

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY THURSDAY 04 NOV 2021 AT 5.30PM at COMMUNITY ROOM, COOKHAM LIBRARY

PRESENT:

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

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

CLlr Martin Corker (“MC”) (Cookham Parish Council)

CLlr Mark Howard (“MH”) (Cookham Parish Council) Arrived at 5.50pm

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies for meeting absences	Actions
	Tim Veale (“TV”) (Save Cookham) CLlr Ian Wernham (“IW”) (Cookham Parish Council) Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)	
2.	Approval of minutes of meeting of 21 Oct 21	
	The minutes of the meeting on 21 Oct 2021 had been circulated and were approved by the working party.	
3.	AECOM Draft Site Masterplan Document Review	
	The main purpose of the meeting was to review the AECOM draft site masterplanning studies document and send one set of feedback comments to Ben Castell at AECOM for further review.	
	Below is the feedback sent to AECOM on behalf of the CPNWP:	
	<i>Thank you for sending us the Site Masterplanning Studies. The Working Party met on Thursday evening 4.11. This email sent out the agreed comments. For reasons which will become clear in this email, I am copying in Jon Herbert so that he may participate fully.</i>	
	<i>I need to offer some apologies. In certain respects, we have rethought some of the comments made to you on 27 September with consequent changes in what we would like by way of layout. I cannot imagine this is rare but we apologise for any time wasted as a result. I will use numbered paragraphs for ease of future reference.</i>	
	<i>1. We need to confirm with you and Jon the status of the design codes and these master planning studies. Jon has let us have a plan outline which shows the design codes as being</i>	

its Appendix A. As you know, we regard it as important that the design codes, and these master plans, have full (supplemental) planning document status. This appears to indicate that this is correct and that they will have that status, but shows only at the moment I think the main design codes. We want these to have the same status if possible.

2. Once again, I need to emphasise that we want in the design codes and these master plans pretty much everything that is currently in the guidance in the VDS. We don't mind much how you work it in but we want it all in there please.

3. This has relevance because we understand that RBWM is already consulting on the stakeholder master plan for AL 37. We therefore want to submit an "emerging Cookham neighbourhood plan "and required to be consulted on that basis as soon as we can. There are some "vibes" that the BLP may be approved later this year or early next. We need to be ready for this. There is therefore some time pressure.

4. Your documentation refers to housing mix in respect of these sites. Our understanding is that housing mix is an overall criterion in the BLP. If so, that means that this precise mix does not necessarily apply to each site. On the contrary, our understanding is that the Cookham sites (in particular AL 37) are required for family housing due to the concentration of flats in the middle of Maidenhead. We would therefore like the housing types and mix as set out in respect each site to be rethought on that basis.

5. Along similar lines, we note that the site specific criteria for each of the Cookham sites refer to "approximately X units". This is taken from the BLP and transferred into the master planning studies document on pages 15, 16 & 17. We wish to use the plan and/or the design codes/master planning studies to establish that those numbers are absolute maxima.

6. We are frankly concerned by the sizes of the dwellings proposed. Again this relates particularly to AL 37 in the light of the "family housing" to ensure we have referred but is in fact common across all three sites. We wish to make it clear that we would expect a substantial proportion of dwellings to have floor areas significantly above those defined in the minimum standards code. (though we also accept that a small proportion of dwellings will be acceptable at minimum size, particularly for part of the affordable homes). The same goes for the plots on which the houses (and flats) are placed, at any rate in most places. We are prepared to sacrifice a little on our height and open space aspirations in order to achieve this. Please will you adjust the criteria and designs accordingly?

7. In this respect, we are concerned to ensure that the open spaces remain as open spaces and do not subsequently become the subject of infilling or other development. Any ideas you can give us on how to achieve this will be appreciated. We have thought about requiring it to be owned by a company whose shareholders are all the house owners on the site; it could be donated to the Parish Council; we might seek to designate it as common land and/or village green. Any further ideas are welcome. It could in due course be designated as local Green space. I shall be copying this email to Jon Herbert and will ask him for his ideas as well since these might sit better in the plan than in the design codes/master planning studies. Nevertheless if you have any good ideas we would very much like to hear them, please.

8. We believe (since we understand that it was done in the case of the Payton House redevelopment (RBWM planning application 13/02621) in Cookham) that in planning terms we can insist that all permitted development rights are withdrawn as part of the planning permission for the maximum or near maximum number of houses specified for these sites. Will Jon please confirm. Again we also considered whether we could seek to insist upon some kind of restrictive covenant governing the whole development preventing further development/extensions. You will appreciate that this comes from the same concern set out in paragraph 6: the site seemed to us simply too cramped as they are without covering further land with permitted development. This is also a matter of encouraging biodiversity and preserving the ecology generally and animal movement routes in particular. We appreciate that to the extent it is only a planning matter rather than enforced through covenants planning applications can always be made to change the position. Nevertheless we would like to create barriers to further development if possible.

9. On AL 36 we would like the buildings to follow the Broomhill building line (that is that at the northern end of the road) rather than the white ladies lay the building line (the one at the south end). This will result in the development being set slightly further back and thus being less visually obtrusive. It will also mean that any obstructions light caused by the hedges along white ladies Lane will be less serious so that it will be easier to justify keeping the hedges and or trees and encouraging their growth. We would also like you to narrow the road where it has been widened both sides of the main entrance so that it is the same width for its entire length. This would create a bigger area of grass at the back of the buildings, which we believe is consistent with the VDS and indeed the BLP.

10. We would also like to consider the requirements for more tree cover. We propose to consider seeking a tree preservation order now to cover all the trees on the site but any masterplan should require significant tree coverage.

11. I attach to this email a submission made by the Cookham Society. Please will you pay particular attention to their points at 2.5. The working party would like these incorporated into the master plans.

12. On AL 37, please will you pay particular attention to the Cookham Society's points at 2.7 and 2.8. The working party would like these incorporated into the master plans.

13. In particular on site AL 37, the working party came to the conclusion that ecology and utility, to say nothing of design, would probably be best served by splitting the development into three parts. Broadly speaking these would be the north-west part, the centre part and the south-east part. Each could have an access road: this would use the two current emergency accesses as well as the current main access onto Cannondown Road. This redesign seems to us to have potential for encouraging three separate styles of housing (we understand that Bellway homes are the developers and they have different brands, so this might suit them). It would reduce the amount of traffic using the Cannondown Road entrance and the journey time for anyone at the north-west corner of the site who wants to go back into white ladies Lane. It would also eliminate the need for a single road to traverse the entire site. This will make it easier to have panel access routes and make the site more "villagey", feeling more like small developments rather than one big one.

	<p>14. <i>The working party would also like the roads, particularly in the south-east portion of the site to be a little less straight and grid-like. In particular on traffic it would like to require a roundabout at the Cannondown Road entrance (which would mean that the houses either side of that entrance had pushed back a little and otherwise adjusted). It would also like to see pedestrian and cycle exit points from the site at both ends of the Cannondown Road edge, not least to assist children going to school. Finally on traffic we need to require that a pedestrian crossing is put in place across Cannondown Road to enable children to go to Furze Platt school (and Holy Trinity).</i></p> <p>15. <i>On AL 38 having reconsidered the matter the working party would prefer the site to be dealt with by removing fill from the south of the site and shifting it to move north in order to raise the land level sufficient deal with flooding concerns there would not be a solid mass of housing south then the site immediately adjoining the greenbelt. It would prefer a gentle arc of housing towards the eastern side of the site (by the cycleway) leaving the green space between that housing and the existing development at Strande Park. It would prefer it if access could be gained from the existing site but if that is not possible then it would prefer the road to adjoin the bridleway. This would leave a green open space between the new housing and the existing site which could become a community feature (if not used for growing food as suggested in the site specific requirements of the BLP).</i></p> <p>16. <i>On all sites the working party was concerned to be sure that the master planning studies required adequate bargaining points for electric vehicles.</i></p> <p>17. <i>In particular, and this applies to all sites, the working party is very keen to insist upon 'Passivhaus' or similar standards of construction. It would want all homes to be heated, so far as possible, by a development/site-wide ground source heat pump network (it considers this superior to air source heat pumps). It would also want all houses to feature solar tiles and/or panels. While it is a matter for you and Jon whether this is should be in the Plan or the design code/master planning studies, our feeling was that it should be part of the design aspect of each site, as well as general design codes/the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>In view of what I said in paragraph 3 above, we would be keen to have the next rather more final drafts of both the main design codes and these master planning studies by the end of November so they can be incorporated in the "emerging Plan" which we suspect we shall need, in order to influence the stakeholder master plans very promptly following any adoption of the BLP. Obviously our prime requirement is that you and we are all satisfied that we have done our best with it all so we are ready to give any further comment/assistance we can at any time. So please come back to me if I and/or we can be of any further help or you are not clear on anything I have said.</i></p> <p><i>We should let you know that the Working Party proposes to bring in for help on sustainable energy and so on, a local person with expertise in these areas. If as a result we have further comments, we will get back to you about.</i></p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Local Landowners/Businesses' Meeting</p> <p>WJP advised he had sent an email out to the local landowners/businesses' inviting them to a Cookham Neighbourhood Plan group consultation meeting. He had to date had responses from National Trust and The Odney Club. Date and time for this meeting yet to be agreed.</p>	<p>WJP</p>

5.	AOB No AOB raised.	
6.	Date/time of next meeting To be confirmed. It was felt that we need to now see the plan with everything brought together and that can then be fully reviewed. Expectation to have the draft plan for review by mid Dec, ready for a face-to-face meeting Mid Jan 22.	

Final Approved