	
	2. Approval of minutes of meeting of 09 Sep 2021	
	The Minutes of the meeting on 09 Sep 2021 had been circulated and were approved.	
	3. Report on meeting with AECOM 27 Sep 2021 Agreement that item 6 on the agenda Consideration of AECOM design work and any appropriate decisions , would be brought forward to be covered with BC and GV, so they are able to leave the meeting once finished. A meeting took place on 27 Sep at the request of BC and GV, to go through the feedback which had been given by the CNPWP on the draft masterplan report. WJP advised that only himself, MH, LA and NM attended the 27 Sep meeting due to it being arranged at short notice. Broadly speaking it allowed BC and GV to ask questions and clarify from the initial feedback given, rather than decisions and agreements being made. BC commented that at the meeting GV shared some design for each of the sites, but these were very much in draft at that point. Since then, BC and GV felt they had a clear steer from the feedback and will present to this meeting a single option for each site, based on everything that has been said, feedback and reference to the VDS. Agreement by BC that he and GV have the same shared understanding as the CNPWP from all the discussions so far.	

	<p>6. Consideration of AECOM design work and any appropriate decisions</p> <p>BC and GV shared the updated draft masterplan report on the call and advised it was awaiting a proofread. Discussions were undertaken during the meeting on each page of the report. In particular, the meeting asked if a wider green ‘verge’ could be created on the eastern edge of development on AL37 to try to help keep the ‘open’ approach to Cookham. BC and GV said they would do their best; the issue was accommodating the density (which as with all sites is laid down by the BLP and cannot be altered by us) while keeping the open space and green corridors requested. The comments collated from the meeting will be implemented so far as possible and the updated draft masterplan report will be forwarded to WJP.</p> <p><i>Next steps:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Circulate and share the updated masterplan report to the CNPWP ○ Provide one written set of feedback/comments to AECOM which they will then investigate further ○ Arrange a meeting in the next couple of weeks to focus on the report and the feedback <p>WJP extended his thanks to Ben and Giuseppe for the great work in producing the report thus far. It is very much appreciated. BC and GV then left the meeting.</p>	BC
	<p>4. Consideration of Troy Consultation Summary Report on Second Consultation</p> <p>JH started by updating the working party with the main headliners that had come out of the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Positive support for the vision objectives and set of ideas and that we are heading in the right direction. ○ Some people suggested they felt there was a conflict between objectives 1 & 2. Objective 1 being around achieving high-quality design development and objective 2 being around protecting the environment. Troy felt that in relation to objective 1, it may be more about people not wanting development to take place, rather than the high-quality design itself. Further communication will be needed around this as to what the Neighbourhood plan can/cannot do in relation to this. ○ Quite a few comments made on capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with the pressure arising from new development, mainly in the context of the medical centre. ○ Suggestions about traffic and congestion – looking to the plan to resolve this. ○ Climate change; strengthen this. Recognize the importance of green spaces, biodiversity, and renewable energy. Make provision for future proofing the area. ○ Ideas put forward for the spending of any CIL money. <p>JH summarised that the response rate was down from the last round of consultations. He is hoping for a stronger response for the next round of consultations once the draft plan has been prepared. This should drive more response.</p> <p>WJP felt that overall people’s silence affirmed that there was nothing with which they disagreed; it is hard to get up enthusiasm for a ‘that’s fine’ response. Please will speak up when they see something with which they disagree! We should forge on and get the first draft plan produced.</p>	

	<p>DS picked up on 2 minor points: Creating safer shared routes for different users' pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders. DS was not sure where this has come from as he thought that Cookham's basic position was firmly to oppose sharing footpaths with cycles and horses. Creating new routes would be fine; we should have them where people want. Existing ones should not be shared; it is difficult and potentially dangerous for everyone. MC also mentioned pinch points; he has been trying for 21 years to get a sign up for the Cannondown Arch to warn people of the height restriction on approach. Especially as two big estates are to be built nearby, there will be a lot of traffic. WJP agreed with DS's point re sharing the footpaths, especially the more narrow and restrictive ones.</p> <p>JH responded on this point. The bullet points were a summary of comments raised rather than Troy commenting on what people have said. But JH feels something has been lost in translation between the responses and the way his colleagues have put it into the report. JH feels it is 'yes' we need to maintain access to the countryside, but we have an issue where footpaths are currently shared, and that people do feel these should be made safer.</p> <p>DS also pointed out that Cockmarsh is not a chalk downland. JH noted.</p> <p>WJP reminded the meeting that MH has previously mentioned that a Traffic Management Project should be an addition to this plan, which would maybe cover a 5-year span.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Decision on next steps in plan process</p> <p>JH advised the next steps will show that the devil is in the detail, with more information on policies. It needs to have 'teeth', show what can be done and make sure it will be done.</p> <p>WJP commented that significant contributions from both Copas' businesses have been received. It is important we take these seriously. It was agreed that a landowners consultation group should be set up. John Lewis/Odney Estates, both Copas family businesses, the National Trust, Summerleaze and any other major farm/landowners should be invited. SCS and LA felt this was a good idea. It is important to be and to be seen to be properly taking account of these significant views.</p> <p>JH agreed. There have been extensive responses and good ideas submitted. These should be discussed in more detail.</p> <p>WJP asked for volunteers to be part of the landowners' consultation group. It was agreed that WJP, DS, SCS and LA would form the group, with JH. WJP will send out an invitation. WJP thought it might be best to have the landowner meeting parallel to the next stage. JH confirmed that he can proceed in parallel. This idea and process was agreed.</p> <p>LA asked if the next steps/stage can be defined and that the objectives are. He would like to understand what our role is in this next stage; what work is important; and whether it will need to be split for people to take different areas. LA also advised that some updates he had sent through for the CPC website were still pending. On this point, WJP said he will follow up with The Clerk, Cookham Parish Council.</p> <p>WJP said that as he envisaged it, the next document will not be a full first draft but a building block. This will then be enlarged and added to, in stages until the final first draft</p>	<p>WJP</p> <p>WJP</p>

	<p>is complete. Thus, the landowner consultation can proceed in parallel, and results added in organically. JH confirmed this sort of process.</p> <p>JH said that he will now put the structure and broad content together of the plan and how the policies link to the objectives; start scoping out further and then come back to share this with the working party. There may be gaps where he is waiting for information or for questions which need answers. This will be an iterative process.</p> <p>MC made a plea that the simplest form of language is used, as professional jargon could be misinterpreted. JH advised they will use plain English as much as possible and provide a glossary. However, there is a balance needed as the plan will also be used for developer management purposes and needs to speak that language.</p> <p>The CNPWP agreed than JH should proceed to next stage.</p>	JH
<p>7.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>No AOB raised.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Date/time of next meeting</p> <p>Agreement to stick with Thursday evenings for future meetings, as these seem to work best. 5.30pm to 6pm start would be preferable.</p> <p>04 November for the next meeting was agreed and that it would be face to face. IW gave his apologies in advance. NM to reach out to Cookham Library to see if the Community Room would be available or failing that CIM. WJP has a contact there he will forward to NM.</p>	NM