

## MEETING MINUTES

### PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING FOR FEEDBACK ON THE COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

SATURDAY 02 OCT 2021 AT 5.00PM

#### PRESENT:

CLlr Bill Perry (“WJP”) (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)

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

CLlr Mandy Brar (“MB”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

Tom Milner (A Member of the Public)

Mark Loveday (A Member of the Public)

2 Names Unknown (Members of the Public)

1.	Purpose of the meeting	Actions
2.	<p><b>Purpose of the meeting</b></p> <p>Cookham Parish Council is preparing a Neighbourhood Plan which will help to guide future changes in Cookham.</p> <p>This event was for the public to attend to give thoughts/comments/feedback on the vision for the area and the draft set of objectives and ideas for the emerging Cookham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Meeting points</b></p> <p>A member of the public commented that schools are currently situated in the middle of residential areas which brings parking problems. Would it not be better having schools nearer to train stations? WJP replied that the Parish Council are not the local education authority; we do not create the school or acquire the land for them; nor can the proposed plan change much of the status quo. He did not think the Parish Council would have any objections to a change of use from housing or businesses to schools if RBWM paid. But important things like schools and the green belt are in the BLP as “strategic” items which we are not allowed to change.</p> <p>A member of the public raised a concern over the scheduled ‘end’ of the CNP 2035 along with the fact that by 2035 we will need to significantly change the way we do things. He understands some aspects of this are not friendly to the plan, such as things we have consulted on like pollution and traffic. He also understands that we are producing this plan within the constraints of the Neighbourhood planning process and why we have to do that. There is a gap between what we need to achieve and what is allowed in the plan. There are variables of which we do not know the effect, such as working from home, circular economy etc. He does not see how these things can be meshed together and produce a plan which is not out of date by 2035.</p> <p>WJP made three points in response:</p>	

- 1) Yes, we do have to do it within the planning process. We have no choice but to operate within the framework that we are given in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms, the BLP, the South-Eastern Joint Minerals Authority Plan and so on. All those things are or will be in place and to the extent that such a policy framework exists we are within it.
- 2) A NP is about the use of land. But it's not about us using land: it's about how other people use land. Short of buying land we cannot make people use it. So the aim/objective can only be to ensure that if and when people do decide use their land in the future they must do it within the NP framework. We cannot take away existing rights as that make compensation payable. In terms of renewable energy LA was talking about using one of the sites e.g., Strande Park, as being a complete eco-friendly site. This is the sort of thing we are trying to factor in for when the owners want to use the land.
- 3) We are told by Troy that this is not necessarily, and so we do not intend it to be, a one-off exercise. We want to get the NP through now, but then we can apparently update/amend/change it incrementally, we hope without having to go through the entire process again. It is intended to be a living document to bring in new factors as soon as they are relevant.

A further comment was made that the plan is a policy and should be seen as guidelines and a mandate for further projects.

Another question was asked; could the NP policy been used to hold government to account e.g air quality? Someone commented that there is a difference between holding people to account and a demand for authorities to comply. WJP answered that we have been quite consistent that this document must have 'teeth;' so we can make sure it is actually observed. We want policies that say they 'must' be followed except in 'exceptional circumstances.' (We cannot get away without making the 'exceptional circumstances' clause.) What we do not want is for the planning panel in Maidenhead to say Cookham can put up with this and that, we have done all we must by 'taking account of' the NP. We want them to be bound by this. On green issues there is a line to walk: we want to be able to say that we think it's not appropriate to put up wind turbines everywhere, but at the same time we want to be able to ensure that there are solar panels on new roofs etc.. We believe we can make both of those stick.

To what extent have the Copas' been involved so far? WJP advised we have had three submissions so far. Tom Copas, Geoffrey Copas and Richard Copas with the aide of the surveyors that that Copas Farms business retains. We have got their substantial documents raising significant issues on how the countryside in particular the greenbelt and the Working Party will be engaging with them as we move forward.

All documents that come into the NP will/must be made public. The same is true of any/all meetings of the Working Party.

We have a lovely environment and not many major landowners, the main ones being Copas (both branches of the family), National Trust, Odney Club (including Winter Hill Golf Course), Summerleaze and White Place Farm. It's wise to get support from these landowners and get them onboard; we want to consult them all. However, landowners only get one vote at the ballot box and probably represent 50 out of 4500 votes. Not all landowners are going to be entirely happy with the plan, but then not 100% of other

	<p>people will be either. The point of transparency is to make sure that if people are not happy they will come forward and raise objections.</p> <p>Question raised; Who is the owner or guardian of the NP? WJP advised the NP is an official supplementary planning document which is an advantage over the VDS which is not. It has legal status therefore it has to be taken into account by the local planning authority i.e., RBWM. In that sense, RBWM are. But it is Cookham Parish Council's document (planning law says that where a Neighbourhood Plan area is the same as a Parish, the Parish Council leads it); it is paying for it (subject to large Government grants), instructing the consultants, and WJP as Chairman of its Planning Committee is chairing the Working Party and reporting monthly to the Council. So in that realistic sense, the Parish Council is its guardian.</p> <p>Question raised; Is there going to be an ongoing group that is constantly looking at this developing, to make sure situations are dealt with as opposed to a one-off event. So, it is proactive rather than ad hoc? WJP repeated that this is not envisaged as a one-off event. There will be further developments as time goes by.</p> <p>On enforcement, WJP said that he has already raised the issue at the Parish Council of finance to bring judicial review proceedings should RBWM do something contrary to the CNP . (This is another way that the Parish Council will be 'guardian' of the CNP.</p> <p>The first draft of the NP might be ready by this time next year, October 2022. Certainly, we hope to put it up for adoption no later than the local elections in May 2023. It also depends on how long the Borough take in their evaluation. The timings are important in relation to the CIL money that could be available, which is a seven-figure sum. This is a significant amount of money when you consider infrastructure projects for this Parish.</p> <p>Question raised; How do you galvanise public involvement so to help achieve the 51% of the vote? WJP said that getting people behind it is a challenge. We had four hundred responses to our first consultation. We are consulting a second time on the lessons we jhave drawn. There will be a third round of consultation. There is a lot more yet to do.</p> <p>Question raised; Will there be a quorum after taking on the number of responses that are received? WJP said no, we will just take the votes we get. If three people turn up, you go with those three votes.</p>	
<p><b>3. AOB</b></p>	<p>No AOB raised. WJP thanked all those who had come.</p>	
<p><b>4. Date/time of next meeting</b></p>	<p>Further consultation meetings/events should be held in the future. Dates/venues will be advised appropriately.</p>	