

## MINUTES

### MEETING OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY 17 JUNE 2021 AT 6.00PM

#### PRESENT:

Cllr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society) (apologies sent – he would have to leave meeting at 7.15pm)  
Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)  
Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)  
Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council) (joined meeting at 18.40)  
Tracy Bailey (“TB”) (CNPWP Administrator)

#### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

#### 1. Minutes

#### Action

The Minutes of the meeting on 27 May 2021 had been circulated, and were approved.

#### 2. Comments from Cllr Perry on meeting with RBWM re parking

WJP confirmed that RBWM will be imposing a new parking limit in the village of 2 hours, thereafter parking would be charged for (except for resident permit holders). The National Trust would agree application to their road leading to Moor Hall. MH queried whether the National Trust car park would be monitored. WJP thought not. WJP believed that enforcement of the roadside parking limits would be stepped up, at least initially. WJP confirmed that a parking app would be used, accessible by phone, which will apply everywhere. The point about the National Trust car park was that it should be used if parking for a longer period was needed, especially visiting Marsh Meadow, Cockmarsh, the Bounty etc.

#### 3. Report by Jon Herbert on draft vision statement, questionnaire and leaflets for June/July consultation and decision on issue/consultation

JH was not present at the meeting.

LA had submitted some proposed wording changes. DS had also suggested some changes, which he had sent to JH/WJP before the previous meeting, which hadn't been reflected in JH's drafts. WJP will circulate DS' comments to everyone and seek some further input from JH. WJP will forward LA's/DS' comments to JH for further discussion.

WJP

LA suggested that proposed changes, when circulated, should be in a more editable form, so that any amendments could be made more easily. This was taken on board.

WJP suggested that since JH was not present to discuss the proposed amendments, and that not everyone had seen the changes proposed by LA/DS, it might be wise to adjourn the meeting for a week or so, so that everyone had time to consider the proposals. The meeting preferred to continue.

#### **4. Consideration of and decision on consultation mechanism, publicity and timing, including application to Council for funding**

WJP noted that he and MH had had a discussion about the consultation mechanism. They thought that the flyer should be converted from A5 to A4 to make it more visible. This was agreed. MH believed that the Council would fund the extra cost.

MH thought it was important, now that there would be more space, to look again at the layout. There was an opportunity to put headlines on the reverse pulling out the core objectives, to draw people in, i.e. less text, more headlines. Whilst this format had been used elsewhere, MH felt it would be powerful if these objectives were actually “put through people’s doors”.

DS noted that the cost of adding additional information is very small, compared to the cost of distribution; therefore it was important to take the opportunity to get out as much information as possible. He also thought the wording should be in “plain English” that everyone could understand; no jargon. MH felt it was important that the format was “*This is what you said – this is what we’ve done about it*”. Both points were agreed. It was therefore agreed that WJP would email JH and ask him to rewrite the flyer and come back with another draft.

WJP

LA thought it was important to let the residents of Cookham know exactly where we were now; he had prepared a “process picture” which he had forwarded to WJP for comment. WJP forwarded this during the meeting, praised it and invited further comment. It was agreed it was a very good visual of the “process” and “where we were now”.

It was unanimously agreed that the Parish Council would be asked to put LA’s flowchart as the opening page on the Plan website.

MH was keen to clarify timelines. It was agreed that each step should be taken one at a time, and precise projected timelines could not sensibly be publicised. WJP noted that RBWM were not factoring anything into their budget for the examination process until the financial year 2022/23, and would not be expecting the Neighbourhood Plan to arrive until late 2021/early 2022. MH requested and WJP agreed that WJP’s report to the Parish Council include confirmation that the Plan was still on course.

WJP

MH thought that it would be a good idea to do a “roadshow” (with banners,

leaflets and A3 copies of objectives etc) to be held in various locations within the Parish, inviting people to come forward with their opinions. We could perhaps set up a stall at various locations for a couple of hours at a time, to promote the Neighbourhood Plan and make it more visible. MH envisaged showing/discussing diagrams, handing out leaflets etc. CD would be happy to assist with this. MH will ask the Clerk to laminate some of the information from Troy, so it can be used in this way.

Moor Hall had not responded. The public meeting would now be held at Pinder Hall. It was envisaged that this meeting would be an exhibition for a couple of hours, followed by a Q&A/talk. This was agreed to be a sensible approach.

The original plan was to hold the meeting on 24 July, but as the literature was being redrafted and would need to be reapproved, the meeting would probably need to be put back. WJP would check with the Post Office when the flyer would be sent out once it was ready: the general consensus was that the meeting should be put back to end of August/early September just before the schools go back. A Saturday was considered to be best, however a mid-week date should also be considered. CD noted that the event can be advertised very well on social media to ensure maximum attendance. It is hoped to agree a date at the next meeting.

WJP

WJP

Reverting to LA's flowchart (SCS had been absent at the time of the earlier discussion), SCS, whilst she thought it was visually very good, believed it needed some more refinement to remove jargon and realign the boxes/arrows. It was agreed that LA would consider SCS' suggestions, and everyone else was invited to comment. LA would rejig and circulate.

LA/SCS  
LA

DS suggested JH was consulted re flowchart to make sure there was nothing technically wrong with it. WJP confirmed JH had seen it and was happy with it. LA confirmed that it coordinated with the graph that JH had provided.

**5. Report by Jon Herbert on Aecom's current position and involvement in next steps**

WJP said that JH had confirmed Aecom were still at the information gathering and drafting stage, and that there was nothing specific to report. JH hoped they would be in a position to report back by August.

**6. Any Other Business**

LA noted that WildCookham would like to revise their submission, particularly in respect of the classification of local green space and biodiversity. The meeting was happy for WildCookham to rejig and resubmit their submission.

[DS left the meeting at 7.15pm, as previously intimated.]

LA noted that the Mission Statement mentioned doing something about flooding issue. LA would like to work with someone on this. He suggested that members of Flood Committee submit something to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. CD suggested LA contact MC, who is Chairman of the

Flood Committee, and also liaise with DS. LA will speak to both MC and DS. **LA**

SCS questioned whether enough had been done to highlight the green spaces around properties. MH believed this was being addressed in planning criteria for new properties. WJP confirmed he had stressed to JH on day one that the Plan must give “teeth” to the Village Design Statement (“VDS”), so everything that had been requested in the VDS should be adopted as a part of the Plan. However, not everything had been included in the VDS. It was agreed that the original requests should be reviewed to see if anything else can be added. SCS will provide a list of what we would have wanted, to see whether it can be added into the Plan. **SCS**

LA noted that in Buckinghamshire, they were operating a policy whereby in exchange for extending a property, applicants were expected to make a contribution to wildlife in exchange for the extra building (e.g installing nesting boxes, planting something in the garden), thus providing an ecological net gain. He suggested that this might be something that could be adopted in Cookham. It was agreed that this was an excellent idea. WJP would emphasise this point to JH. All agreed. **WJP**

**Date of next meeting – Thursday 24 June 2021 at 6.00pm (subsequently changed to 6.15pm)**