

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY WEDNESDAY 04 JAN 2023 AT 6.00PM COMMUNITY ROOM COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

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

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

Cllr Jane Perry (“JP”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Cllr Jacqui Edwards (“JE”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Cllr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council)

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Nic Dawkes (ND) (Save Cookham)

Sue Tisdale (“ST”) (Cookham Footprint)

Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Spencer Expert)

2 Members of the public

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies Jon Herbert (“JH”) (Troy) Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (Wild Cookham) & Mike Copeland (“LA”) (Wild Cookham) Paul Strzelecki (Cookhams Footprint); ST is standing in.	Actions
2.	Approval of meeting minutes Changes to be updated in the 21 Dec 22 meeting minutes as agreed by the WP: 1) Item 3 topic 3 (2 paragraphs) starting DS- Project C(g). This is the subject of Renewable Energy projects . Add: PS challenged the proposed “Referendum” clause, both WJP and DS stated that this clause was for projects and not technically part of the NP. PS then said if it’s not part of the plan then what are we doing discussing and voting on it in this meeting. 2) Amend: PS has already written the requirement in an email (to Jon and WP) before the meeting (at 17.34) and read it verbatim at the end of this meeting. The request on Jon was for an answer to: “Is the draft you have prepared on Renewable(Local Energy) less restrictive , neutral, or more restrictive than the existing NPPF and BLP in place at present?” 3) Section 4 paragraph 2. Add: Such input is equally valued and heard by the WP which must be both fair and seen to be fair by all parties in the village. 4) Insert sentence after pre penultimate sentence. LA, in response to DSs comment clarified the arrows were broad lines and not intrusions into peoples’ gardens. 21 Dec 2022 meeting minutes approved by the WP with the above updates.	

<p>3.</p>	<p>Decide upon whether and if so how to move the Projects part of the document into a discrete section or document.</p> <p>WJP asked whether the WP want to move the Projects sections into a discrete part or appendix to the document, but all in one document; An alternative would be to move the Projects out entirely to a separate document.</p> <p>WJP has asked Troy for views. Troy consider this to be up to the WP. Troy do not support either change. Troy have, however, seen the projects move into a discrete part of the document before and understand the reasons for this. Troy would oppose moving the projects into a separate document.</p> <p>MH asked “How do projects get on the project list as they get renewed through time. How do we update?” WJP commented that Troy have always said we can make minor changes to the plan without having to go to a referendum. So it is assumed we could change a project without a referendum as they are not in the planning part of the document, what is technically the Plan.</p> <p>MH and WJP like the idea of separating the Projects. They feel that it will be clearer and works better. DS supports this as well and it will keep the planning document as small and as neat as possible. DS asked “If the projects are an appendix in the main CNP then would they have to go to referendum?” WJP said if it is in the document then he would assume that everything would go to referendum.</p> <p>MH stated that the starting point is that everything would go to referendum initially. The CNP is generally updated every 10-15 years. However, the projects may get completed over a period of time.</p> <p>ST advised she may be able to access some other Neighbourhood Plans to review and see if any other plans have separated the projects out. WJP explained that the WP have had access to other Neighbourhood Plans already.</p> <p>ST continued that Cookham Footprint is concerned that the plan is putting roadblocks against renewable energy. This is a plan for the future, and it needs to be inspiring. They are very passionate about aiming for zero carbon and other villages have achieved this. Cookhams Footprint are concerned about the tone of the CNP in relation to renewable energy. She went on to say that there are incredible innovations and home energy is changing fundamentally; we will all need to be moving off carbon. Solar is one of the very important ways of doing this for the moment. She also thanked the WP for all their hard work on the CNP so far. MH commented that whilst he takes the point about the plan being a vision for the future, this is still a planning document and whilst we can set guidelines here, the national law goes above us. WJP pointed out that the decisions on this were taken at the last two meetings of the WP, which could not re-open discussion on previously decided matters which were not on the agenda.</p> <p>MH proposed that the CNP is still one document. The planning section will be one part and the projects will be in a separate section in the same document as an appendix, both of which will have to go to referendum on day one. LT, ND, CD agreed.</p> <p>WJP asked MH would he be wanting to put into the wording about the projects that “Over time these maybe subject to change” if Troy say we can do that. MH said we need to understand how we get a change. If this proposal goes through MH thinks we should do this and attach some wording about changes. WJP to ask Troy what amendments can be made/timescales etc.</p>	<p>JH</p>
------------------	---	------------------

	<p>WP nem. con. agreed with MHs proposal.</p> <p>CD asked if the project side could be revisited for example every 6 months. MH thinks it seems to be something that evolves over a longer timescales more likely 4-5 years.</p>	
4.	<p>Review/decide upon draft appendix relating to Stanley Spencer.</p> <p>WJP expressed his enormous thanks to SCS for all her work, on behalf of the WP. The WP unanimously agreed.</p> <p>As accuracy is important, SCS would like the WP to review. Taking SCS’s questions/points in turn (Appendix A):</p> <p>WP were happy to incorporate the following paragraph taken from the Cookham Village Conservation Appraisal Statement, into the text which supports policy C-CI2 with a statement that this is taken from the Cookham Village Conservation Area Appraisal Statement, a document issued by the LPA in its capacity as such, which acknowledges the important of Spencer to Cookham:</p> <p>“The paintings, however, are not always accurate depictions of the village; he was not afraid to exercise artistic licence to aid his narratives. Many details in the smaller canvases are actual, recognisable views and are as direct as many of his bold portraits. In the larger pictures, however, artistic liberties are taken so that the spirit of the place is captured. It is this character and appearance which designation as a conservation area serves to protect.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change the word “Landscapes” in the text of the Plan document to “Landscape setting and built form” to reflect the fact that Spencer did not only paint landscapes. WP agreed. 2) <i>I have not spotted any references in the text to the INTERNATIONAL renown of Spencer’s works. People come from all over the UK and all over the world to Cookham to view ‘Spencer’s village’ and explore the subject of these paintings. The Gallery’s Visitors’ Book is evidence of this and the point should be made quite prominently.</i> WP agreed. 3) <i>If we can achieve appropriate references to Spencer, there is no need to use his name so many times in the main body of the text.</i> WP prepared to downscale these references if/where Troy consider wise. 4) <i>My version of Appendix 5, is provisionally renamed ‘Stanley Spencer’s Cookham - in contrast with ‘The Spencer Landscape’ in the Contents List of the current Neighbourhood Plan draft, and ‘The Spencer Catalogue’ as the actual heading of Appendix 5.</i> WP agreed to change to ‘Stanley Spencer’s Cookham.’ 5) It is important that Policy C-CI2 should align with the VDS Guidance Point G14.1 as they are both part of the same document. Does the Working Group consider that these are sufficiently aligned? <i>WP agree to refer this back Troy to ensure that this is so. C-CI2 must ‘say the same thing’ as G14.1, though different wording is fine if that is desirable to make it fully effective. DS opening paragraph WJP to discuss with Troy. 1917.</i> Send back to Troy. 	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>

	<p>6) Please can we discuss/confirm whether the ‘consultative’ way forward proposed in the Acknowledgements section of the document is acceptable to the Working Group. If allowed by RBWM, WP agreed with this approach in principle.</p> <p>7) Can we discuss whether the Spencer Appendix is to be included in full in the document, or simply referenced. It appears that the VDS is simply referenced, which, if so, seems OK as it is a document of known and established status, recognised as a Supplementary Planning Document by the Borough Council.</p> <p>The Spencer Appendix, in contrast, has no known or established status. If is not included in full, but simply referenced (which may be ideal, given its length), will it run into the problem that it has no weight in either direction in terms of arguments that may be put in relation to planning decisions? Possibly a halfway house would be suitable, in which Appendix 5 would contain the key listings of painting titles (and maybe the map also) but none of the following detailed pages. If this is preferred, we would still need to decide how to ‘package’ the document as a whole, which would then be referenced from the Neighbourhood Plan but independent of it in some way.</p> <p>Just as the WP wants to ensure the full incorporation of the VDA as an effective and binding part of the Plan, so it wants to ensure that this part is fully effective. Against that background, the WP agreed to ask Troy’s view on this and how best to do it.</p> <p>WJP said he felt it important for fairness, and in recognition of SCS’s splendid work, that the intellectual property rights in this document remain with SCS and are not transferred to the Parish Council or anyone else. The document must ensure this. WP agreed.</p>	<p>JH</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Review/decide upon length of document. DS much happier on seeing the projects come out of the main part of the plan. Nevertheless, Troy still asked so see what can be done to reduce the length of the document if and to the extent that this can be done without sacrificing effectiveness and desired outcome.</p>	<p>JH</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>AOB DS asked when the three policies to still be redrafted by Troy would be done. WJP advised that Troy would start redrafting after this meeting.</p> <p>WJP updated the WP that the next Parish Annual Meeting will include a presentation about the Neighbourhood Plan. Hopefully by then we should have a pre consultation draft to present. Also by this time we should have the Borough Councils response to the SEA and HEA enquiries which have been made. MH also asked as we have representatives across various groups could the please publicise the meeting date.</p> <p>ND brought up the point PS had raised via email with regards to the referencing Marconi in the plan. WJP to ask Troy how this could be worked into the plan. WP agreed.</p> <p>ND also mentioned P21 of CNP box 4- It reads ‘Retail parade between car park and Pinder Hall,’ should this be the medical centre car park? Please change this. WP agreed.</p> <p>Can Troy check if the Station Car Park is protected in any way and if not it needs to be added to be protected in plan. WP agreed.</p> <p>CD asked if we could give a timeline for the redraft by latest Mid Feb.</p>	<p>JH</p> <p>JH</p> <p>JH</p>

	<p>SCS asked if we have a full picture of the way forward? WJP advised we have an approximate picture, and LAs time flow is on the CPC website. What we are planning to do next; 1) Next version of the draft CNP back by Mid Feb latest, to be exposed to the public at the next Annual Meeting. 2) The draft will go straight up on to the CPC website for comments. 3) We will write to everyone on the list of July 2020 for comments. 4) WP will meet to also put forward its comments. 5) At roughly the same time SEA and HEA tests are being done by RBWM, which involve consultations with the statutory consultees e.g. Water people and Historic England etc.</p> <p>So, it is hoped by end of March we have enough to go back and make any final changes we need to make. At that point we are into statutory consultation managed by RBWM not by us, which should take place around Apr/May. Outcome of that may mean more tweaks are required. Then it will go to the examiner appointed by RBWM, but who is technically independent. Feedback will follow that. Then it would go to referendum. WJP can see no way this will get in front of the public before Sep/Oct. WJP commented that he thought we would have an Autumn or Spring referendum. MH said that we had thought we might be able to combine this with a local election but feels it might be better now to piggyback on the general election on 2024. WJP advised that the Neighbourhood Plan gains no weight whatsoever, they either exist if they do not. If they exist, they are binding and if they don't they are not. So until the CNP is adopted it will not affect the developments on Lower Mount Farm, Strande Park and or the Gas Works Site, and therefore if we want to insist on Passive House Standards for these developments, we won't be able to until this plan is in effect.</p> <p>Also, once this plan is in effect, the Parish will receive 15% of community infrastructure levy proceeds instead of the 10% it acquires when there is no Neighbourhood Plan in existence. MH confirmed that the CIL entitlement attaches when they get their commencement statement. This is a certificate by building, not by site.</p>	
7.	<p>Date/time of next meeting TBC. Dependency on Troy's redrafting of the CNP. It will be a multiple of fortnights on a Wednesday.</p>	

Spencer points for discussion, meeting 4 Jan 2023

Now that the Working Group is in receipt of a full draft of the Spencer Annex, I believe it is important to consider the following.

1 Sufficiency of expression 'Spencer Landscape' or 'Landscape'
Despite my stated reservations about the use solely of the word 'Landscape' where Spencer is concerned, as if Spencer painted nothing else, this expression has remained dominant in the main body of the Neighbourhood Plan. On a number of occasions, it is made clear that 'Landscape' includes the built environment, but, on most, the document conveys the impression that all we are interested in is long-views and vistas. The Appendix now produced should make clear how extensively Spencer documented built forms, as well as views.

A trawl through the document is needed to make sure all references are suitable for the context in which they are written.

Here are some examples:

6.16 In addition to his depiction of biblical events, Spencer also painted a series of landscapes. Everyday life in the Parish was captured in his pictures; cows ambling across the Moor, boatyards on the Thames banks and the hazy meadows that surround the settlements. Standing on The Causeway over the Moor today gives a view towards Cookham Village that hasn't changed since being captured by Spencer in his painting 'Cookham Moor'.

Too narrow

6.19 The works of Spencer and Grahame represent important artistic interest for the Parish, relating to our appreciation of and therefore the significance of the landscape and its setting as a cultural and heritage asset. Their work contributes to the significance of both the place that is seen and experienced, as well as the place you are looking from.

Too narrow

Install and use heat pumps as a low carbon way of heating the property. Solar Photovoltaic panels can also be utilised. Roof tiles and panels should be designed such that they are sensitive to the setting and views across the valued Spencer landscape.

Too narrow as the buildings themselves also matter

6.22 Many of the paintings of the Parish produced by Spencer depict key views, scenes, facades and other details from in and around the area. Among the works with the greatest relevance are the landscapes painted from the ridge which extends from Woodlands Farm down to The Mount, looking across the valley towards Hedsor, Cliveden and Taplow Court, together with various paintings around Poundfield and Englefield. Several works provide views of the river, including the series 'Christ Preaching at Cookham Regatta', and there are many which show parts of Cookham Village as well as specific buildings. These are listed in Appendix 5.

Better wording, but then it goes on to downplay the importance of the built environment

	<p>The unique and distinctive qualities of the area, as reflected in the landscape setting and built form, and depicted in the paintings of Stanley Spencer, should be retained for the benefit and enjoyment of all, including future generations.</p> <p>This is OK</p> <p>6.23 The retention and safeguarding of the Spencer views are important to the character and identity of the Parish. Equally, they contribute towards the local economy, with visitors to the area attracted because of the Spencer legacy, for leisure and recreation activities. This is recognised in the Cookham High Street Conservation Area Statement which notes that <i>'due to the international focus on Sir Stanley this [the setting of the paintings] is not solely of significance to Cookham in isolation, but is an issue of interest to a much wider audience.'</i>³⁹</p> <p>Too narrow.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>International renown</p> <p>I haven't spotted any references in the text to the INTERNATIONAL renown of Spencer's works. People come from all over the UK and all over the world to Cookham to view 'Spencer's village' and explore the subject of these paintings. The Gallery's Visitors' Book is evidence of this and the point should be made quite prominently.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Repeated naming of Spencer</p> <p>If we can achieve appropriate references to Spencer, there is no need to use his name so many times in the main body of the text.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Naming of Appendix 5</p> <p>My version of Appendix 5, is provisionally renamed 'Stanley Spencer's Cookham - in contrast with 'The Spencer Landscape' in the Contents List of the current Neighbourhood Plan draft, and 'The Spencer Catalogue' as the actual heading of Appendix 5.</p> <p>I'd settle for the 'The Spencer Catalogue' if this is preferred, but I am unhappy with 'The Spencer Landscape' as I believe this naming understates the matters of interest.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Policy C-C12</p> <p>It is important that Policy C-C12 should align with the VDS Guidance Point G14.1 as they are both part of the same document. Does the Working Group consider that these are sufficiently aligned? As already pointed out, 'The Spencer Landscape' is not an adequate title for this Policy.</p> <div data-bbox="261 1346 1049 1680" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Policy C-C12: The Spencer Landscape</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development must protect and enhance the cultural value of the Spencer Landscape, encapsulating views, facades and other building details depicted in paintings by Sir Stanley Spencer as presented in the Spencer Catalogue in Appendix 5, and avoid causing harm to this: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Development should carefully balance the need to protect this cultural heritage with the aims of creating sensitive change. b) Development having an adverse impact, especially in relation to the direct visual linkage which is possible between the painting and the present day scene shall be avoided. c) Where the provision of public utility services necessitate the construction of buildings or other installations, care must be taken to minimise their impact on the Spencer Landscape. 2. Proposals which remove features that detract from the 'Spencer Landscape' will be encouraged. <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> <p>Deleted: including</p> <p>Deleted: views to and from it</p> <p>Formatted: Font: Not Bold, English (US)</p> <p>Formatted: English (US)</p> <p>Deleted: <#>Development must integrate positively with the character of the landscape and reinforce local distinctiveness.⁴</p> <p>Deleted: <#>Development that has an adverse impact on the present day scene of views painted by Spencer shall be avoided.</p> <p>Formatted: Font: Not Bold</p> <p>Formatted: Font: Not Bold</p> <p>Formatted: English (UK)</p> <p>Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.06 cm, Hanging: 0.75 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm</p> </div> </div>

	<p>GUIDANCE: Stanley Spencer scenes G14.1 The views, facades and other building detail depicted in paintings by Sir Stanley Spencer are part of Cookham's cultural heritage and contribute to the understanding both of the history and character of Cookham and of Sir Stanley Spencer's celebrated works. Proposals should carefully balance the need to protect this cultural heritage with the aims of creating sensitive change. Proposals having an adverse impact, especially in relation to the direct visual linkage which is possible between the painting and the present day scene should not be permitted.</p>
6	<p>Review and acknowledgements</p> <p>Please can we discuss/confirm whether the consultative way forward proposed in the Acknowledgements section of the document is acceptable to the Working Group.</p>
7	<p>Treatment of the Spencer Appendix</p> <p>Can we discuss whether the Spencer Appendix is to be included in full in the document, or simply referenced. It appears that the VDS is simply referenced, which, if so, seems OK as it is a document of known and established status, recognised as a Supplementary Planning Document by the Borough Council.</p> <p>The Spencer Appendix, in contrast, has no known or established status. If is not included in full, but simply referenced (which may be ideal, given its length), will it run into the problem that it has no weight in either direction in terms of arguments that may be put in relation to planning decisions?</p> <p>Possibly a halfway house would be suitable, in which Appendix 5 would contain the key listings of painting titles (and maybe the map also) but none of the following detailed pages. If this is preferred, we would still need to decide how to 'package' the document as a whole, which would then be referenced from the Neighbourhood Plan but independent of it in some way.</p>