

MINUTES

MEETING OF COOKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY 17 Mar 2022 AT 6.00PM VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING

PRESENT:

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

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

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

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

Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)

Lars Ahlgren (“LA”) (WildCookham)

Nic Dawkes (“ND”) (Save Cookham)

Dr Shez Courtney-Smith (“SCS”) (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)

Dick Scarff (“DS”) (Cookham Society)

Nina Milner (“NM”) (CNPWP Administrator)

1.	Apologies for meeting absences	Actions
	CLlr Chris Doyle (“CD”) (Cookham Parish Council) Ms E Tomalin (Energy Consultant)	
2.	Approval of meeting minutes from 20 Jan 22 The meeting minutes from the NPWP meeting on 20 Jan 2022 had been circulated and were approved by the working party.	
3.	Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda No matters arising otherwise on the agenda brought to the meeting.	
4.	Review of revised draft Plan, Green Space Assessment and associated items/issues, with decision on next steps MH just wanted to draw everyone’s attention, after reviewing various documents/comments, that this is not just about today. This is about making sure we have tools in our toolbox to look after Cookham years ahead. We might not need it now and we might not ever need it, but we should have tool is our toolbox appropriate to use in the future. WJP in agreement. DS posed the question: Do we need a design guide, as we have a VDS which has been produced by people who know the village? He added that he does not feel the design guide adds anything different to the VDS. He would be happy with one paragraph which	

stated the VDS should be abided by, or words to that effect, rather than the whole design guide unless there are very special circumstances.

WJP asked for comments, as at the last meeting it was agreed that the WP were broadly happy with the design guide.

MH had no problem with the design guide. If it helps us achieve the goal we want to achieve then keep it. If it does not, then we do not keep it. If there is a valid reason, we keep it. It does add a little bit extra, and it helps achieves the goal, so that is what we need.

WJP added he has already used the design master planning document for AL38 by handing it to Shanly and will also use it with Bellway for AL37. These go considerably beyond the VDS. The design guide incorporates the VDS, and so will therefore it will give it the extra force we want.

MH pointed out that we are trying to complete this in the next 12 months. When we speak to Shanly and Bellway they do not expect to be completely through the planning process in this time. Also, that is not going to be the last time land is taken out of greenbelt for major housing developments. WJP completely agreed. He further commented we are already aware of the site behind Whyteladyes Lane which has been turned down once already and there may be a risk that the land immediately west of AL37 might be considered as a next step for development; other substantial sites around Cookham could also, regrettably, be considered as potential developments at some point.

ND agreed there is a lot of repetition, but the design guide also gives elaboration in parts e.g., sustainable design so from that point of view it puts a stamp on it. He felt the VDS feels brushed over a bit in this, but overall it is there and the design guide is a worthwhile document to have. It is also more of a professional document than the current VDS from a visual aspect.

SCS had no major objection to the design guide and could see where it is adding potential help. She felt the VDS is weak on e.g., development in your own garden. VDS was weak on sustainability as it was done in 2013. SCS does not like the idea of getting rid of the design guide.

WJP added that AECOM are on standby to add further input on sustainability.

LA if it does not harm and does some good then we should keep the design guide. The investment has been done now and further augments the VDS.

WJP is happy to go back to AECOM and ask for it to be more concise but not to lose anything from it.

WJP said that the sense from the WP was that the design guide adds something and we should stick with it. Agreed.

SCS asked if we could instruct AECOM that we do not want anything in the design guide that does no more than duplicates what is in the VDS? And that they need to make direct

comparison and take out anything that duplicates. MH was more concerned with the idea it contradicts anything.
Agreed we should ask AECOM to edit it down and remove some of the duplication. MH also felt we should get AECOM to sign off saying that it does not contradict anything in the VDS.

DS raised a concern on how the NP meshes with the BLP and how it interacts with strategic and non-strategic policies. He had raised this with JH from Troy who responded to say it is fine as it is, they have done it like this before. DS asked whether where we are putting a policy forward that is covering non-strategic areas in the BLP does what we put forward totally replace what is in the BLP? Do they ride side by side? How do they relate? WJP's understanding is that we have a duty to comply with the strategic requirements of the BLP. Not a duty to comply in every specific detail, it is a general duty to comply with the general strategic requirements, but the BLP is quite specifically detailed about what is strategic. Because the CNP will be adopted by the borough and is a planning document, if the CNP and the BLP clash, the CNP has priority, because it is the most recent document adopted by the borough.

DS made reference to renewable energy. BLP says you do not have any wind turbines unless you allocate positions for them in the NP. In the BLP this is a non-strategic policy. If we put in a policy which covers renewable energy, does the whole of the BLP policy drop out, or do the bits that we have not gone against stay? WJP's understanding would be that the bits we have not gone against stay there, and the two documents need to be read together.

LA feels this is an important question, as if we are putting in a lot of work without first checking the appropriate BLP policies strategic/non-strategic, we might be wasting a lot of time. We need to work out a way forward in the drafting phase and think about how we are going to work with the policies we are proposing. WJP has taken the view to date, he said, that we have to work within the perimeters of the BLP. WJP feels that JH will have worked to this.

LA asked if JH under each section could refer to the BLP policies that are relevant. (He means this just for the reference of the WP, not in the final document necessarily.)

MH feels we are taking on a burden at this stage which is not needed. The documents will be checked go through various legal processes before it goes to a referendum. We will not get the document completed if we get bogged down in the detail at this stage. It is the responsibility of the group to get a complete document, which the experts will then check. MH added the WP have chosen professionals who have completed many Neighbourhood Plans before. We must go with it and have confidence.

Agreed to proceed accordingly.

Policies Review in Draft CNP Version Feb 22.

A full review of the draft Plan was undertaken. DS in particular brought forward significant comments from the Cookham Society, and LA made significant comments. A separate document is being compiled with the comments/feedback, which will be amalgamated with those which may be made at the next meeting, in accordance with JH's request for a single feed-back document. Please refer to this.

5.	AOB No AOB raised.	
6.	Date/time of next meeting 6pm Wed 13 April 22. Community Room, Cookham Library or Zoom. TBC.	

FINAL APPROVED