

MINUTES

MEETING OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY 22 APRIL 2021 AT 6.00PM

PRESENT:

CLlr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)
CLlr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)
CLlr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council)
CLlr Ian Wernham (“IW”) (Cookham Parish Council) (apologies sent – has to leave at 7.00pm)
Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)
Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)
Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)
Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy)
Tracy Bailey (“TB”) (CNPWP Administrator)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

CLlr Martin Coker (“MC”) (Cookham Parish Council)
Tim Veale (“TV”) (Save Cookham)

- | 1. Minutes | Action |
|---|---------------|
| Minutes of the meeting on 18 March 2021 had been circulated and no comments received: they were unanimously agreed. The report to the Council circulated by WJP was also approved. | |
| 2. Current position – Consultation/Responses | |
| 2.1 WJP noted a submission had been received from the CIM (which had already been circulated). | |
| 2.2 WJP confirmed that he had chased John Lewis, but had received no response – however, they should be kept in the loop. | |
| 2.3 WJP confirmed that the new advert, having been circulated to members of the WP, had due to their print deadline been put in the Parish Magazine, which would appear in around 2-3 weeks’ time. This was ratified. | |
| 2.4 SCS had sent WJP a detailed and carefully thought out paper regarding the Pound. It was agreed that SCS would circulate as soon as agreement from DS had been received, and could be discussed at the next meeting. | SCS |
| 2.5 WJS noted he had received a draft further submission from DS on behalf of the Cookham Society, which they had not yet finalised, so there will be another submission coming from the Cookham Society shortly. | DS |

- 2.6 WJP declared (confirming that he had already registered this with the Parish Council) a potential interest in that he had been elected Chairman of the Cookham Society at their AGM. He confirmed that there would be no conflict of interest, since in the light of his position as Chairman of the Parish Council's Planning Committee he never takes any part in the Society's planning deliberations. No concerns were voiced.
- 2.7 LA had been in touch with the National Trust to remind them that they had made no response regarding the Neighbourhood Plan. They wish to see something they can comment on before they formally respond.
- 2.8 WJP had previously circulated the detailed submission from Paul Strzelecki.

3. Report from Cllr Christine Doyle on results of schools picture competition

CD confirmed that she and WJP (with the help of JH) had decided on an overall winner and a runner-up. The overall winner is an entry from Herries School and the runner-up from Cookham Rise School. The winners had not yet been announced – WJP to send a congratulatory email. JH screen shared the winner's entry.

WJP

It had been found after the decision that the winner did not live in Cookham, but attended a Cookham School. It had been concluded that the decision should stand, as it had not been stipulated at the outset that only Cookham residents could enter.

LA thought that the way the winners were communicated was really important and suggested that a winner be elected from each school, to recognise the effort put in, and then have the overall winner. CD confirmed that this was the way it had actually turned out – there were no entries from Cookham Dean and Holy Trinity. WJP confirmed that he hoped there would be a ceremony to present the winners with prizes: £20 for the winner and £10 for the runner-up (probably in book vouchers for the local bookshop) – WJP to arrange this. This was agreed. WJP also confirmed that as we had confirmed we would get copyright, we can use the posters.

WJP

JH confirmed that Troy's graphic designer is currently in the process of putting the 'Future Cookham' banner from the winner's entry into Adobe illustrator to tidy it up, for use as a more professional print.

4. Reports by Cookham Society, WildCookham, Save Cookham and Shez

Cookham Society

DS confirmed that the new Cookham Society draft would be circulated within the next couple of weeks. WJP queried whether the draft would contain any submissions on local green spaces ('LGS'). DS' understanding was that the areas put forward already were white land that needed to be made LGS. He thought there should be some sort of policy about free public access greenbelt land in the Neighbourhood Plan.

JH confirmed that the purpose of the green belt is different from that of LGS

designation, although it is correct that LGS is, in effect, treated as greenbelt. It was agreed that greater protection would be offered by nominations in both camps.

LA wondered if green belt should be disregarded for the time-being; the criteria for LGS should be looked at. WJP noted that the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') is very specific about the criteria for LGS, and that care should be taken not to include anything that doesn't meet those criteria.

WJP queried what is meant in the criteria by "close to". For example, Marsh Meadow (some of which is in a conservation area) is between the Village and the Rise, but is frequently used by the communities close to it. JH noted that, loosely, close proximity means within walking distance of the community. Another example, Battlemead, was also discussed. WJP suggested that it might be appropriate to nominate it, so it could be considered and the NPPF tests applied. JH's judgement should be relied on as to whether the areas were sufficiently close: the previously circulated pro forma should be completed, giving reasons as to why they are of value to the community (including a map). Troy will then revert with recommendations. JH to recirculate the pro forma with the criteria. WJP reminded everyone to get their nominations in, as JH is now beginning to put together his first draft.

JH

WildCookham

LA queried whether the document could be in spreadsheet format, so long as it satisfies the NPPF criteria. JH confirmed that either would be acceptable, although Word format would be easier to manage.

JH confirmed Troy would prepare the final maps to go into the Plan – they just need an indication of where the sites are (e.g screenshot of Google Maps). The most important thing is the name of the site, how it meets the criteria, together with a "rough and ready" map.

LA raised the issue of green infrastructures/green corridors. He believed this should be set in a format that people could comprehend with detailed policies, e.g hedge maintenance, wildlife migration. LA said WildCookham should be able to put something together by August, and asked JH for assistance in structuring this information. JH to circulate the document published by the London Wildlife Trust for the GLA. JH asked if WildCookham had anything mapped on local wildlife, corridors etc, and, if so, could they send it through?

JH

DS expressed concern about putting anything in the Neighbourhood Plan which was too prescriptive in what people could and couldn't do with their gardens. LA confirmed that this was not the intention.

As IW needed to leave the meeting, WJP asked him if there was anything he would like to raise. In connection with the point regarding residents' gardens, IW believed that tarmacking/block paving over front gardens needed planning permission (which had come about due to flooding), so he was happy for it to be put into the Neighbourhood Plan. MH noted that his

understanding was that anything with a hard surface being added (i.e an extension) which is non-drainable, is part of that planning permission, but to just tarmac your driveway does not require permission. JH clarified that you have permitted development rights to pave up to 5m², anything over this requires planning permission, although this is not well known. This is a difficult area to deal with: – people can only be encouraged to think of the environment.

Save Cookham

TV had confirmed in an email to WJP that he had nothing to add at present.

5. Report/Update by JH on responses to consultation

JH gave a quick overview of the findings of the consultation. This had been very successful: almost 400 responses (based on population, around 7%, or 17% of households).

JH confirmed that Troy were now preparing a first draft vision for the Plan, under which they will start developing the areas of focus in more detail. They hope within a couple of weeks or so to present a series of policy and/or project headlines responding to the analysis. JH hoped that it might be possible to go out to consultation again on these by around mid-June. JH also suggested that the group started pulling together information on LGS now.

It has been suggested to WJP that although some sites in Wycombe (Bourne End and Woburn) were designated in the Local Plan for a number of buildings, the Neighbourhood Plan there had reduced that number. If this is correct, it would seem to indicate that it may be possible to use a Neighbourhood Plan to reduce the density/number of dwellings on a designated site. JH confirmed that one cannot plan in a Neighbourhood Plan for less development than is in the Local Plan. Policies and principles can be put in place about the design and layout etc, but quantum is outwith the Neighbourhood Plan's power. JH to take a look at what has been going on in Bourne End.

JH

LA queried whether a strategic environmental assessment ("SEA") would still be carried out in September or October. JH confirmed that once a draft Plan with policies had been put together, it will go to RBWM to screen for a SEA, but in our circumstances it is unlikely it will be screened in for assessment.

LA commended JH and his team on their excellent work.

LA believes communication to the public is very important. It is important that there is a continuous flow of information on the website, in simple easy-to-follow graphics, rather than a written document. LA to let WJP/JH/JG/Adam have his ideas. JH to provide a copy of the graphic on the locality guidance about the journey and planning.

LA/JH

DS was in favour of seeing facts and numbers (not the Word Cloud). WJP queried whether a table could be included alongside the Word Cloud. JH said this would require quite a lot of manipulation, but he would analyse how

JH

many times the different words appear, and will revert. It was agreed that JH should consider both LA's and DS' requests to see what could be done.

WJP thanked JH and his team for their excellent work.

6. Report/Update by JH and WJP on Aecom's current position

WJP confirmed that Ben Castell had spent the previous day touring the Parish unaccompanied (at BC's request). BC had said it was very productive and helpful. BC hopes to make a presentation at the next meeting about the way forward with his design package.

WJP confirmed we have the extension approval for the three sites.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 WJP noted that the banners had been an excellent idea. They can and would be used again.

7.2 DS queried what the future of the area analysis (produced by JH in August 2020) was. DS considered there were some errors and asked whether it was going to be revised. JH confirmed the document itself would not be used, but that information would be extracted from it to help justification of policies in the Plan. JH had received comments from everyone, which had been responded to and the 25 page report should have been circulated in around October 2020. DS noted he has had no feedback – JH to liaise with WJP. DS was concerned it still appears on the website, without corrections. WJP to go back through his emails and liaise with DS/JH; but we cannot alter documents already produced and used; we must just correct anything wrong.

WJP/DS/JH

7.3 JH said that Troy inferred from the Inspector's latest letter about the emerging BLP that sites AL36, 37 and 38 would remain in the BLP; and that Poundfield would be designated as LGS. Concerning LGS designation for Poundfield, DS asked if he could send through everything that had been put together for the Borough designation. JH that if Poundfield was designated LGS in the BLP, it did not need to be, indeed could not be, duplicated in the Neighbourhood Plan – it would just be struck out.

7.4 TB confirmed that the updated Appendix A would be posted on the website, as the Minutes of this meeting had now been approved.

TB/JG

7.5 CD had just received an email from Catherine Rosen at Herries School saying that they will be announcing the winning poster in their Golden assembly tomorrow. WJP will draft the email this evening – CD to provide WJP with the headmaster's email address.

WJP

CD

7.6 WJP confirmed he had raised the matter of a "communal repository" for CNP communications and documents with the Clerk. A solution is being worked on.

WJP

LA suggested Google Cloud or OneDrive, with a list of folders where all the documents are stored. Dropbox was also suggested. WJP will discuss this

WJP

further with the Clerk.

There being no other business the meeting was closed at 7.50 pm.

Date of next meeting – Thursday 13 May 2021 at 6.00pm, as previously agreed.