

**MINUTES OF VIRTUAL MEETING
COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY
THURSDAY 10 DEC 2020 AT 6.00PM**

PRESENT:

Cllr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)
Cllr Martin Coker (“MC”) (Cookham Parish Council)
Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council)
Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)
Cllr Mandy Brar (“MB”) (Cookham Parish Council)
Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)
Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)
Dr SCS Courtenay-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)
Tim Veale (“TV”) (Save Cookham)
Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy)
Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1. Apologies for meeting absences

Actions

Cllr Ian Wernham (“IW”) (Cookham Parish Council)

2. Approval on minutes of last meeting 11 Nov 2020

Meeting minutes agreed and approved from 11 Nov 2020.

3. Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda

WJP reported the following progress on the design package. There are 2 options we can opt for; 1) Design Support; 2) Design Package. If (1) Locality pay £8000 grant and Troy do the work, including the design module. If (2) we still get £8000 grant and Troy will still do most work, but the design module will be done by a consultancy company called Aecom who liaise with JH. JH is used to working with Aecom. Consequently, CPC have opted for (2), the design package.

WJP has spoken to a lady called Elena at Aecom on a diagnostic call. WJP has provided them with Troy’s initial view and area analysis documents, along with the initial list of our consultees, to advise where we are with each of these. WJP has discussed how he feels we should proceed subject to the Working Party’s views. Elena appeared to think that we had done well to date. Elena will now report to the team within Aecom. If they approve, they will report to Locality, if Locality sign off on this, they in turn report to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. If MHCLG sign off on it, we will get the design package. Elena’s estimate is that she should make her internal report by the end of this week, Locality should receive it before Christmas. We should then get a decision by mid - late January.

JH added that this is completely free of charge to us. The team at Aecom who will prepare the package are ex colleagues of his. Ben Castell, who will be in touch with us, is the Director leading the teams at Aecom. JH works closely with Ben on various Neighbourhood Plans. JH and Ben have already shared emails and JH has given him some prompts on the area and has shared some of the challenges we face. JH does not see any issue with this being approved and feels it should happen quite quickly.

4. Current position on liaison with RBWM (and on BLP)

RBWM

WJP advised that Jill, CPC's Clerk, escalated the question of liaison with RBWM. JH and WJP now have a conversation in place on 15 December with Tomas Pugh-Cook of RBWM who is our liaison person. WJP asked JH to draft an agenda ahead of for the call with RBWM. JH will do so.

JH/WJP/Jill

BLP

WJP commented that there is nothing particularly relevant on the BLP, apart from recording that the hearings are now over. On the question of housing projections. WJP has received an email from Tom Denniford. Broadly speaking, the position is that RBWM admits that its housing projection figures are conservative. It is projecting a supply of 15,367 dwellings over the plan period, as against a requirement 14,240. Therefore, there is a surplus of 9.7%. This thus helps the argument that there is an oversupply. WJP will forward the email to JH.

WJP

Tom has argued that RBWM were overly cautious because they have been projecting only 131 units per annum compared with an average of 338, which has been the average since the plan period started in 2013. There is also some confusion over RBWM's housing trajectory. As a result, the Inspector has asked RBWM to produce a paper fully explaining its numbers and reasoning. All of this obviously has a favourable impact on our argument that AL37/AL38 are surplus to requirements.

WJP also reported that: a) With Tom's help he had submitted some new wording on for policy ED4, designed to reduce the possibility of transforming agricultural buildings into residential ones; b) Infilling is something that the Inspector has asked RBWM to review. This is a trigger to remind us that this is an area we need to bear in mind in the CNP; c) RBWM has confirmed on the record that it is not proposing to take the proposed protected employment site next to AL37 out of the green belt (but also said that within those constraints it was possible for anybody to bring in a proposal to redevelop the whole site, provided it was not less open than it is now). This is another cue to us and JH to bear in mind that we will have at least 1 protected employment site in the CNP area and that we need to make sure we have policies in the CNP relating to that site and its relationship with the adjoining sites. WJP had made this point to Elena at Aecom today that this will also be relevant to the design code.

JH

SCS asked what sites the numbers related to. WJP apologised for using jargon and responded:

- AL37: 9-hectare field between the Lower Mount Farm agricultural units which adjoin Long Lane and in effect Whyteladyes Lane and Southwood Road.
- AL38: Smaller site immediately adjoining and to the east of Strande Park. The latest maps show that AL38 is more susceptible to flooding than was originally thought to be the case and RBWM admits that it has no real certainty over vehicular access to get people who cannot walk out of the site during floods. The only firm escape plan seems to be by walking up to the B4447 through Bass Mead. The Inspector seemed unimpressed by that.

DS commented re employment sites in the green belt that Mount Farm has got existing farm buildings being used as offices. It also has permission for 1000 square metres of new office space employing 100+ people there. Has that come up at all in the BLP discussion? WJP said 'no' and that this is a reminder for us that we have to bear in mind this site as well.

WJP had emphasized to Elena today the importance of infilling and subdivision of properties. While it will be a matter for future decision, he currently doubts if we are going to make a call for sites for the CNP. But if we do not make a call for sites, then apart from AL36/37/38 (AL36 is the gas holder site off Whyteladyes Lane) the only other land he would think we would expect to see built on is infilling, happen-stance windfall and subdivision of properties. Such sites are perhaps not covered quite as fully as necessary in the VDS, the policies in which can be used but are not easily adaptable to subdivision of properties, for example. This will probably require more work for the CNP. SCS agreed.

MH said that at the last election it had been found that people were supposedly living at the Lower Mount Farm site. This could have an implication for potential redevelopment of the site in the future. WJP agreed this point needs attention.

WJP also mentioned an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness in respect of the dwelling unit behind Costa. CPC would have strongly opposed any application for permission: CPC needs to be vigilant in reporting such matters and pressing for enforcement action.

MH wondered if we would be receiving a similar application about residence at LMF. WJP to ask the Clerk of CPC to check if there is residential planning permission there and if necessary, to chase up RBWM.

WJP

DS thinks that RBWM has already reviewed the buildings at LMF to assess them for rates after the Cookham Society raised this about 18 months – 2 years ago. He fears that it may be a fait accompli.

WJP asked if so if we should get CIL money for it if so? DS suspected that it was only on larger developments, but wasn't sure. JH thinks there is a threshold but is not sure. MB concurred. WJP will have the Clerk ask the CIL officer about the principle and this case.

WJP

5. Updates from members on contacts made by them as part of consultation

See Appendix A.

MH mentioned the difference in approach between the 3 clubs which own or have their own clubhouse; (Sailing; Cricket; Football) and other societies which are nomadic and move where the facilities are available.

DS felt that we should canvass national organisations on cycling as we have the paths coming up from Maidenhead. TV said that he is involved with a Cycling Club in Cookham. MH to follow up on this.

MH

6. Cookham Society, WildCookham, Save Cookham and SCS on formulation of their input as part of the consultation

WJP advised there was nothing further to report since our last discussion.

7. Report and updates by JH Herbert on Troy's current position

JH thanked all for their inputs, comments, and outreach. This has generated a lot more local information and knowledge than Troy would normally have been able to find at this point. It is therefore a great start and basis for working on the CNP. JH has been through all comments and responded to them. His first draft of a few weeks back was updated today. It was not sent out before this meeting but will be sent following. WJP to circulate.

WJP

JH felt that five key topics/themes for the CNP were emerging, with some sub points under each:

- 1) Quality of design and new development. This is in effect the issue of giving the VDS 'teeth'. The CNP will do this if we embed it or its equivalent into it. The design package will help supplement the work particularly in terms of the sites in the emerging BLP just discussed. This theme extends to promoting energy efficient new development; 'Passivhaus' standards; the unique quality and character of the Cookhams; Heritage assets; and establishing design policy so that the quality and character of the area are responded to and respected. JH would like to begin associated discussions about employment land and agricultural holdings with RBWM next week: we need to work out how to shape a policy that responds to national guidance on certain permitted rights that exist from agricultural uses and so pass examination, but which also respond to local concerns. JH will report back in due course.

JH

TV mentioned social housing as something the group might want to discuss further. His sister is working on a scheme (which RBWM are considering) involving small (one person) prefabricated units which can be inserted at the back of industrial or landfilled sites. (JH said it sounded like a YMCA initiative called Y cube.) TV doubted how relevant this would be for Cookham. The WP will return to it if appropriate in due course.

- 2) Environmental qualities of Cookham. Key points: a) protecting open spaces generally; and b) utilising the local green space designation route, to identify and protect those green spaces of special value to local community. Poundfield is suggested as one in the BLP. The Cookham Society has suggested the Alfred Major Rec and some others initially. JH has provided NM and WJP a proforma for this. We will come back to this once we have gone through the 5 topics. Many present, favoured this as a priority, with the need to encourage biodiversity, wildlife habitats, verdant character of Cookham. The WP's consensus wished to promote policies to retain, protect and enhance those qualities; it wished to explore green corridors and improving access to green infrastructure for all, as examples. It was agreed that to be necessary to manage the impacts in respect of flood risk including matters like sustainable urban drainage for any new sites and potentially encouraging retro-fitment of things like rain gardens to help manage surface water runoff.
- 3) Landscape and setting. Respecting and retaining the separate identity of the 3 Cookhams, but also of the Cookhams from Maidenhead, which in turn means looking at preserving green gaps between the settlements. There is here a strong point on the landscaping views and the unique character of the Spencer landscape. This will be a unique approach to the CNP which we can embed. To this should be added the wider point of access to the countryside and enjoyment of that and those views and character by everyone, visitors as well as residents.
- 4) Social and community infrastructure. Delivery in a timely fashion of the infrastructure that the community needs in terms of things like education, sports, leisure facilities. There are standards for provision in the BLP. We can be firm about encouraging the type of facility which needs to be provided. We need to think about the parking provision associated with these, which has come up in discussion with the various local sports clubs and churches as a challenge, and in the light of changing cars needs

and uses, as well as 'non-car' transport infrastructure. This is crucial to the accessibility and vitality of our local centres and hence their future.

The use class order which categorises different types of use into different categories was greatly simplified from 1 September. In particular former use classes A1, 2 and 3, B1 and parts of D2 and 3 are now all within one new use class E, including retail, restaurant, office, financial/professional services, indoor sports, medical and nursery uses along with "any other services which it is appropriate to provide in a commercial, business or service locality". Hence uses can now change between these without any need for permission. This means it is no longer practical to have former types of policy like support for classes A1-A2 (in effect retail) in our local centres. Further, the Government has now launched consultation on introducing permitted development rights for change of use from all class E activities into residential use. This could be a massive challenge to local centres all over the country, with loss of shops to residential with no need for planning permission. JH needs to consider this carefully. It is of course all very new. We may also need to look at things like the quality of the public realm: for example, where parking is provided and how best to use public space. These are just as important to the quality and future of our centres.

5) Transport access and movement. The WP needs to evaluate cycling, walking and active travel, and promoting this as both land use policy and projects. These are separate projects and aspirations we could look at embedding into the CNP. Parking features again here: we face the question whether we want to identify particular sites for new parking or step back and merely support opportunities for new parking sites coming forward?

MH referred to CPC's previous efforts to discuss parking with existing car park owners at the Odney Club and CIM. It was not productive. CPC managed to secure some extra spots for Holy Trinity School, but the take up and interest was low. This was also a feature of the previous village 'plan'; proposals for car parks on the common and around the Pound were controversial. It is a very emotive issue. MH felt also that we should consider potential future trends such as driverless cars; sharing cars; electric cars; are we reaching car peak today?

JH agreed. There is a balance to be struck. There is a strong climate change and sustainability agenda around walking/cycling and living locally, which we need to embed in the CNP. A mode shift to different forms of movement may resolve some of our current challenges.

While WJP understands MH's point, he questions if we have reached car peak. Up to now more family units result in more cars. More wealth leads to more cars. We certainly ought to consider the need for electric car charging points on private and public premises.

CD and LA feel that parking problems result not just from Cookham usage. First, commuters come here to use Cookham station and park in the side roads and people working for the schools and businesses in Cookham which do not have adequate parking cause problems. Secondly visitors who come to Cookham and stay over the weekends need parking. Most today come by private car. Some may come by rail, but facilities are limited, especially for families who wish to cycle, for example.

We also need to look at what kind of destination Cookham is. What do we want to have and what type of challenges does that provide? That applies not only to transport but also to land use. People come here, park their car, and take their mountain bikes to go biking round here. That puts a stress on the environment e.g., the ground and nature, just as do dog walkers. So, car parking has knock-on effects about what in Cookham we would like to see develop here.

JH feels that the challenge for the CNP with parking is the BLP has policies about land use and development (for example potential provision for new car parks, and parking for new development proposals). If there are wider things such as the issue of overflow parking from the station, we might need a parking strategy. That is not an actual land use policy so would be a wider project. It is important to put projects into the CNP, even if they are not a policy, because they are an expression of the feedback from the community and this is a community manifesto to some extent. It is clearly an emotive issue which comes up as a number one challenge in a lot of other places too. There are many differences between policies and projects. He wanted to flag this up for wider response and comments later.

JH wants to use these as a basis for wider communication and consultation with the Cookham community. He considers them to be the key challenges that the plan should address (which have been identified from our consultations so far) and seek feedback on this to ratify the direction of the plan before we get too far in terms of drafting policies which is important. Consultation and engagement are the golden thread for the CNP, and we need people on side, so we get a positive result on the referendum once we get to that.

8. Issues which should be incorporated in CNP

WJP – JH has covered item 8 of agenda in the above discussion under item 7.

9. Future procedure

LA is pleased that we are looking into the future. We should try to come up with a wish list and expectations of what we would like Cookham to look like in the future. Some of us would like to preserve as much as possible what is nice. It has been gratifying to hear so many positive comments and visions. We know already, though, that in 5-10 years' time things will be different. We see if Institutes or Governmental Bodies will tell us their projections: for example, what the extent of environmental and climate change may be and what is that likely to entail. Such bigger questions would impact village life and should be incorporated into the CNP as things that will play a role and so these are policies to cope. LA asked if JH could spend some time gathering data to discuss?

WJP comments that he has recently asked JH various things, but JH has pointed out that the CNP has to function within the BLP, and we cannot either contradict or repeat in effect anything strategic that is in the BLP That will be relevant here since the BLP contains relevant policies.

SCS felt that the CNP by definition deals with the future, on a factual basis whereas LA wanted account taken of the more speculative future, the sorts of things we could find ourselves facing in a good few years' time. Could this be, in JH's terms, an area 6, as a set of possibilities and what our policies would be. MH said that one such thing was the potential use of agricultural land for things like solar farms. How does that integrate into

the greater idea of maintaining the look and feel of Cookham: 20 acres of glass mirrors would have a material effect. SCS is sure that is under consideration; MH said that it must be by every farmer.

WJP commented that while as LA says, we have no idea at present, we shall by the time we get to formulating the CNP know what the policies are going to be over the life of the plan. We have to focus on that, though we must certainly reckon on the longer-term effects.

LA asked what binding strategic policies from RBWM must we comply with? WJP said that: 1) If the BLP is rejected then there are virtually none, because all that will remain is the current adopted local plan which is already 7 years out of date. Or 2) If the BLP is adopted then it is anything (remaining) in the BLP that RBWM has designated as strategic, which is most of what is in the BLP. JH will ask RBWM to clarify what their strategic policies are.

JH

JH said that there is a balance to be struck between a lot of the comments we have had based on Cookham as it is today and worthwhile comments like LA's, which are a form of stargazing, the upfront vision of the Neighbourhood Plan and where we want Cookham to be going or be like in 10 – 15 years. When we move to consultation, we will ask for feedback on the five overarching topics and we should also pose questions around what the future holds for Cookham so we can help establish a vision that brings this all together in the CNP. How do we respond to climate change? To the changing role of the high street and the impact of internet shopping? To the post pandemic environment, and how can this fit in with the framework of the CNP?

JH reminded the WP that following a regulatory change a few years ago, it is now easier to update, review and amend a Neighbourhood Plan once it is made. It is not now always necessary to have an examination (though the first hoop is still to align with strategic policies).

MH felt that we must focus on the CNP being both simple enough to communicate in the referendum group but also detailed enough that it means something. If this becomes a 2-inch-thick document, people will find something they do not like. The art is to keep it simple and focussed, with the flexibility for the groups to work within it, to then define how that moves forward.

While WJP agreed, we need to give things 'teeth', which means giving things detail. MH fully understood WJP's point but still felt that we must not confuse or upset by too much detail.

10. Next steps re consultation

WJP has spoken to Diana Tombs and Margaret Morgan, the authors of the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan. They talked through how they had communicated and consulted and emphasised the importance of maximum engagement. This fitted with the vision WJP and CPC had always adopted. WJP explored how the next stage could now be implemented. We need to engage with as many people as we can in the Parish as soon as we can. Unless we get public enthusiasm and engagement and they sense that something is happening they need to take notice of and be engaged with,

then we are not going to go anywhere. We need to bear in mind the referendum, as well as the examination.

WJP and JH discussed this and wondered if the next stage would be to produce something which tends to be a vision statement. This would be a general idea on the 5-6 points we have discussed earlier: this is what we are doing; this is how we are thinking of developing; what we are doing; what do you all think? One of the points of this is that as we have seen from the people we have consulted with; they want something to shoot at/skeleton on which to add their thoughts/ideas. Such a vision statement would be a preliminary to creating, after that round of engagement, the first draft of the plan, which would be consulted on more widely still to inform the second and final working draft, which could then go through to RBWM. By then, physical displays and meetings might be possible. WJP and JH reiterated that consultation would be key.

WJP

It was agreed that the WP and CPC need to increase publicity, publish more documentation on a website etc. It was agreed that WJP should discuss this with CPC. We/ CPC should also be looking at mailshots to the Parish as a whole. We could ask Cookham Society/WildCookham who have quite extensive lists of members/contacts to be part of our delivery mechanism for this. This is the sort of future procedure WJP was envisaging.

LA commented that the AS&S group, who WildCookham had also consulted, made a particularly good argument about being very careful about the process, which is key here. To pass a referendum and the inspector, we need a process which can stand up to scrutiny. We need to be transparent and to communicate well. This needs to be the next steps as well as defining the steps and show that we are following a structure.

WJP and MH agreed. MH felt the most powerful thing is paper. The only catch he can see about this is, we need several communications. We need to make sure we are doing enough on paper to grab interest, without making it complex, expensive to deliver and needs to be understood. MH's vision would be a quite simple 1-page leaflet/postcard getting people involved, Parish Magazine, various other magazines etc. There are other ways rather than giving it to the postman and paying.

WJP feels it needs to be a 2-level process. 1) It has to be pithy to get it over and if we can refine the 5-6 themes, we want a single piece of A4 showing: this is what we are doing; this is what we are thinking about; BUT if you want more detail go to Facebook, Website etc... you can get the detailed information, it is all there. 2) If you prefer to keep it simple, please do simply respond to this. MH thinks that 'survey monkey' could also be used. Things need to be visible and provable. We would need a website and email outreach for that.

WJP commented that this is a particularly important area as the examiner and any critics will concentrate on process. If they can find a flaw in the process on how we arrived at our conclusions, then they will do so. We need to be able to show we have been rigorous in process, criteria, and analysis, as well as vigorous in encouraging engagement. WJP has also had a discussion with the Clerk of CPC about methodology for preserving our records, recording our decisions, and making sure we are able to demonstrate the process.

JH agreed with everything that has been said. In the past they would have had face to face sessions and drop ins, but unfortunately, we are not in that space now. We should

use the internet as our friend and use as far and wide as possible. People do respond to letter drops quite positively. JH designs 1-page flyers which they were going to propose to do, along with some wider information/posters which can sit on the Parish Website/Parish Newsletters. Also look at questionnaires whether it be survey monkey etc. to capture everything electronically. JH will start thinking about materials and a proposed suggested form.

JH

MH added that the Parish Magazine goes through every door in the whole village and maybe we have a regular advert in there every month for a year or two, then no one could come back and say we did not try. WJP commented we did get an extra £1000 on our grant due to COVID crisis and being prepared to push ahead, so we do have additional money we could use towards paying for this.

LA was pleased to hear all these good ideas in terms of communication. They echoed what he would have said himself and he agreed with them. There was little he wanted to add. He feels we should develop a visible communication strategy. We should accommodate people who respond in different ways. The elderly do not easily respond by electronic means. We may be able to reach parents of school-age children by going through the schools; and children in primary schools are worth listening to as well: they will be the ones living here. Throughout this, and it is quite urgent, transparency of the process is needed.

MH agreed and commented that to move forward from this stage we need a bullet pointed plan, with a few dates in there. WJP was not so keen on having bullet pointed dates in there but agreed that (as previously agreed) JH will now go away and put together the themes. While he is doing that, and once NM has produced the minutes, WJP will go through them, analyse what has been said in this part of the discussion and put together MH's type of package. He will circulate it to everyone separately. WJP will also report what is wanted to CPC.

WJP

WJP asked if this seems sensible and a time efficient way? Agreement was unanimously given.

WJP acknowledged the points that this needs to be transparent so everyone knows what is happening, can always find out what is happening and when, and that we are always accessible. All these meetings should be as public as those of the Council and accessible to everyone. Anyone can input and contribute.

MH said that in his view, this is the most important thing happening now at CPC, so there should be no issues with money. This is important for the future of the village. MC added it is not that expensive to do. MH said that we should do it properly or not bother. WJP agreed.

WJP and JH will progress this in the way we have agreed and will be back in touch as soon as they can.

WJP/JH

JH referred to LA's point on schools and engaging with the next generation who we are planning for. JH said that a request to design a poster at schools, maybe a competition, has succeeded elsewhere. They can design a poster for school bags to take home. This captures the attention and ideas of parents and guardians. WJP said it echoed Theresa May's Christmas Card competition; he endorsed it. JH will pick this up.

JH

MC advised about 3 years ago for one of the Annual Parish Meetings children from Cookham Rise and Holy Trinity schools designed what they wanted for the village. WJP will ask the Clerk to CPC to seek out this information if possible.

11. Next steps by Troy

- Meeting RBWM.
- Draft agenda and report back after.
- Thinking around consultation materials, structure key messages etc..
- Local green space designations. Certain criteria need to be met to be a designation. JH feels the local community and this group know these areas better. He has a proforma drafted, it would be useful if the group, or someone could lead on this from this side and JH can liaise with them on this subject. Cookham Society has already put in some suggestions. JH feels this group could take on this task at the moment and put forward/identify these spaces. Then when we progress to the next round of consultation, we can ask for feedback on those at this point. The first thing is to identify those spaces and why we think they meet the criteria. WJP asked if, when JH mentions the group, is that just the 10 people on this group or the wider group of 25 consultees? JH feels it would be better to keep it tight at the moment. This group is more active and hands on, so the task could sit with this group in the first instance. This was unanimously agreed.

LA commented on the historical importance of Cookham. He has seen no-one come forward to advance their agenda on this so far. He was reminded of this by Battlemead, supposedly the site (or just south) of a battle. Is this something we should heed? Does it need to come from the public?

WJP replied that any of us are entitled to raise it. We could consult a local historian, Historical Society or Archaeological Society. Historical importance is one of the criteria of the NPPF for a local green space. The Cookham Society last year had a local historian/archaeologist to address on this.

MC added that when he was on the Planning Committee, the Historical Society had tried to make people have surveys on their properties, especially in certain parts of Cookham, because in Anglo Saxon times there was a Parliament (Witan) here. So, there are finds scattered throughout Cookham when land is dug up. The Historical Society have an interest.

WJP will ask the Clerk to CPC about any local society we could contact MC said there is an Historical Sites Society based in High Wycombe. MB added that there is a lady who lives in High Road into archaeology. MB will advise WJP of her details and see if she can give some input.

WJP

MB

DS commented that he thinks the Maidenhead Archaeology Society seem to get a watching brief over sites when they are dug up.

SCS made a closing comment that everyone is aware of the plan to phase out gas boilers. The Government favours ground heat exchanges. For this one needs to dig about 2m

down. That is relevant when we think about the long-term future, both in itself and in terms of what may be found.

JH's agrees with contacting local historical societies. There should be a local list. If there is a local green space with historical value, then that is indeed a criterion for designation.

12. AOB

WJP raised the matter of a cover picture for our publicity. It maybe we can get children for this purpose, but MC put forward a picture of The Angel from Holy Trinity Churchyard. WJP feels this would be a nice cover photo. There are 2 criteria for a cover photo: 1) excite peoples' interest, 2) needs to be a photo of our own, so we do not have to pay royalties. However, the Clerk to CPC felt that this picture is looking back and that a Church is not most people's view of the future of Cookham.

WJP would be happy to stick with MC's photo but wanted to ask for the group's thoughts. Are there any alternatives? Do we want to leave it to a children's competition? We need a theme photograph, a brand, for this. Other Neighbourhood Plans start with the first page being a photo of their local area.

MC commented he had an idea of a graphic on the front cover, where you had a circle in the centre with that photograph on it and around the outside you had views. MC said he had been trying to find modern places in Cookham, but there are not that many. Unless we have the CIM, places like that. MC is happy to take the pictures.

MH commented there are not a lot of modern buildings in Cookham. He feels we just want to obtain a feel of Cookham. He likes the poster competition idea, and we would get the word out and add interest. If this is not possible, then he is happy with the photograph.

WJP pointed out that we are going to need something in the next few weeks if we are to get going fast with publicity and we would not get posters from a competition until halfway through February (though he still favoured going ahead with this).

SCS commented that the VDS has quite a lot of photographs and a good 50/50 mix between traditional and newer buildings. WJP asked what the copyright position of those pictures is. SCS would need to check as she thinks it is shared between the Parish Council and VDS working party. She does not think there is any problem with any individual photographs.

SCS

MC will be happy to take the technical lead and WJP will assist, as necessary. MC needs some feeding of information; he can do the technical/design bits.

WJP asked again that copyright be borne in mind; we need to be careful.

DS said that there are a lot of copyrighted photos at the back of the VDS (p80). SCS was thinking of the photos on the cover. SCS will check.

SCS

13. Date/time of next meeting

11th Feb 2021 @6pm.