

MINUTES

MEETING OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY 24 JUNE 2021 AT 6.15PM

PRESENT:

CLlr Bill Perry ("WJP") (Chairman) (Cookham Parish Council)
CLlr Mark Howard ("MH") (Cookham Parish Council)
CLlr Chris Doyle ("CD") (Cookham Parish Council)
Lars Ahlgren ("LA") (WildCookham)
Dr Shez Courtney-Smith ("SCS") (Trustee of Stanley Spencer Gallery)
Tracy Bailey ("TB") (CNPWP Administrator)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

CLlr Ian Wernham ("IW") (Cookham Parish Council)
Dick Scarff ("DS") (Cookham Society)

This meeting was so shortly after that on 17 June because the Working Party had then felt that they could not agree to the previous draft of the literature and wanted swiftly to agree that, so was technically an adjournment of that meeting. WJP had relayed to JH the concerns raised. The purpose of the meeting was therefore to sort these issues out in discussion with JH: there was therefore no formal agenda.

- 1. Minutes** **Action**

The Minutes of the meeting on 17 June 2021 had been circulated, and were approved.
- 2. Comments on Lars Ahlgren's flowchart**

Following feedback received, LA had circulated revised flowchart options. It was agreed that "C" was the preferred option. LA thanked everyone for their input and enthusiasm. LA will send the revised flowchart to WJP and Jill. **LA**
- 3. Revisions to literature**

WJP reminded everyone that DS had raised concerns with him prior to the meeting, as he was not able to attend. DS had concerns about some of the wording in the literature, which he didn't feel accurately reflected the Cookham Society's position. Also, JH had had some reservations about the extent to which it was possible realistically to incorporate what was wanted, but had sent through some alternative drafts for discussion.

JH thanked everyone for their input. He confirmed Troy were comfortable with most of the suggestions and that there were only a couple of points with which they were not. JH agreed that the Introduction rewording

worked well and also that the rewording of the first two paragraphs of the Vision Statement made a lot of sense.

In respect of the second “what if” idea, on the design & development page, a new sentence added in about adapting new building regulations, JH confirmed that the new building regulations being introduced by the government would come into effect irrespective of whether they were included in the Neighbourhood Plan. LA explained that the rationale behind the additional sentence was that the regulations planned for by the government were to take effect in 2025, and that it was hoped that the Neighbourhood Plan would be agreed and adopted before that, so there might be a window in between to potentially have some say over building regulations.

JH noted that the aim was to encourage applicants to meet the new higher standard building regulations before the regulations actually come into force. After discussion, however, it was agreed that this in the light of the proper scope of a planning document as distinct from a building regulations one, this might cause confusion and that the sentence should therefore be removed.

JH

WJP noted that, for the future, we wanted to make clear in the Plan that we are looking forward in this respect and it was hoped people would plan accordingly. MC queried whether WJP was referring to the SuDS Regulation, which it was hoped would be put into force in advance of the Neighbourhood Plan. WJP confirmed he was referring to all regulations: he thought it was important to encourage people, as Cookham wanted, to be ahead of the game in environmental matters.

MH queried how it would be possible encourage people to abide by a higher standard – energy efficiency, car charging points, low carbon etc - when the regulations are not yet enforceable. JH explained the wording of the policies was important to achieve this; however it was not possible to say “*you have to do this*”, only to encourage and support.

WJP felt that there were things that could be done in terms of surface water and run-offs, which are not building regulations, but are environmental gains.

MH raised the concern that if a developer had completely different objectives, nothing could be done to stop that happening. WJP confirmed that if it were a building regulation issue, that is outwith the scope of the plan. However, if it is a planning issue, it can be insisted upon in the NP. JH confirmed this. He confirmed that the best that could be done under the current framework is to put forward a clear statement of intent of what was wanted.

MH queried whether the Borough Council could ignore the Neighbourhood Plan’s requirements on design/construction and building regulations. WJP confirmed they could do this on building regulation matters but not planning

matters; design issues were appropriate and it had always been the intention to incorporate most of the VDS requirements in the NP.

JH

In respect of the “what if” ideas 3, JH thought the new sentence added by LA was great, but said it should be expanded so it is not restricted to development in the Green Belt, just all new developments. MC noted that the same applied to archeological surveys.

JH screen shared the document, so everyone could see the text and comments.

JH was happy to keep in the revisions made in Objective 2 – Environment “what if” idea 1.

JH

JH had no objection to LA’s revision to Objective 3. MC noted that Thames Water, who deal with sewage, should be included, as well as the Environment Agency. This was agreed.

JH

JH thought the new text on page 4 – Landscape & Setting, idea 2, would lead to potential exposure. JH suggested removing the point about extensive unsustainable farming, but retain the sentence about opportunities for re-wilding. This was agreed. JH to reword.

JH

JH was concerned that relocating the text regarding the open space objective to page 5 - objective for social and community infrastructure, idea 2 – might suggest that the Alfred Major Recreation Ground is a location where development of new buildings would be supported. JH to reword.

JH thanked LA for his constructive comments.

JH noted the two main concerns that DS had raised. JH believed SuDS needed to be incorporated to manage the surface water and run-off. He confirmed that the work Aecom were doing would help to show how SuDS would be integrated into new developments.

JH

MC noted that the Royal Borough were responsible for the management of surface water and should be held accountable for that. MC thought points regarding The Causeway and surface water should be separated. It was agreed that JH would re-order the wording.

JH noted DS’ second concern regarding opening Cookham up to any large scale, commercially operated or inspired solar or wind farms. DS had suggested including some hydro-energy ideas, such as weirs in the Thames. WJP suggested rewording along the lines of renewable energy projects which are small scale and community-orientated, as well as sensitive in the landscape and their neighbourhood, will be encouraged. JH to reword along the lines of the suggestions made in the meeting to take into account DS’ concerns.

JH

4. Flyer

WJP had sent JH a note of what the Working Party would like to see included. JH screen shared the revised draft flyer, for discussion.

MH had made it clear that the flyer should be set out in the form of “you said this, so we did this ... we have heard you”. It was important to be transparent. MH suggested listing the 5 major points on one side of the flyer and making it into a questionnaire. He thought it was important to make the flyer different from the previous one, so it would get noticed: it needed to be clear and simple.

It was agreed that JH would change the wording and circulate the revised text the following day for review and inviting suggestions: the graphics and formatting would be worked on once the text had been agreed. Any comments/suggestions should be made by the end of the following week. It was also agreed that the flyer should initially be set out as a two-sided A4 document to see how it looked, and then a final decision would be made.

MH thought that the use of a QR code, which made feedback easy, was excellent. JH will provide QR code stickers to go onto the existing posters/banners.

SCS confirmed that the Stanley Spencer Gallery will be providing input. She said that the Stanley Spencer works can be divided into landscapes on the one hand and images of the built environment on the other, but that overall the Working Group needed also to consider views that are not specially highlighted in, or by, Stanley Spencer works. These needed to be identified also in the Neighbourhood Plan. Hence three sets of views resulted. JH will give this feedback to Aecom when the Stanley Spencer contribution has been received.

JH raised the issue of images. LA had sent through some suggested changes. JH confirmed that Troy didn't have access to the images and requested that preferred images be sent through to him. LA felt it was important that the images corresponded to the adjacent text. WJP thought that using photos of other locations in respect of what the new developments might look like on AL36, AL37 and AL38 was better than drawings. MC suggested using some photos of the proposed development landscape as it is now; he would send the negatives through to WJP. It was agreed that suitable images would be sent to JH so he could juggle with the layout.

5. Next steps

JH will produce some text and circulate for comment. Once the text is agreed, JH will fit in the photos, produce a double-sided A4 sheet and again circulate for comment. As soon as the first draft has been produced, WJP will contact the Post Office to agree and book delivery dates. It was hoped that this would be sorted by mid July, but if there was any delay, WJP would let everyone know.

JH will produce new QR codes for the A4 flyers, banners and posters.

JH

All

JH

JH

All

JH

JH

WJP

JH

It was agreed that the end of the consultation period should be last weekend in August/first weekend in September and that the public meeting will if possible be held on the first Saturday in September, with closure on the Sunday.

The next meeting of the Working Party would be held once the results were in. If Aecom's report were received in the interim, a meeting would be scheduled to consider it. WJP would keep everyone informed.

FINAL APPROVED

MC is going to contact Mark Hopwood of GWR to request a consultation with them.

MC

Date of next meeting – Thursday 23 September 2021 at 6.00pm

FINAL APPROVED