

**MINUTES OF VIRTUAL MEETING  
COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY  
WEDNESDAY 11 Nov 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)  
Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)  
Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)  
Dr Shez Courtenay-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery) Arrived 38 mins into the meeting.  
Tim Veale (“TV”) (Save Cookham)  
Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council) Arrived 1 hour and 19 mins into the meeting.

**1. Introduction of Administrator**

**Action**

Nina Milner (“NM”) was introduced as the new administrator for the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party.

**2. Apologies for absence**

Cllr Ian Wernham (“IW”) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy)

**3. Approval on minutes of meeting on 29 September 2020**

Minutes of the meeting on 29 Sep 2020 were approved.

**4. Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda**

CD asked when we will be including other members of the community in consultation and/or meetings. WJP said that this is something that will need to be discussed: a lot of the people he had spoken to, do not want to get in on the ‘ground floor’ consultation. They would prefer a draft document to review and provide comment on. We should therefore have a draft, before going out to the members of the public to have their say. He noted that in the consultation by RBWM on designation as a Neighbourhood Area, Mark McGovern a member of the public expressed an interest in being consulted on the CNP, so he should be included specifically.

WJP advised we need to start putting up notices on Facebook, our website etc. so the public know what we are up to. WJP does not feel we are at this stage yet but hope to be early in the New Year. He will liaise with the Clerk about this.

MC mentioned different subgroups have been used in the past which fed into the main group. However, there was not a 3<sup>rd</sup> party consultant involved and so that is a fundamental difference.

WJP wants to set an indicative deadline of 30 Nov 2020 for the 'ground floor comments' to be received by the 'first call' list of consultees/stakeholders and fed back to Troy. This will enable us to produce a draft for the community to review/comment on. Once this has been completed, if we feel a need to set up subgroups, then we can do so. This was agreed.

CD asked if a blanket email could be put together for the enthusiastic members of the public advising: 1) we have not forgotten about them; 2) we have noted their interest, but we will come back to them at a later date for their comments. WJP to action. WJP also asked CD if she had sent them the original Neighbourhood Plan, which she has done and what they would like to contribute. CD has sent out all the headings and advised if there was anything at all they would like to share, please do. Nothing has been received back to date. From 2 conversations CD has had, she has been asked if there will be a meeting where they could share their thoughts.

**WJP**

WJP asked the rest of the attendees if they have received any comments/interest in contributing at a meeting, as he has not from the people he has been engaged with. No one else made comment.

MC commented he had spoken to Jan Jones from GWR and she wants to give the VDS and Troy statement to their planners, so they can say what they want done to conserve the alignment of the railway line. They do not want people building anything too close to it. They as well want the draft plan on which to comment.

MC mentioned that there was a previous issue in Marlow where a developer wanted to build near the Station. It nearly went through, before it was realised that National Rail had not been consulted; it had to be rejected. GWR/National Rail are concerned that nothing should be agreed without their approval. WJP confirmed that we will consult all statutory consultees.

LA raised a point that there might be people who want to contribute and raise a voice. There is also the case where we want other bodies to contribute (he was thinking specifically of the EA). Has there been any success in getting hold of them? It is fundamental that they are involved even at the draft stage. If there is a hole in our draft, someone needs to fill this and provide content.

WJP advised Ian has heard back from the EA, advising they will only be able to provide limited input into the CNP, due to resourcing issues in the team and an increasing volume of Neighbourhood Planning consultations. However, they shared some general guidance bullet points in the email. WJP to circulate email to the group with this further detail. WJP feels this will be the total input from the EA at this stage.

**WJP**

LA commented we somehow need to take this general guidance from the EA onboard and include it in the draft plan. Also LA would like to see if they provide any generic advice about the future and future risks of

flooding, given the environmental changes and also the amount of housing being built upstream, which means the water is not going to be as contained into the upper area and grounds. This resulting in higher river levels downstream. Those are changes we know are happening, but not in a position to say how this would affect us. The EA should know about these things.

DS said that the EA they do update their model with physical changes to the environment. Also when they are looking at flooding they look at period returns of percentage chances of it happening this year; or 1 in 5 chance; or 1 in 20 and then look at it in terms of flow conditions now and an estimate based on climate change.

WJP to ask Ian to go back to Environmental Agency to ask for a Risk Assessment and make the above points to them.

**WJP**

WJP noted that Jon Herbert needs to have done enough work to use up the grant by the end of March 2021 or it will be forfeited.

**5. Current position on liaison with RBWM and on BLP**

No further progress. Jon Herbert and WJP cannot get any response from RBWM. Therefore, WJP has been told by the Planning Committee to escalate matters, subject to talking to MH and getting authority from full council.

**WJP**

As far as Jon Herbert's liaison, Jill Gavin as Clerk has taken this matter in hand and is trying to use her contact at RBWM, at officer level.

**JG**

6. Report by members on contacts made by them as part of consultation

	<u>Suggested Consultees</u>	<u>Allocated to</u>	<u>Update/Status</u>	<u>Action</u>
1	Churches	CD	<p><u>Methodist Church</u> Positive response from Rev. Vicki who was extremely enthusiastic and has been through a Neighbourhood Plan before in a previous Parish and when would we like her thoughts. WJP advised 'immediately', unless she would like a template to complete.</p> <p><u>St Elizabeth's</u> Phone call has taken place and interest shown, however nothing back in writing so far.</p> <p><u>Holy Trinity</u> 3 emails sent in total, but no response to date.</p>	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
2	Copas Group	WJP	<p><u>Copas Group</u> Geoffrey forwarded copies of 2 articles to WJP he has written and published. Now deferred to James or Richard. WJP waiting for them to contact.</p> <p><u>Copas Partnership (Tom and Tom and Daughters)</u> WJP has emailed, waiting for a response.</p> <p><u>David Matthews</u> WJP has spoken to David and is supposed to be ringing back.</p> <p><u>White Place Farm</u> WJP has emailed Jenny Brown (née Edwards) and she has advised she will come back. Nothing received to date.</p> <p><u>Simmons Land Agent (for the owner of Cemetery Field)</u> WJP trying to find out who the owner of Cemetery Field is. DS advises it is registered on the Land Registry as he had looked at it a little while ago.</p>	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
3	National Trust	WJP	Responded with no time or resource currently but asked to be sent a draft and they will comment.	WJP to follow up with a draft when available.

4	John Lewis/Odney Estates	WJP	WJP had a conversation with Suzanne Bailey, the Manager, who advised the call was helpful. She would let us have her thoughts once she is free from managing things with COVID etc. She also wanted to discuss internally, as she was not aware that John Lewis had asked to be opted out of the Cookham Neighbourhood Plan Area.	Waiting on response from Suzanne Bailey.
5	Schools	CD	<u>Cookham Rise</u> Onboard. Chair of Governors' from Cookham Rise is interested. <u>Holy Trinity</u> Onboard. <u>Cookham Dean</u> Onboard. <u>Herries</u> No response to date.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
6	Cookham High Street Traders/Businesses	IW	No response at all. IW suggested putting leaflets through doors despite COVID restriction. WJP thought not to do that, they will get their chance to respond later if they do not want to get involved at the 'ground floor' now.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
7	Station Parade/Cookham Rise Traders/Businesses	IW	No response at all. IW suggested putting leaflets through door despite COVID restriction. WJP thought not to do that, they will get their chance to respond later if they do not want to get involved at the 'ground floor' now.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
8	Chartered Institute of Marketing	IW	No update.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
9	Cookham Medical Centre/PPG and Nursing/Care Homes	CD	<u>Cookham Medical Centre</u> Emailed no response to date. <u>Harewood House</u> Emailed no response to date.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
10	Cookham Dean Cricket Club	MH	Contact made with Ian Berry. Positive response to getting involved and asked how to channel their interest. Mark to put the information gathered to date into bullet point and email that through to WJP.	Mark to respond back asking for comments but noting we are dealing conceptionally now, so nothing to detailed.

11	Cookham Dean Football Club, Rowing Club, Running Club, Members Club	MH	No responses to date.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
12	Cookham Dean Women's Institute	WJP	Contact made with a lady there who has volunteered to be our major contact. She is a former Local Councillor so understands the process and what the Neighbourhood Plan is. She advised she would respond promptly. No response to date.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
13	Cookham Dean Village Club	WJP	WJP to catch up with Finbar at CDVC.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
14	The MMPA	MC	Interested.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
15	Network Rail/GWR and perhaps Chiltern Railways	MC	NR/GWR will consider and seek sight of draft plan.	To be sent draft plan when available.
16	Other transport groups such as Active Travel Cookham	MH	MH to contact. MH notes that in past discussions with Active Travel Cookham on the cycle route issue and protection of cyclist was always close to their hearts in a more commuter way.	MH to reach out to Active Travel Cookham.
17	RBWM qua Highways Authority and in any other appropriate role	MH	No movement.	MH to reach out to RBWM.
18	Pinder Hall Trustees	CD	Liz is on board.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
19	National Grid * (maybe a utilities group Inc. water, telecoms etc?)	MC	No response to date.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
20	Natural England*	IW	No response to date.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
21	Sport England*	MH	Advised they are a grant giving body to fund other peoples' ideas. They are a National Consultee so had to be consulted.	No further action required.
22	Environmental Agency	IW	Email response received and WJP circulating to the group.	WJP to ask Ian to go back to them asking for a risk assessment and to feedback points raised in this meeting under agenda item 4.

23	Rt Hon Teresa May	WJP	Supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan, but felt it is up to the people of Cookham to decide what they want in the plan. She sent WJP some correspondence she had with the RBWM about Green Belt with relevance to the NP and the BLP. WJP has passed this on to Jon at Troy.	No further action required.
24	Cllr Gerry Clark	IW	No update.	Final email to be sent asking for comments prior to the deadline of 30 Nov 2020.
25	If groups outside the above consultees can be found, residents' area groups/	n/a Yet		

\* indicates a national compulsory consultee

In summary it seems most people are waiting for something more concrete to comment on.

WJP would like to set a deadline of the 30 Nov 2020 for the 'ground floor' input from the list of consultees/stakeholders. Agreed. We then need to move on from this stage to a draft plan, then we can go out and consult everyone.

LA commented that in principal the above is fine it's just a matter of how we communicate this and give people a chance stating that there are several stages in which you can contribute and we feel the earlier you contribute the more of an impact you will have. If we can outline these stages then if they do not contribute now, they can later.

WJP to draft a template for the group to use, emphasising the importance of contributing to the process at this 'ground floor' level and outlining the process and stages. Others from the group can also add to this.

7. **Reports from Cookham Society, WildCookham, Save Cookham and SCS**

**Cookham Society**

DS has already produced headlines and comments. Jon at Troy has sent comments back and DS will go back on these by the end of Nov.

**DS/Troy**

DS asked WJP if he knew (about the parking issue) that a new borough wide parking guide was produced, which apparently went before the Council but then got withdrawn. WJP was aware but had no details.

Regarding Agricultural Development and polytunnels, Troy had referred to the Kingston Local Plan. WJP to get a link to this plan for the group.

**WJP/Troy**

LA commented it would be good to look at other plans. These could be good reference points.

WJP has been sent the Datchet Local Plan and will circulate to the group.

**WJP**

LA advised he had looked at the Ascot/Sunninghill/Sunningdale plan and this has a good framework for environmental issues. LA to forward a link to group.

**LA/Troy**

DS advised another thing we ought to think about is defining the boundaries of Cookham Dean. WJP agrees this is important. The Borough have taken away the whole infilling policy in the BLP to look at it again. We can look forward to this being rewritten. WJP to attend to this and will mention this to Jon re settlement boundaries and infilling.

**WJP/Troy**

**SCS**

SCS advised since the last meeting she has had a meeting with Tom Denniford ("TD"), who was keen to pick up certain elements about things which have been expressed at an earlier point in the VDS. The Cookham Society comments deal with anything she would like to say.

**WildCookham**

LA commented further on the SEA, on which Jon at Troy has provided comment and seems he is advising this might go for screening. LA is aware that that has been a screening on the SEA already. TD told LA that the SEA Sustainability Assessment was a tick box exercise. LA agrees.

**Troy**

The SEA in LA's view presents an opportunity for someone to take a fresh look at the impact to the environment, caused by certain factors, one being the planned development. LA considers that this has not been done thoroughly previously as part of the BLP. This has been raised by the Inspector during the process we are going through now. We need to take responsibility for the CNP going to screening and assess if we need some sort of SEA. If we feel we need this, then we must do it, if we do not, then we carry on as we are.

**Troy**



WildCookham has not yet provided any content input but has started working on it. LA has headlines and will provide content under these in bullet points, with the caveat that these are 1<sup>st</sup> draft and are for Troy to create text around. LA advised he will have this done by the 30 Nov 2020 deadline.

LA

### Save Cookham

WJP commented that Nic from Save Cookham advised last time that SC was one of the organisations which would prefer to comment after a draft plan has been produced, so WJP has been proceeding on this basis.

TV said that Save Cookham came about due to the BLP. Anything that is impacting development in the Cookham Rise area, which is where a majority of the followers are on their website as it concerns them. They currently have 250 people linked into the site. It would be mainly residents inputting. Only when it is relevant further down the line does TV feel it is worth putting anything to them, otherwise there could be confusion.

WJP accepted this. However, he will tell Jon of the useful points made by Save Cookham, about the BLP which we need to consider for inclusion in the CNP, to make sure new housing complies with standards, in terms of renewable energy etc.

TV went on to point out that there is a lack of larger sized properties in Cookham and this needs to be taken into consideration in the plan as there are not many £750k–1m properties in Cookham. People, with families can't upsize into houses they are looking for with space and land, so they are moving away from the area. Cookham Dean is a huge price leap for larger houses with land. If people are moving out of London, they want to be looking for a country style village house.

TV said he will update Save Cookham's comments/remarks and send them to WJP. WJP will forward straight to Jon at Troy.

TV/WJP/Troy

LA mentioned that the younger generation of home buyers are more environmentally aware and would like to live in houses that are greener than the traditional houses. They are moving out of London for a reason which is they love the greener environment and thus the house they get into, they want to represent that.

TV felt that people are 'much greener' nowadays and want to be able to grow their own fruit and veg. Whilst there are allotments in Cookham, they are not near the development sites that are being discussed, apart from possibly the gas site, so people want to have gardens to grow their own produce. TV also felt that if a development site is currently Green Belt and wildlife is travelling through, it needs to have a green run through it.

MC reminded everyone that it is not only the £1m houses that can be green. Housing solutions in this area did an experiment with houses that they built which had such a good U factor you hardly needed any heating

at all in them. However, we do need to consider the younger generation who have grown up here, who cannot afford these million-pound houses.

WJP commented that there were 2 different topics here. 1) TV and LA were talking about the young generation who want green housing, but as a second point there are a surprisingly large number of people not being catered for in the middle upper market who want more space. 2) The design/development brief for Lower Mount Farm as WJP recalls has 40% Affordable Housing. There is no reason why affordable housing should not also be green.

TV added that just because people cannot afford a big house, does not mean they should get a poor garden and no space for their family.

MC said that every time we try to get affordable housing here, social housing gets out bid or bought out by the developers. Developers also ask for 5 houses, as every time you ask for 6 you have to put affordable housing with it.

SCS explained that the VDS made a particular feature of the size of a house as a proportion to the size of its plot, emphasising that Cookham is somewhere you need decent sized green boundaries, on all sides of a house. This obviously conflicts with what developers want, which is to fill the space right to the walls. There have been some recent examples of this in Cookham. SCS wanted to mention the Brian Cleurs' view as an ecologist, that you not only need green spaces, but also be connected as corridors. We cannot have one isolated house with a garden and expect that to suffice. Animals must be able to move. This had proved a challenge to the borough planners. The wording put in to VDS had many debates around it. We should pay close attention to this and try to do more.

WJP mentioned that last night at CPC's planning committee, they debated an application for Briar Glen. The committee relied very heavily on 6 of the policies in the VDS. However, the VDS is merely guidance, whereas CNP will be policy. The Council is chasing up the grant for the design part of the package, which Jon advised we should have received. WJP has put Jon in touch with Jill directly.

MC commented that it is not a level playing field. Developers can do what they like, yet social housing people (e.g. Housing Solutions) have regulations which say they have to build in a certain way. As a result, they can't shoehorn in so many houses and they have to be a certain quality.

#### **8. Report by Jon Herbert re Troy's current position**

Troy have reviewed the Cookham Society comments which were submitted but require further comments before moving forward.

**9. Next steps re consultation**

Deadline for 'ground level' comments 30 Nov 2020. Then everything will go to Troy. Comments after that will be fed in as/if they arrive.

**10. Next steps by Troy**

As above, they will move forward when they hear further from us. Then they will start preparing the 'bones' for the plan.

DA asked what the Area Analysis is intended to do: 1) Where it fits in to the scheme of things; 2) How does it go forward as a document. WJP said he understands that it is for us to look at and agree that this is what Cookham looks like.

DS, MC, MH have forwarded some feedback on inaccuracies in relation to the Area Analysis document to WJP. WJP to follow up with Troy.

**WJP/Troy**

**11. Any other Business**

Nothing raised.

**12. Date of next meeting**

10 Dec 2020 at 6.00pm

LA asked if the meeting minutes could be sent out a bit earlier, as they are a good reminder for actions and to use as a check list. WJP said the lateness of the last minutes was his fault. The next minutes will not be delayed.