

## MINUTES

### MEETING OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY TUESDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2020 AT 6.00PM

#### PRESENT:

Cllr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Cllr Martin Coker (“MC”) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Cllr Ian Wernham (“IW”) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council)  
Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)  
Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)  
Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)  
Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham)

#### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council)

#### 1. Introductions

Action

WJP welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Tracy Bailey (“TB”), who would be acting secretary for this evening.

#### 2. Minutes

Minutes of the meeting on 28 July 2020 were approved.

#### 3. Update on secretarial position

WJP confirmed that the Council had advertised the position and a number of applications had been received. WJP and MH would interview the top three (this included TB) over the next couple of weeks, which will go to the Council meeting in November. Hopefully, an appointment will then be made.

WJP/MH

WJP confirmed that if the NPWP decided to meet again before the Parish Council meeting in November, TB would be invited to carry on being secretary then – if the decision is made first, the secretary attending the next meeting, will be the person appointed.

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

No matters were raised.

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

WJP reminded everyone that Troy had asked to be excused from the meeting, asking that the area analysis was worked on further before attending again.

Jon Herbert (“JH”) had confirmed to WJP that he had made a number of attempts to get hold of someone at RBWM, but had received no response.

WJP has been exchanging emails with Adrien Waite (Head of Planning) at RBWM, who was very polite. However, he has not responded to WJP’s last two emails – therefore, the promised personal meeting has not taken place nor has the name of someone with whom to liaise at RBWM been provided.

JH will continue to try to make contact and WJP will send another polite email to Adrien Waite, to try to cooperate with them and progress matters.

JH/WJP

LA raised the point that he had mentioned when he knew Troy would be absent: namely, that he wanted to know what discussions had taken place with RBWM in respect of the Strategic Environment Assessment (“SEA”). He assumed Troy had had no luck. LA asked for the SEA to be discussed further at point 8 on the agenda.

## 6. **Planning White Paper and potential impact on Neighbourhood Plans**

WJP confirmed that not much comment could be made because it is only a Planning White Paper at the moment. However, it appears to indicate that the government is thinking seriously about imposing more blanket, straightforward (zoning-type) rules on what does/does not require planning permission. The major direction seems to be in three parts: land on which building is positively encouraged (brown field sites); land on which building is acceptable (existing built on land); and land on which building is unacceptable (green belt). The overall effect of this could be to make Neighbourhood Plans less useful – however, this is not yet clear.

SCS asked if DS had heard anything from Tom (Denniford). DS confirming that Tom had worked through two thirds of the Paper, but given up as it contained very few facts, anything Cookham said wouldn’t be listed to, so it wasn’t worth continuing. SCS noted that it was necessary to be further informed.

DS asked WJP if he had any information from Groundwork. WJP confirmed he had not.

DS confirmed that the only possible source of information Cookham Society had was from Civic Voice. Membership had been cancelled, but emails were being received whilst might be useful. DS will send the links.

DS

WJP has been in touch with Theresa May. Possibly best way to get voice heard on White Paper. WJP very happy to discuss at the end of meeting and relay any views to TM (see further at point 8 below).

Consultation period on the White Paper ends 11.45pm 29 October 2020.

## 7. **Report by members on contacts made by them as part of consultation**

### **WJP**

**Copas Group** (Geoffrey Copas) – Contact made with Geoffrey, who would be

pleased to cooperate, and a consultation session will be set up.

**National Trust** (Owen Hibben) – Contact made, but nothing definite yet.

**John Lewis/Odney Estates** (Suzanne Bailey) – Very enthusiastic and delighted to be consulted.

**Cookham Dean Women’s Institute** – Contact made and they will revert.

**Cookham Dean Village Club** – Contact made and they will revert.

**Theresa May** – Contact made – it is unlikely she will want to make any submissions, but she will probably take a “maternal” interest. WJP suspects we will be able to ask for help if we need it.

## CD

**Cookham Methodist** – Terrific response (new person, who was heavily involved in producing a Neighbourhood Plan in her previous area).

No response from any of the other churches so far.

The schools have been very receptive. **Cookham Rise** (including Chair of Governors) and **Cookham Dean** definitely on board. No response yet from **Herries** and **Holy Trinity**.

No response received as yet from **Cookham Medical Centre**, **Pinder Hall** or the **care homes**.

MC queried whether contact had been made with Father John, St Elizabeth’s. CD confirmed that she would make contact.

CD

## IW

IW confirmed he had emailed the vast majority of the businesses in the High Street and Cookham Rise – only two responses received to date; both saying thanks, but no thanks.

**National England** – Email sent. Sharon Jenkins responded – happy to be involved and awaits further information.

**Environmental Agency** – Email sent, but no response.

**CIM** – Email sent, but no response except a polite “thank you for your email”.

**Cllr Gerry Clark** – Email now sent and awaiting response.

LA noted it was particularly important to get the Environmental Agency involved. MC suggested contacting Brian Clews. LA/MC to send details to IW.

LA/MC

DS suggested keeping a communication with the Environmental Agency

through their enquiry line, to make sure the right person is being contacted.

## **MC**

**MMPA** – Request for comments had been sent out, and response had been circulated.

**Network Rail** – Will be in touch with Jane Jones to find out history and future plans. There was a discussion about potential timetables, covenants they have over local land and their policy on enforcement, but WJP felt that timetables and their car parks were not really within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan. It would be worth discussing it with Troy. This should perhaps result in a more specific, albeit bullet-type, list of what people could ask for. It is important not to raise expectations inappropriately about what a Neighbourhood Plan can deliver. More explicit guidance about the incorporation of the VDS and how this could be done should also be sought.

**National Grid** – MC to make contact (including utilities groups, water and telecom) (Ian Herd).

**MC**

MC noting that something needed to be done about the Arriva buses, as they don't run after 7.00pm. This will be passed to MH.

**MH**

WJP asked that everyone chase up non-responders.

LA raised a concern that people might have a lack of understanding of what a Neighbourhood Plan is. WJP and IW confirmed that they had sent out the Troy outreach document which explains what it is and what it can do. It was agreed enthusiasm needed to be generated and any ideas should be put forward to achieve this. IW suggested using Cookham Facebook page, as this draws people in.

MC raised zoning areas.

WJP commented that it needed to be explained to people what is actually at stake.

ND suggested an online survey form (perhaps via Survey Monkey), to create a document to send out to businesses. WJP agreed this was a good idea, which he would discuss this with JH and revert.

**WJP**

## **8. Reports from Cookham Society, WildCookham, Save Cookham and SCS**

### **Cookham Society**

They are reviewing this carefully, under the guidance of Tom Denniford, the Chairman, who is a chartered surveyor with much experience in this field. They expect to produce some thoughts before the next meeting.

### **SCS/Stanley Spencer Gallery**

SCS is not representing the gallery or its trustees as such (to be taken as read

in future even if SSG's name is used). She is pleased about the perceived importance of Stanley Spencer ("SS"), but has some concerns about the emphasis on him since (only) some of his paintings were not 'literal' but adjusted scenes. This is accepted, but even the adjusted ones are adjusted within Cookham, and the way he captured the essence and life, as well as the actual scenes, of Cookham is important. Annex B to the VDS setting out the relevant scenes is highly important and relevant.

### **Wild Cookham**

LA felt that the SEA was a most important step. RBWM's ?? for the BLP had been inadequate both for the Borough and for Cookham. He appreciated that this was an expensive step, but wondered whether funding could be found somewhere. A proper SEA would provide not only more and more valuable data about habitats and species, but thus also backing for better environmental and other relevant policies in Cookham which both is and should be a bio-sensitive area. WC is continuing to look at how it can assist further with both data and policies, but beyond that would perhaps prefer the Plan to develop a little further before making more specific comments.

### **Save Cookham**

Save Cookham felt that on the whole from what they have seen, against the background of their general position which is that Cookham should be preserved as it is so far as possible and combined with policies designed to ensure that any development was highly sensitive to the existing position, including the environmental position, would prefer to await a more developed stage of the Plan. They would then make specific comments.

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

In the absence of Troy, there was nothing to report.

#### **10. Next steps re consultation**

This point had been dealt with earlier. WJP asked everyone to ensure that they came to the next meeting with any significant feedback which their contacts wished to make. Troy needed that to move on to the next stage.

**All**

#### **11. Next steps by Troy**

WJP confirmed that the Minutes of this meeting would be sent to JH at Troy. He would ensure that Troy were consulted about the SEA position and that the Design Module was progressed so far as possible.

**WJP**

WJP reiterated that this needed to be progressed relatively quickly: The grant already received (which had been earmarked to Troy), had to be spent by 31 March 2021.

#### **12. Any other Business**

There was no other business; the meeting was therefore closed.

The meeting closed at 8.00pm

**Date of next meeting – Wednesday 11 November 2020 at 6.00pm**