

Comments from members of the public concerning any of these Planning Applications should be made to RBWM in writing or through <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning>

COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of a Meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held in the Community Room
at Cookham Library on Tuesday 12th August at 7.30 pm.

PRESENT: Cllr J. Edwards, Chairman, Cllr Carol Asladie, Cllr Caen, Cllr B. Perry, Mr. D. Scarff

Also Present: Assistant Clerk

Open Forum

Present: 1 member of the press, 5 members of the public

25/01852/Full: The Coppice, Startins Lane, Cookham, SL6 9AN

Paul Phelps and Mumtaz Alam showed the meeting plans of the proposed extension. They explained it was intended to make the house suitable for multi-generational living. They considered that work on the garage was needed as it was not currently fit for purpose being small and the roof was caving in. They believed the proposed development fitted in with surroundings and could not be seen from the highway.

Both Mr Phelps and Mr Alam were happy to include a planning condition or covenant stating that the garage would always be ancillary to the main dwelling.

25/01706/FULL 27 Broom Hil, Cookham, SL6 9LH

Maria Stibbs and Hardeep Turner-Kany explained their concerns about the proposed extension to 27 Broom Hill. Their houses back on to the property. The proposed dormer will look over both their gardens and the back of their properties affecting their privacy.

1. Apologies

Cllrs Austin, Kellaway. Cllr Bedwell sent apologies and resigned from the Committee.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. To approve the minutes of the meeting of 8th July 2025

Proposed by Cllrs Caen and Edwards. These were approved

4. Matters arising from the previous meeting not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

None to discuss

5. To agree the Council's comments on all matters received from RBWM planning department prior to the meeting including:-

Application Number	Current Planning Applications.	Parish Council Decision
25/01601/FULL App date 27 June 2025 Comments to RBWM 1 Aug. Ext granted.	External alterations, including 1 no. retractable awnings and redecoration. The Ferry Sutton Road Cookham SL6 9SN Mitchells And Butlers	No Comment
25/01602/LBC App date 27 June 2025 Comments to RBWM 1 Aug. Ext granted.	Consent for external alterations, including 1 no. retractable awnings and redecoration. The Ferry Sutton Road Cookham SL6 9SN Mitchells And Butlers	No Comment

25/01706/FULL App date 4 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 6 Aug. Ext granted	1no. rear dormer, 1no. sun tunnel and alterations to fenestration. 27 Broom Hill Cookham SL6 9LH Mr Andrew Speakman	Objection The proposed extension remains poorly designed and out of keeping with properties in the surrounding residential area, contrary to RBWM Design Guidance paragraph 10.20. In addition, the back-to-back spacing between properties in the immediate area of the proposed extension is particularly narrow (we believe less than 20m). Consequently, the dormer windows of the proposed extension significantly overlook the neighbours backing onto the property, resulting in significant loss of amenity and privacy, contrary to the RBWM Design Guidance paragraph 8.4. inadequate window design mitigations are proposed for the proposed extension to preserve neighbours' privacy. The above failings are also contrary to Cookham VDS Guidance G6.9a. Extensions. Councillors' understanding is that any properties with dormers in this immediate area are likely to be houses with permitted development rights, rather than first floor maisonettes, where scrutiny via the planning permission process is quite rightly required.
25/01737/FULL App date 10 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 11 Aug. Ext to 15 Aug	Detached equestrian stable building with associated parking. Lower Mount Farm Long Lane Cookham SL6 9EE G W Copas Farms	Strong Objection. The property history for the application is significantly incomplete and does not include multiple relevant previous applications for this site, including those which were refused. The proposed building will further encroach into Green Belt between Cookham. The proposed stable building is not of an appropriate size to service the acreage under consideration in the application, which is not enough to graze even one horse. A further, more detailed objection will follow.

25/01717/FULL App date 10 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 18 Aug.	1no. front bay window, 1no. single storey side extension, 1no. single storey rear extension and new steps, following demolition of existing elements. Manor Court Danes Gardens Cookham SL6 9BF Mr Mumtaz Alam	No Comment
25/01852/FULL App date 25 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 27 Aug.	Single storey rear extension, 2no. front dormers, 1no. rear dormer, new roof and raising of the ridge to the existing detached garage to provide habitable accommodation within the roofspace, ancillary to the main dwelling. The Coppice Startins Lane Cookham SL6 9AN Mr Paul Phelps	No objection, providing any permission granted includes a planning condition that requires that the proposed development must remain ancillary to the main dwelling
25/01944/FULL App date 1 Aug 2025 Comments to RBWM 3 Sept	Part single part two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration. Spring Cottage Spring Lane Cookham Dean SL6 6PW Mr Paul Garner	No objection provided the proposed development is not additional to all the currently approved developments for this property under permitted development rights. If the proposed development is approved, we request a condition that permitted development rights are removed from the property. If the proposed development is approved, CPC also requests a condition requiring an archaeological survey, as the proposed development is in an area of high archaeological potential.
25/01804/REM App date 15 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 18 Aug.	Reserved matters (landscape) pursuant to outline planning permission 22/00343/OUT for access, appearance, layout and scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the construction of x20 dwellings with associated vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking, drainage works and open space Land East of Strande Park Strande Lane Cookham Shanly Homes Ltd Sorbon	Objection See comments below
25/01804/REM – Objection CPC thinks it undesirable that the asphalt path at the southern end currently shown as between plots 18 and 19 should debouch into the Ecology Buffer. Instead, the gardens of either plots 17 and 18, or else plots 13 and 14 (and perhaps plot 17 a little) could be slightly curtailed to have the footpath running east/west there instead of where currently suggested. That would allow access and egress onto the path while leaving the ecology buffer alone (a hedge between it and the footpath would plainly also be desirable) The boundary treatment for the site is not clearly defined in the supplied plans. In some areas, particularly to the east and south of the development, the proposed planting scheme appears to encroach on land outside the boundary of the site, presumably marked by the red line. It is not clear from the plans whether fencing is used in addition to hedging, and if so, whether this will be replacement, additional or existing fencing, and if replacement or additional fencing, of what height or type. It is also not clearly marked in the plans how high hedges on the development will be allowed to grow. These issues should be clarified before any approval of the application takes		

place.

To promote good community relations, we request the developer further consults the residents of the mobile homes immediately adjacent to the access road along the west border of the development site, regarding the details of the proposed new planting and possibly fencing scheme along this border. The hard and soft landscaping of this border will directly impact on the amenity of adjacent residents' mobile homes, which are within just a few metres of this border and which by their nature may not be well insulated against noise. The wishes of individual residents of these mobile homes should particularly be taken into account regarding the positioning and number of the trees on the western border of the development, which will directly affect the amenity of their individual homes and gardens. In addition, the hedge on the western border of the development site should be specified to be of a height and thickness to provide as much screening from noise and pollution from the access road along the western boundary of the development site as practicable, consistent with sympathetic and biodiverse planting.

In order to comply with VDS guidance G6.4, Rural and semi rural character, more native species should be used for the planting, particularly on south and east parts of the development, and the 'ecology; buffer', which directly border rural, undeveloped land, This is particularly the case for the hedging and trees which will be visible from the rural undeveloped areas on these sides of the development plot. The 'ecology buffer' should be planted as far as possible with native plants, which provide the best food sources and habitats for native wildlife, and should be minimally managed. Any existing native hedging at the boundaries of the site should be left in place, and entirely native hedging and trees should be used to screen the development on the south and east sides. As per VDS Guidance G6.20, we request that careful consideration is given to the native hedging on the south and east borders, that is continuous, with no gaps, and that any fencing or gaps on the south and east borders are completely screened by native hedging. We also request the inclusion, where appropriate, of more native oak trees in the planting scheme for the development, especially in and around the eco buffer. Oak trees provide the best bio-diversity gain, as habitat for the greatest numbers of native species.

25/01921/VAR App date 31 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 1 Sept.	Variation (under Section 73) of Condition 4 and Condition 5 (Approved Plans) to substitute those plans approved under 24/02513/VAR for Variation (under Section 73) of Condition 4 (Materials) and Condition 5 (Approved Plans) to substitute those plans approved under 24/01074/FULL for new front, side and rear steps, part single part two storey side/rear extension, alterations to fenestration and external materials, following demolition of existing elements with amended plans, with amended plans. 9 Coxborrow Close Cookham SL6 9HH Mr Matthew Seamons	No Comment
--	--	-------------------

Application Number	Current Applications for Tree Works.	Parish Council Decision
25/01738/TCA App date 8 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 7 Aug. Ext to 14 th Aug	G1 - Mature Conifer - Reduce height, T1 - Yew - Crown reduction by 2m, T2 - Mature Conifer - Reduce height 4m, T3 - Conifer - Reduce height by 4m, T4 Conifer - fell as per photographs. Bagsters Kings Lane Cookham SL6 9AY Bethany Taylor	No Comment
25/01694/TCA App date 8 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 7 Aug.	(T1) Norwegian spruce - Remove branches (as shown) (T2) Leylandii - Cut down the tree Chantry House 8 Vicarage Close Ms Andrea Ward Cookham SL6 9SE	No comment
25/01701/TPO App date 4 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 4 Aug. Ext to 13 Aug	G1 - Remove 4 no. Ash trees (060/1991/TPO) April Cottage Poundfield Lane Cookham SL6 9RY Mr Joe Margerrison	No objection, providing an appropriate replanting plan to replace the trees with suitable species is provided.

25/01544/TCA App date 18 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 18 Aug.	(T1) Hazel - Reduce leaving a final height of 3.5m and spread of 2.5m (T2) Strawberry - Reduce leaving a final height of 3.5m and spread of 3m. (T3) Elder-Reduce leaving a final height of 3.5m and spread of 2.5m (T4) Hazel-Reduce leaving a final height of 3.5m and spread of 3m. (T5) Holly-Reduce leaving a final height of 3.5m and spread of 2m. Brewers Orchard Dean Lane Cookham SL6 9BH Mrs Vivien Duffy	No Comment
25/01813/TCA App date 17 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 18 Aug	(T1) Fell dead tree (circled in photo). (T2 and T3) Llandi and (T4) Maple - Thin by 30% Ash House Popes Lane Cookham SL6 9NY Mrs Katy Savidge	No Comment
25/01847/TCA App date 21 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 21 Aug.	(T16) Pine and (T19) Liquidambar - Remove trees. Triboges Berries Road Cookham SL6 9SD Mrs Polly Whall	No objection providing an appropriate replanting plan to replace the trees with suitable species is provided.
25/01923/TCA App date 28 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 27 Aug.	(T1) Maple - Remove top of tree to leave 4m from ground level. (T2) Sycamore - Reduce by 2m to provide clearance (as shown). Chiltern Point Bigfrith Lane Cookham SL6 9PH Mr Connell	No objection provided the Tree Officer evaluates the request to fell the Maple, T1, as T1 is on the boundary of the property, is widely visible, and contributes to the rural nature of the area.
25/01888/TPO App date 31 July 2025 Comments to RBWM 1 Sept.	(T1) Beech - section fell and (T2) Beech - section fell. (005/1964/TPO). Silver Birch Stone House Lane Cookham SL6 9TP Philip Bittan	No objection providing an appropriate replanting plan to replace the trees with suitable species is provided.
25/01973/TPO App date 1 August 2025 Comments to RBWM 3 Sept.	(T02); (T03); (T04); (T05); (T06); (T07); (T08); and (T10) Conifers - remove. Brunswick House The Pound Cookham SL6 9QD Ms Diane Williams	Objection CPC request that the trees in question are, where possible, replaced with smaller more appropriate species. We also request that any replacement hedge is of suitable native species, as per VDS Guidance G6.20 (incorporated in the Cookham Neighbourhood Plan), rather than cherry laurel, which has very low ecological value.
Planning Inspectorate Appeals		
Planning Inspectorate APP/T0355/C/25/3369085 Comments to Planning Inspectorate 27 August:	Without planning permission the material change of the use of the land to a caravan site for stationing of a caravan (mobile home) for residential purposes, with associated hardsurface. Land to the side of 16 Halfway Houses, SL6 6PP Sean Doyle	RBWM Refused No further comment

Planning Inspectorate APP/T0355/X/25/3370339 Comments to Planning Inspectorate 15 Sept:	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the existing use of the yard and buildings as a commercial landscape contractors yard is lawful. Primrose Farm Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean SL6 9TL Mr S Taylor	RBWM Refused See CPC comment below
CPC noted that currently the business situated on the site is relatively small, with limited traffic movements. It was agreed to write to the Planning Inspector for this Application, to request that, given the rural nature of the roads by which the site is accessed, should the appeal decision overturn the refusal, a condition be added to the appeal decision to restrict any large future growth in traffic movements to and from the site.		

25/01706/Full: 1 no. rear dormer, 1no. sun tunnel and alterations to fenestration, 27 Broom Hill. Although the proposed new extension is smaller than the previous proposal, it was felt it was still unsuitable. This extension would compromise the privacy of the neighbours backing onto it.

The building when completed would not be keeping with the rest of neighbourhood, as no other masionettes had extended dormers. Mr Scarff pointed out masionettes were not covered by permitted development as houses were. This has led to less scrutiny of house extensions.

Action: Cllr Edwards to object using the Borough Design Plan and Cookham Neighbourhood Plan as evidence that the development is unsuitable and unsympathetic.

7.55pm Paul Phelps, Mumtaz Alam, Maria Stibbs and Hardeep Turner-Kany left the meeting.

25/01834/CONDIT Land West of Switchback Road North and North of Nightingale Lane Maidenhead

Cllr Perry explained this application 25/01834/CONDIT was not valid, because the conditions it details needed to be satisfied within one month of the application 21/02963/FULL to which it relates. 21/02963/FULL was permitted in September 2023, so the conditions are now incapable of being met, and no valid planning permission exists for the original application 21/02963/FULL. It was also noted that the test data referred to in 25/01834/CONDIT was undated and therefore should not be treated as reliable.

Mr Scarff and Cllr Edwards expressed concern over water safety related to this situation. It was possible that nitrates from the turkey farm could be the source of the water contamination which it is understood has closed the nearby drinking water pumping station in Whyteladyes Lane.. Currently it is believed that the pumping station is still closed.

Action: Cllr Edwards was given the authority to write an objection to the application to the RBWM.

25/01966/PIP 1no. detached dwelling (self build), with relocation of the existing access and demolition of the existing detached outbuilding Land to the North of Paddocks Terrys Lane, Cookham The Chairman, with the agreement of the meeting, moved the discussion of this item:from Chairman's submissions to after the end of the planning application section.

The developers claim this development was in as Grey Belt, rather than Green Belt. The proposed property would be sited in a prominent position at the front of the plot.

Cllr Bill Perry advised this was contrary to policy Cl.1. He advised using the same arguments as had been used for the crematorium and find additional relevant policies in the CNP. Also draw attention to it being on the edge of settlement so not sustainable. Draw attention to the fact it contravenes sections of the now accepted Cookham Neighbourhood Plan.

Action: Councillors authorised Cllr Edwards to respond on behalf of CPC, as no formal extension past the deadline of 21st August could be given.

6. RBWM Decisions

No comment on any of the decisions.

7. To receive any update on progress of the following strategic planning matters and to consider any further steps

- a) development of next RBWM Borough Local Plan (BLP)
 - o CPC BLP working party set up – aims, membership and terms of reference

Action: Cllr Bill Perry confirmed he will lead this.

- b) ratification of new Cookham Neighbourhood Plan
 - o access for CPC planning councillors, use in objections

Action: Assistant Clerk to obtain 12 copies of the CNP, including appendices, of the finalised document. Planning councillors to be given the option to obtain one of these each for use in planning responses.

- c) request to RBWM for information on availability of S106 and CIL funds

- o suggested escalation to RBWM Ward Councillors

Action: Cllr Edwards to ask Cllrs Howard and Brar to help obtain this information, as there is no response to repeated requests from the Clerk.

8. To receive any update on the following large development schemes in Cookham and to consider any further steps

- a) land at Cannondown Road (BLP site AL37, pl/aps 23/02022/OUT and 23/02019/OUT) and for the land at Strande Park (BLP site AL38, 22/00343/OUT)
- o Cllr Edwards had been introduced to Gareth Ebenezer, Constituency Case worker who has been involved in discussions with the EA and residents regarding flooding and the Thames.
 - o Meeting between Mark Howard, Dick Scarff to discuss way forward and next steps.

Action: Cllr Edwards to finalise meeting date ASAP. following councillor holidays.

- b) No update for application 24/02904/FULL for a proposed Crematorium development
 c) No response from Church Commissioners' regarding the intended Cemetery Field development.
 d) No update regarding the planning application 25/00362/FULL for Riverside, Berries Road
 e) No response to follow up with Grange Farm's new owners

Action: Cllr Bill Perry to contact the owners to ask for an update.

9. To receive an update on the following planning related matters and to consider any further next steps:-

- a) CPC's planning objection to Hollands Farm, Bourne End : no update.
Action: Asst Clerk to ask Bucks why CPC's objections are not on the website .
Action: Cllr Edwards to request update from Mark Howard on RBWM's response
- b) refusal of 25/01261/FULL New building to house 3 no.Stables etc, Land at the Junction of Warners Hill*.
 o Planning Officers' judgement that the proposals now represent appropriate development in Green Belt. It was noted that the application was refused primarily because it was considered detrimental to the Cookham Dean Conservation Area.
- c) refusal of 25/01648/PIP Land next to Hills Lane*
 o Planning Officers' judgement that land for proposed development is in Grey Belt. It was noted that this was refused due to it being considered not to be in a sustainable location. That the Planning Officer considered it to be Grey Belt rather than Green Belt is a concern.

10. To receive any update on the following CPC Planning Enforcement requests to the RBWM, and any other planning enforcement matters, and to consider any further next steps

- a) Waiting for an update from Planning Enforcement regarding the unauthorised gym in football pavilion next to Lower Mount Farm:
- b) Swimming pool - Cllr Edwards has emailed Brian Benzie to acknowledge that the unauthorised swimming pool is indeed also located in the football pavilion next to Lower Mount Farm. The swimming pool has been added to the the same enforcement request as for the unauthorised gym as it is in the same location.
- c) No update on enforcement request for gate across Poundfield.
Action: Asst Clerk to visit site, take account of the current situation and email Planning Enforcement.
- d) The proposed enforcement request for the removal of the tunnels used for rearing turkeys, since 23/02693/CONDIT 'Conditions for new poly tunnels for rearing turkeys (refused July 2024)' have never been met, was not sent to the RBWM planning enforcement team, due to the subsequent submission of 25/01834/CONDIT.
- e) **Action: Cllr Edwards to send the list of current enforcements to Cllr Howard and ask him to follow up as appropriate.**

11. Any other business (by permission of the Chairman) and upon which no decision may be made
 25/01966/PIP was discussed after item 5, Planning Permissions.

Next meeting Tuesday 9th September 2025 at 7.30pm in the Community Room at Cookham Library.

The meeting closed at 9.05pm.

Signed as a true record of the meeting

Chair

Dated.....

Summary of Actions

Asst Clerk	Item 7b) : Assistant Clerk to obtain 12 copies of the CNP, including appendices, of the finalised document. Planning councillors to be given the option to obtain one of these each for use in planning responses. Item 9a) Hollands Farm Asst Clerk to ask Bucks why CPC's latest objections are not on their planning website. Item 10c) Gate across Poundfield: Asst Clerk to visit site, take account of the current situation and email Planning Enforcement.
Cllr Edwards	Item 5; 25/01706/Full. 1 no. rear dormer, 1no. sun tunnel and alterations to fenestration, 27 Broom Hill. Cllr Edwards to object to the proposed loft extension, using the Borough Design Plan and Cookham Neighbourhood Plan as evidence that the development is unsuitable and unsympathetic. 25/01834/CONDIT Land West of Switchback Road North and North of Nightingale Lane Maidenhead: Action: Cllr Edwards was given the authority to write an objection to the application to the RBWM. 25/01966/PIP Permission in Principle: Land to the North of Paddocks Terrys Lane, Cookham: Cllr Edwards to respond on behalf of CPC as no formal extension past the deadline of 21st August could be given. Item 7c) Cllr Edwards to ask Cllrs Howard and Brar to help obtain this information on availability of S106 and CIL funds for Cookham. as there is no response to repeated requests from the Clerk. Item 8a: Cannondown/Strande Park developments: Cllr Edwards to finalise date of meeting with Cllr Howard and Dick Scarf ASAP, following councillor holidays Item 9a) Hollands Farm: Cllr Edwards to request update from Mark Howard on RBWM's response.. Item 10e) : Cllr Edwards to send the list of current enforcements to Cllr Howard and ask him to follow up as appropriate.
Cllr Perry	Item 7a) Cllr Bill Perry to lead the set up of aims, membership and terms of reference for CPC working party on the BLP Item 8e) Cllr Bill Perry to contact the owners of Grange Farm to ask for a further update on their plans.