

# **Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead**

## **Cookham Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document**

### **Consultation Statement May 2013**

Planning and Property Service  
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  
Town Hall  
St Ives Road  
Maidenhead  
SL6 1RF

## **1.0 Introduction & Background**

- 1.1 This consultation statement relates to the adopted Cookham Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document (hereafter referred to as the Cookham VDS).
- 1.2 Representations have been referenced to the Draft Cookham Village Design Statement which was published for consultation in November 2012.
- 1.3 This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which requires the preparation of a statement setting out the persons that have been consulted in the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document, a summary of the main issues raised and how those issues have been addressed in the Supplementary Planning Document. The Cookham VDS has also been consulted upon in accordance with the Borough Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

### **Background**

- 1.4 A Village Design Statement (VDS) is a document which describes the character of a place in order to help manage change in a way that is sensitive to the harmony between building, settlements and the wider landscape setting. By defining these qualities, VDS guidance can assist in planning decisions by highlighting key elements of character against which the impacts of planning applications may be assessed.
- 1.5 The preparation of Cookham VDS began in December 2008 as a result of a recommendation made in the earlier Cookham Plan. The project was jointly sponsored by Cookham Parish Council and The Cookham Society.
- 1.6 The Cookham VDS was drafted by a working group of residents which was initially formed by individuals who had responded to an open invitation from Cookham Parish Council. Collaboration was in place throughout with the Borough Council to support the process and ensure compliance with legal requirements.
- 1.7 The Cookham VDS describes the character and setting of Cookham's three settlements with particular reference to the physical and tangible qualities that resident's value.
- 1.8 The Cookham VDS provides local guidance to those seeking to make changes to their properties or land, and where planning permission is required, assist the Borough Council in considering whether the proposed development is sympathetic to the local character. By doing this, it helps support the interpretation of existing planning policy relating to design, most notably Local Plan policies DG1 (Design Guidelines), N1 (Areas of Special Landscape Importance), N2 (Setting of the Thames) and H10 and H11 (Housing Layout and Design). These policies require the design of development to have regard to the character of the local area, including matters such as scale, height, building lines, materials, and landscape setting and river views. The Cookham VDS will also assist the implementation of Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects development to respond to local character and history.
- 1.9 It is important to note that the Cookham VDS does not guide whether development should take place in principle. These decisions are subject to other planning policy

documents<sup>1</sup> most notably the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted June 2003) and the South East Plan (May 2009).

- 1.10 The adoption of the Cookham VDS as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) means that it is a material planning consideration in determining planning applications.

---

<sup>1</sup> The development plan for the borough at the time of writing comprises the South East Plan (May 2009), Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted June 2003), the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in December 1997 and May 2001) and the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (1998).

## **2.0 Consultation on the preparation of the Draft Cookham VDS**

### General Consultation

- 2.1 The Draft Cookham VDS was prepared by a working group of residents which was initially formed by individuals who had responded to an open invitation from Cookham Parish Council. Further invitations to become involved in elements of the VDS work were issued at each of two village 'characterisations' public meetings (see 2.3). Collaboration was in place throughout with the Borough Council supporting the process and ensuring compliance with legal requirements.
- 2.2 The drafting of the Cookham VDS was informed by preceding work on a draft Cookham Plan and by a number of consultations with residents, visitors, local businesses and other organisations.
- 2.3 In 2009, two village 'characterisation' public meetings were held. The meetings were advertised in the Maidenhead Advertiser and local posters as being open to all residents of Cookham Parish. All attendees individually completed questionnaires concerning what they most valued and what they disliked about the physical appearance of Cookham Parish and its three settlements. In all around 500 questionnaires were completed by residents and visitors to Cookham, covering topics such as favoured views, favoured attributes of the village and the perception of visitors to Cookham.
- 2.4 Throughout 2009, carefully designed structured interviews were undertaken with 22 specific members of the community, each being selected to represent a particular viewpoint - for example farmers and landowners, representatives of sports, community organisations, archaeological and heritage organisations, the Stanley Spencer Gallery, National Trust, local ecology, youth groups and residential developers. A professional surveyor was also contracted to conduct surveys of all streets and major areas of green space within the settlements.
- 2.5 In 2011 an interim draft of the Cookham VDS was sent to all members of the Parish Council and all members of the Cookham Society committee (the Joint Sponsors) for their individual comment as part of the overall consultation exercise.

### SA and SEA

- 2.6 The requirement for the preparation of SPD to be supported by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) was removed by the Town and Country Planning (Local Development (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009.<sup>2</sup>
- 2.7 The explanatory memorandum to the 2009 Regulations advises that Local Planning Authorities are required to "screen their SPDs to ensure that legal requirements for SA are met where there are impacts that have not been covered in the appraisal of the parent Development Plan Document or where an assessment is required by the SEA Directive."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Planning Act 2008 was the first step in removing the requirement of sustainability appraisal of supplementary planning documents through amending sections 15 and 17 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Town and Country Planning (Local Development (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009 reflected changes introduced in the Planning Act 2008.

<sup>3</sup> European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.

- 2.8 The Cookham VDS project commenced in 2008, before the enactment of the 2009 regulations. As a result a draft SA Scoping Report was prepared and consultation undertaken with the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage. Following the enactment of the 2009 Regulations, the SA was not progressed since the sustainability implications of protecting character were assessed through the South East Plan process.
- 2.9 The Borough Council has undertaken a screening against the SEA Directive. The screening opinion concluded that the Draft Cookham VDS was unlikely to have significant environmental effects. The preliminary screening opinion was published for consultation alongside the Draft Cookham VDS. Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency indicated their agreement with the preliminary screening opinion.
- 2.10 The Borough Council also undertook a screening against the Habitat Regulations.<sup>4</sup> The screening opinion concluded that the Draft Cookham VDS was unlikely to have significant effects that would affect an international site.<sup>5</sup> Natural England and the Environment Agency indicated their agreement with the preliminary screening opinion.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Natura 2000 sites (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Area) and Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar sites).

### 3.0 Consultation on the Draft Cookham VDS

3.1 The Draft Cookham VDS was subject to a period of formal consultation from Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> November to Friday 28<sup>th</sup> December 2012. Appendix A provides a summary of organisations invited to comment on this and its supporting documents.

#### Compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement

3.2 Consultation on the Cookham VDS complied with the Borough Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), adopted in June 2006. The SCI can be downloaded from the Borough Council's website. The table below summarises the SCI requirements and the actions which were undertaken.

SCI Requirement	Compliance
Make documents available in principal council offices	Yes
Display documents on the internet	Yes
Send documents to specific and general consultation bodies	Yes
Place a public notice	Yes
Make documents available in borough libraries	Yes
Issue a press release	Yes
Place site notices	Only required for site specific SPD
Send neighbour notification letters	Only required for site specific SPD
Distribute a leaflet	Optional

3.3 In addition to the above, the working group of residents undertook the below actions to further publicise the Draft Cookham VDS. Hardcopies of the Draft Cookham VDS were sent to all parish councillors and to all members of the Cookham Society committee for further comments. Copies were also provided to each of the 22 members of the community which were individually interviewed as set out in paragraph 2.4.

3.4 Hardcopies and information fliers were provided at the community locations outlined in the table below. Information alerting readers to the forthcoming public consultation was also provided in the Autumn 2012 issue of the Cookham Society newsletter.

Location	Village	VDS (hardcopy)	Fliers	Poster
The Jolly Farmer	Cookham Dean	✓	✓	

Location	Village	VDS (hardcopy)	Fliers	Poster
Uncle Tom's Cabin	Cookham Dean	✓	✓	
Sanctum on the Green	Cookham Dean		✓	
The Chequers	Cookham Dean	✓	✓	
Cookham Dean Village Hall	Cookham Dean	✓	✓	
Cookham Dean Primary School	Cookham Dean	✓	✓	✓
Winter Hill Golf Club	Cookham Dean	✓	✓	✓
St John the Baptist Church	Cookham Dean			✓
Pinder Hall	Cookham Rise		✓	✓
Elizabeth House	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Hillcrest Stores	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Parish Council Office	Cookham Rise	✓		
Swan Uppers	Cookham Rise		✓	
White Oak	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Library	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Cookham Rise Primary School	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Stationery Depot	Cookham Rise			✓
Village Hardware store	Cookham Rise			✓
Medical Centre	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Cookham Parade dentist	Cookham Rise		✓	
St Anne's House dentist	Cookham Rise		✓	
Railway Station waiting room	Cookham Rise	✓	✓	
Post Office	Cookham Rise			✓
Holy Trinity Community Hall	Cookham village			✓
Holy Trinity Church	Cookham village		✓	✓
The Crown	Cookham village	✓	✓	

<b>Location</b>	<b>Village</b>	<b>VDS (hardcopy)</b>	<b>Fliers</b>	<b>Poster</b>
Kings Arms	Cookham village	✓	✓	
The Ferry	Cookham village		✓	
Village Wine Stores	Cookham village		✓	
Christmas Fayre Cookham Society stall	Cookham village	✓	✓	
Stanley Spencer Gallery	Cookham village	✓	✓	
Chartered Institute of Management	Cookham village		✓	✓
Odney Club	Cookham village		✓	
Sailing Club	Cookham village	✓	✓	✓



## 4.0 Adoption Stage

- 4.1 During the public consultation, representations from 32 respondents were received.<sup>6</sup> These comments have been considered by the Borough Council in consultation with the working group of residents who prepared the Draft Cookham VDS.
- 4.2 The matters raised in representations have been fully considered and where appropriate changes were made to address issues. Having reviewed the representations, the Cookham VDS is appropriate to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
- 4.3 The main consultation points can be seen in the table below. A full summary of representations is provided in Appendix B. Representations received in response to the Habitat Regulations Preliminary Screening Opinion and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Preliminary Screening Opinion is also provided.

Summary of Main Point	Response
The preparation of the VDS does not reflect the localism agenda.	<p>The VDS has been prepared by a resident working group with the assistance of the Borough Council. Residents and business have had opportunities to influence the project through initial consultation and comment on the draft VDS itself.</p> <p>The VDS has been fully endorsed by Cookham Parish Council and the Cookham Society.</p> <p>The Localism Act 2011 introduced the ability for communities to prepare neighbourhood plans. The preparation of neighbourhood plans is optional with parish councils being the qualifying body. The statutory right to prepare a neighbourhood plan does not inhibit the use of other planning tools such as Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>
The VDS should consider the future requirement for new homes.	<p>Strategic planning matters such as where development should be encouraged are defined in regulations as Local Plan matters. They cannot therefore be considered through Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>The future requirement for new homes and how this will be met are matters being considered through the Borough Local Plan process.</p>
The VDS will block development.	The VDS has been prepared to provide design guidance to support existing planning

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that 2 respondent's representations were received following the close of the consultation but were accepted as duly made.

	<p>policy most notably Local Plan Policies DG1 (Design Guidelines), N1 (Areas of Special Landscape Importance), N2 (Setting of the Thames), and H10 and H11 (Housing Layout and Design). It will also assist the implementation of Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects planning policies and decisions to respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials.</p> <p>The VDS does not guide where development should take place in principle and it does not allocate land for specific uses. This remains the responsibility of the Borough Council through the Local Plan. Whilst not guiding development, the design guidance will however be a material consideration in considering whether a proposed development is sympathetic to local character.</p>
<p>The legal status of the VDS is unclear and therefore susceptible to legal challenge (Wakil v Hammersmith and Fulham LBC).</p>	<p>The status as a Supplementary Planning Document was clearly referenced in the draft VDS and remains clearly referenced in the updated version. The referenced court decision relates to a plan which concerned large scale, multi-faceted transformation of an area and is not considered to have a direct material bearing on the VDS, which is of a different nature.</p>
<p>The need for clarity between the status of the National Planning Policy Statement (NPPF) and the VDS.</p>	<p>Improved clarity has been provided in section 1 referencing the NPPF. Particular reference is made to Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects planning policies and decisions to respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials.</p> <p>The support of the NPPF towards local character and the complexities of individual planning applications require the matter of weighting to be considered in light of individual circumstances.</p>
<p>Whether the size of the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead can be described as one of the smallest green gaps within the borough.</p>	<p>The VDS has been updated to refer to the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead as “narrow” which is considered to be a more appropriate description. It is accepted that smaller gaps exist between settlements elsewhere in the borough, for example the gap between Eton and Eton Wick.</p>

<p>The appropriateness of establishing Poundfield as a green wedge.</p>	<p>The southern part of Poundfield performs the function of separating The Pound from the Cookham Rise and Station Hill area, whilst the remainder of the area provides the setting to the historic environment as recognised by the area's inclusion within a Conservation Area. This is recognised by the Cookham High Street Conservation Area statement and the Townscape Assessment.</p> <p>The related guidance G4.5 seeks to ensure that development proposals do not compromise this role. A minor change has been made to G4.5 to improve clarity. It is recognised that some proposals might be acceptable. However, it is not the function of the VDS to propose and design specific developments.</p>
---	---

## **Appendix A: Specific and General Consultation Bodies**

The following organisations are defined in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as specific consultation bodies:

- the Coal Authority
- the Environment Agency
- the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)
- the Marine Management Organisation
- Natural England
- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587)
- the Highways Agency
- a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the local planning authority's area
- any person:
  - to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and
  - who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the local planning authority's area
- if it exercises functions in any part of the local planning authority's area:
  - a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006 or continued in existence by virtue of that section
  - a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989
  - a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986
  - a sewerage undertaker
  - a water undertaker
- the Homes and Communities Agency
- where the local planning authority are a London borough council, the Mayor of London

The following organisations are defined in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as general consultation bodies:

- voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area
- bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the local planning authority's area
- bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the local planning authority's area
- bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority's area
- bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area

## Appendix B: Schedule of Comments and Outcomes

Schedule of representations and outcomes				
Consultee and Agent	Section	Nature	Summary	Outcome
David Ashwanden	Whole Document	Support	The VDS presents a fair and balanced view of Cookham as it is today. It does not oppose development but suggests that any development should be in sympathy with the overall look and feel of the relevant area. The guidelines should provide assistance to residents, developers and planners. It should be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.	Support noted.
Ian Blunt	Whole Document	Support	<p>Endorses the principle of the VDS. It is a thoughtful and well researched document that will help safeguard character. The definition of “creeping urbanisation” is an elegant yardstick with which to measure planning applications. Welcomes the principles applying to all Cookham Parish.</p> <p>Developments of 5 or more dwellings should have their impact in infrastructure assessed and required expansion in place and operational before development can go ahead.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Borough Council’s Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document provides detailed policy on securing</p>

				appropriate contributions towards infrastructure, services and facilities. Procedures comply with statutory requirements and national planning policy.
John Bowley	Whole Document	Support	Generally supportive of the VDS. It has been professionally produced and provides a very good analysis of how most residents would wish to see their community develop.	Support noted.
Chris Brown	Whole Document	Support	Overall excellent and should be adopted.	Support noted.
Cookham Parish Council Derek Fry	Whole Document	Support	Support the VDS being adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.	Support noted.
Cookham Society David Ashwanden	Whole Document	Support	The VDS presents a fair and balanced view of Cookham as it is today. It does not oppose development but suggests that any development should be in sympathy with the overall look and feel of the relevant area. The guidelines should provide assistance to residents, developers and planners. It should be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.	Support noted.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Whole Document	Object	The VDS has not been produced under the standards of Localism. The production of the VDS has not been	The VDS has been prepared as Supplementary Planning Document in accordance with the related statutory

			<p>organised in a public and open way since the original consultations and cannot therefore be described as a document that truly reflects the views of Cookham's residents.</p>	<p>regulations. Consultation undertaken to inform the preparation of the VDS is outlined in Section 2 of this statement. Consultation on the draft VDS is outlined in Section 3 and Appendix B of this statement. The VDS was prepared by a working group of residents. Volunteers were sought by Cookham Parish Council via a public notice. Residents and business have had the opportunity to influence and comment on the draft VDS.</p> <p>The Localism Act introduced the ability of communities to prepare Neighbourhood Plans. These are community-led frameworks for guiding the future development and growth of an area. The legal ability to prepare neighbourhood plans lies with Cookham Parish Council in this instance. This ability does not inhibit the use of other planning tools such as Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>
<p>Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas</p>	<p>Whole Document</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned that the VDS has not been produced with an open mind but to avoid development, particularly the Poundfield site. The VDS should assess need and make suggestions as to how this can be resolved for the benefit of the village as a whole.</p>	<p>The VDS provides design guidance to support existing planning policy.</p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need and will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary</p>

				Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Whole Document	Object	Overall the VDS shows that the main character of Cookham comes from the varied types of buildings. This was created when there was no restricting of design and building on open space was allowed to occur. Having highlighted the good points of previous generations developing on open space to our advantage, the VDS should not then justify reasons to prevent our generation creating similar developments to meet the needs of the expanding population.	<p>The VDS recognises that there is no single building style in Cookham, however there are common attributes such as the connection to green space.</p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need and will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Whole Document	Object	Guidance points are only included to reduce the chance of change. There is no reference to white land (Poundfield) or what this designation means, however sections 4.6 and 4.7 are included as justification to prevent development.	<p>The VDS provides design guidance to support existing planning policy.</p> <p>The Proposals Map shows the boundary of planning designations which have a spatial reference, e.g. employment areas or the Green Belt. Land which is not subject to a specific designation appears as white.</p> <p>Section 4.6 explains that land in Cookham Parish is designated Green</p>



				<p>Belt and states that it should be protected in accordance with this designation.</p> <p>Section 4.7 explains that the interaction of the green areas with settlements is a key characteristic of Cookham.</p>
Ann Dank	Whole Document	Support	<p>The VDS captures the spirit of all areas of Cookham.</p> <p>Requests that the book from which many of the photographs were taken is acknowledged, namely Cookham – The Archive Photography series compiled by Chrissy Rosenthal and Ann Danks, published by The Chalford Publishing Company Ltd 1998.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agree. Reference has been inserted into the Photographic permissions section.</p>
Pablo Dubois	Whole Document	Support	<p>The VDS is an impressive achievement and is a highly comprehensive analysis of character and attractiveness of Cookham, supported by clear illustrations. The analysis and judgements are based on widespread consultation with the community.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
English Heritage Martin Small	Whole Document	Support	<p>Welcomes the preparation of the VDS as a tool to enable development to take place in a sensitive and appropriate manner.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

English Heritage Martin Small	Whole Document	Comment	Welcomes the VDS status as Supplementary Planning Document but suggests it sets out what policies it supplements.	Support for the VDS status as Supplementary Planning Document is noted.  It is agreed that reference to the existing policy would be helpful. The following text has been added to 1.1:  “The VDS provides guidance to support existing planning policy, <u>most notably Local Plan policies DG1 (Design Guidelines), N1 (Areas of Special Landscape Importance), N2 (Setting of the Thames), and H10 and H11 (Housing Layout and Design).</u> <u>The VDS will also assist the implementation of Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects developments to respond to local character and history.</u> ”
Chris Harris	Whole Document	Support.	The VDS is comprehensive in scope and content, well researched, formulated, articulated, and presented with insightful guidance notes.	Support noted.
Chris Harris	Whole Document	Comment	The VDS rightly includes small maps but many are difficult to read.	The resolution of maps has been improved. Online versions may have a lower quality to satisfy download limits.

Fiona Hewer	Whole Document	Support	The VDS is a repository of historical, geographical and cultural information about the appearance of Cookham that provides support for planning decisions. Support the status as Supplementary Planning Document.	Support noted.
Michael Johnson	Whole Document	Support	The VDS is presented with care and attention. The photographs and maps give an excellent impression. The standard of writing makes for easy and enjoyable reading.	Support noted.
Jim and Alison Peck	Whole Document	Support	Fully support the VDS.	Support noted.
Lysette Penston	Whole Document	Support	The VDS has been carefully researched and thought through, seeking to note, highlight and conserve the charms and character of Cookham Parish. Intelligent recommendations have been made as to how development should proceed.	Support noted.
Elizabeth Peters	Whole Document	Support	The VDS is well researched and presented. It provides a balanced view of the parish.	Support noted.
Richard Scarff	Whole Document	Support	The VDS is a comprehensive and generally well balanced document and should be adopted.	Support noted.

Bill Spicer	Whole Document	Support	Congratulate the working group for producing such a detailed document. Support every word and recommendation.	Support noted.
Paul Strzelecki	Whole document	Support	The VDS is outstanding work, informative, passionate and reasonable	Support noted.
Emily Tomalin	Whole Document	Object	Concern is expressed that the village will be frozen into a design which isn't suited to the future rather than being dynamic, open, green village and able to embrace social and environmental issues. Solar, water and wind energy should be embraced. Cycle lanes should be provided. Children and the elderly should be a high priority. Suggests a toll for car users.	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning should take account of the different roles and character of different areas. The VDS describes the character of Cookham Parish and provides related guidance.</p> <p>The VDS G6.22 refers to sustainable design and construction. It advises that such techniques and technologies should be welcomed but care must be taken to balance advantages with the negative impacts on appearance of the area.</p> <p>The VDS in Section 12 identified the difficulty of cycling to school throughout the settlements. The possibility of cycle paths is noted as requiring separate evaluation.</p> <p>Issues of housing need and traffic tolls are outside the scope of the VDS.</p>

Joy Vans Agnew	Whole Document	Support	The VDS presents historical facts about the evolution of the Cookhams and draws together intrinsic design characteristics that are repeated across the area. It is hoped that the VDS is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.	Support noted.
John Wagstaffe	Whole Document	Support	The VDS is a valuable reference document for planning decisions and for anyone wanting an insight into Cookham.	Support noted.
John Wagstaffe	Whole Document	Comment	The quality and readability and maps and images when downloaded are a poor resolution. Examples include maps on pages 15, 21 and 36. Suggests improved resolution and use of larger scale maps in an appendix. A single full HQ road map showing formal settlement boundaries would be useful.	The resolution of maps has been improved. Online versions may have a lower quality to satisfy download limits.
Reg Willsher	Whole Document	Support	The VDS provides information about Cookham's past and present, makes sensible recommendations and guidance on future planning and developments.	Support noted.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Foreword (page iv)	Object	The VDS was only produced by a few residents. It is not possible to state that the content truly reflects the views of	Consultation undertaken to inform the preparation of the VDS is outlined in Section 2 of this statement.

			Cookham residents.	<p>Consultation on the draft VDS is outlined in Section 3 and Appendix B of this statement. The VDS was prepared by a working group of residents. Volunteers were sought by Cookham Parish Council via a public notice. Residents and business have had the opportunity to influence and comment on the draft VDS.</p> <p>To reflect the adoption of the VDS, the foreword has been updated.</p>
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	1 (page 1)	Object	<p>The legal status of the document is unclear and susceptible to legal challenge (Wakil v Hammersmith and Fulham LB 2012 EWHC1411 QB). The VDS covers all aspects of development but whilst stating to be SPD it is more characteristic of a neighbourhood plan but without formal processes of SEA, EIA, examination and referendum.</p>	<p>The intention to adopt the VDS as a Supplementary Planning Document was clearly indicated on the cover page and in Section 1.2 "Status of the VDS."</p> <p>The case Wakil v Hammersmith and Fulham LBC concerned a large scale, multi-faceted transformation of an entire local area. This case law is not considered to have material bearing on the Cookham VDS which is of a different nature.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, amendments have been made within sections 1.1 and 1.6 to improve clarity.</p> <p>The following change has been made</p>

				<p>to 1.1:  <del>“The purpose of the VDS is <u>does</u> not guide <u>whether</u> <u>where</u> development should take place in principle <u>and</u> <u>does not designate land for particular purposes</u>. These <u>decisions matters</u> are <u>subject to other mechanisms currently considered through the Borough Council’s adopted Local Plan</u>. The Borough Council is <u>currently reviewing the Local Plan</u>.”</del></p> <p>The following change has been made to 1.6:  GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT Guidance Points in yellow boxes under this heading (all commencing with the letter ‘G’) are those that should <del>be followed in any future development. These are for the use of anyone contemplating any new development, whether simple home extensions or much larger projects, and also to assist all persons involved in reviewing or assessing planning applications that relate to Cookham parish</del> <u>considered by people contemplating changes to their property and those reviewing planning applications</u>.  RECOMMENDATIONS  Recommendations in light green</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>boxes (and commencing with the letter 'R') relate to aspects affecting Cookham parish more generally. Whilst there is an emphasis on the built environment, these Recommendations also concern the protection of Cookham's ecology and its archaeological heritage. It is beyond the scope of the VDS to designate the party or parties that would need to take action in respect of each individual Recommendation <u>do not supplement existing planning policy but are provided as suggestions.</u></p> <p>The VDS includes information on the landscape setting, the shape of settlement and the nature of buildings. The provided Guidance relates to associated design principles.</p> <p>A Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion and a Habitat Regulations Screening Opinion have been undertaken. They determined that there was no likelihood of significant effects and, as a result, SEA and Appropriate Assessment were not required. Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency have all</p>
--	--	--	--	---



			<p>Section 1.2 should be expanded to explain the document expands upon the NPPF including the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that in the event of a conflict the NPPF will prevail.</p>	<p>indicated their agreement with the screening opinions.</p> <p>Agree in part. It is agreed that the text should be expanded to also refer to the VDS supporting the NPPF. Since the NPPF includes the statement that development should respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials and the complexities of individual planning applications, it is not possible to define the weight that should be attached to each.</p> <p>The following text has been added to 1.1:</p> <p><u>“The VDS provides guidance to support existing planning policy, most notably Local Plan policies DG1 (Design Guidelines), N1 (Areas of Special Landscape Importance), N2 (Setting of the Thames), and H10 and H11 (Housing Layout and Design). The VDS will also assist the implementation of Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects developments to respond to local character and history.”</u></p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>The document should record that the adopted Local Plan is out-of-date and will be replaced. The adoption of the new plan will be after the document meaning it will prevail.</p> <p>The length of the document, duplication and excessive detail does not make it user friendly.</p>	<p>Disagree. For the purposes of decision taking, weight should be attributed to individual policies within the Local Plan according to their consistency with the NPPF. This is confirmed in NPPF Annex A. It is recognised that the VDS would benefit from being updated once the Borough Local Plan is in place.</p> <p>The VDS is considered to contain appropriate and consistent information within each section.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	1.6 (page 2)	Object	<p>The VDS states that change will happen and that the purpose of the VDS is not to judge whether development should take place. Therefore the text linked to Guidance for Future Development under 1.6 should be amended to the below:</p> <p>“The Guidance Points are those that should be followed when judging the design of any future development.”</p>	<p>Agree in part. It is agreed that the text is capable of misinterpretation. The suggested text does not cover wider design benefits. The following amendment has been made to Section 1.6:</p> <p><del>GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT</del> Guidance Points in yellow boxes under this heading (all commencing with the letter ‘G’) are those that should be followed in any future development. These are for the use of anyone contemplating any new development, whether simple home extensions or much larger projects, and also to assist all persons involved in reviewing or assessing planning</p>

				<u>applications that relate to Cookham parish considered by people contemplating changes to their property and those reviewing planning applications.</u>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	1.7 (page 2)	Comment	The term “Cookham” should include its farmland, woodland, commons and open spaces, not just built areas.	Comment noted. For the purpose of the VDS, the term “Cookham” has been used as the collective term for the built areas that include all three Cookham settlements and the outlying properties. The term “Cookham parish” has been used for the built up areas and the surrounding countryside.
John Bowley	Acknowledgements (page 2)	Comment	Several of the people mentioned no longer hold the offices listed or have left the village.	Agree. The text has been updated to clarify that it reflects the position held at the time of interview.  <u>“At all points in the VDS where an individual’s role or position is stated, it is their role or position held at the time that that they made their contributions to the VDS.”</u>
Fiona Hewer	Acknowledgements (page 2)	Comment	Mistype. Correct “Kersely” to “Kersley.”	Correction made.
John Bowley	2 (page 4)	Comment	Does not consider Cookham Rise to be limited to the west of the railway line. The line should be the north south axis	Annex A provides information on the naming and boundary issues. The approach reflects addresses generally

			<p>of Maidenhead Road and Poundfield Lane. Westwood Green and Station Hill should be treated as Cookham Rise.</p> <p>Cookham Rise experiences severe parking problems. The presence of the Conservation Area will not help a solution to be found. The Area of Special Local Significance could also restrict solutions.</p>	<p>used by residents, however it is recognised that not everyone will agree.</p> <p>The designation of Conservation Areas and amending the Area of Special Landscape are outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
John Wagstaffe	1.7 (page 2)	Object	<p>Nomenclature is made confusing given the title Village Design Statement for a group of 3 settlements. There doesn't appear to be a way round this.</p> <p>It is incongruous for capitalisation to be used for Cookham Dean and Cookham Rise whilst mixed case is used for Cookham village.</p>	<p>The term Village Design Statement is used nationally to reflect a process used to describe the character of a place. Whilst many VDSs reflect a single village, the resident working group considered it appropriate to prepare a single document covering the parish.</p> <p>To avoid confusion between the village of Cookham and the use of Cookham to describe the wider area, the VDS utilised Cookham village throughout. The use of lower text recognises that Cookham village is not a formally recognised place name in the same way Cookham Dean and Cookham Rise are.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	2.2 (page 3)	Comment	Hedsor Water is not privately owned but a public waterway.	The ownership and public navigation of Hedsor Water has been subject to

				court proceedings. It is understood that Hedsor Water is privately owned but that public navigation rights exist. No change to the VDS is necessary.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	2.3 (page 3)	Comment	<p>The waterway runs across Cookham Moor, not on its western edge. The Fleet Ditch was fed by a spring in Marsh Meadow.</p> <p>The drainage channels from Cockmarsh originally drained into the river. Drainage works blocked off the outlet with a new ditch dug so that drainage was to Cookham Moor and Fleet Ditch. Later a new ditch was dug across Cookham Moor to Fleet Ditch to provide a permanent flow of water.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The following amendment has been made to 2.3:</p> <p>“A second system of waterways runs <del>along the western edge of</del> <u>across</u> Cookham Moor and southwards...”</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	2.5 (page 4)	Object	<p>Cookham is not one of the few built environments that can boast the glory of greenness when viewed alongside Windsor Great Park, Bray, Bisham and other villages.</p>	<p>The text does not suggest that Cookham is the only green area but serves to highlight the value residents place the environment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the following changes have been made to 2.6: “Cookham is a very pretty <del>village</del> in ‘built’ terms (see the descriptions especially in Sections 7, 8 and 9), and already possesses two Conservation Areas. (Section 15 highlights the possibility of creating additional</p>

				<p>Conservation Areas within Cookham Rise and the Station Hill area). This Cookham's architectural value <u>is complemented by the attractive riverside and countryside setting</u>, in a setting as unusual as that of this parish, ensures that the whole of Cookham is a most significant jewel in the very real crown of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Its unique character derives, in sum, from the quality of its built environment, set in the context of its exceptional green environment and combined with its river and waterways."</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	2.6 (page 4)	Object	<p>Cookham is not the only significant jewel in the RBWM crown when viewed alongside Windsor Great Park, Bray, Bisham and other villages.</p>	<p>The text does not suggest that Cookham is the only green area but serves to highlight the value residents place the environment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the following changes have been made to 2.6:          "Cookham is a very pretty village in 'built' terms (see the descriptions especially in Sections 7, 8 and 9), and already possesses two Conservation Areas. (Section 15 highlights the possibility of creating additional Conservation Areas within Cookham Rise and the Station Hill area). This</p>

				<p>Cookham's architectural value <u>is complemented by the attractive riverside and countryside setting</u>, <del>in a setting as unusual as that of this parish, ensures that the whole of Cookham is a most significant jewel in the very real crown of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Its unique character derives, in sum, from the quality of its built environment, set in the context of its exceptional green environment and combined with its river and waterways."</del></p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	3.3 (page 5)		Does not accept that The Lee is anything to do with Cookham Dean Lee Farm. Has understood that Cookham Dean was not settled until much later.	Information from the working group's local history expert is that The Lee covered a wide area and the present property called Lee Farm and the field long known as The Lee are now probably the only Lee names left. The Lee manorial and hundred court (which was sometimes called the King's Court) would have been connected with the manor house at Bradleys (or Broad Lees) in the area where Winter Hill Farm / Lee Farm are now, or very close by. This manor house was still in existence in the 1609 survey.
Copas Farms	3.7 (page 8)		The green gap between Cookham and	It is accepted that Green Belt gaps

Geoffrey Copas			<p>Maidenhead cannot be described as “very small”. The gap is wider than other villages around Maidenhead, Cox Green, Bray and Pinkneys Green.</p> <p>Sport should be an acceptable use in the green gap.</p> <p>Agree with the statement “How did we get here?” The VDS should include old Ordnance Survey maps showing the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ just after the construction of the railway</li> <li>○ Between the 2 world wars</li> <li>○ Post world war changes</li> <li>○ Today</li> </ul> <p>Coombe Cottage address should be added to the text.</p>	<p>between other settlements within borough are smaller, however describing the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead as very small is considered suitable. Notwithstanding this, the text has been amended to describe the gap as “narrow” for reasons of consistency with Box 8.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan both advise that the provision of appropriate outdoor sport and outdoor recreation are considered appropriate forms of development in the Green Belt provided they preserve openness and do not conflict with including land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Comment noted. Unfortunately only limited space is available.</p> <p>Agree. The text has been amended to state Coombe Cottage in Cookham High Street.</p>
----------------	--	--	--	---



Chris Brown	Box 2 (page 8)	Comment	Mistype. Correct “tweny” to “twenty” in the penultimate line.	Correction made.
English Heritage Martin Small	3 (page 9)	Comment	The references to ‘Heritage Asset Record’ should be amended to ‘Historic Environment Record.’	Correction made.
John Bowley	3 (page 9)	Comment	Progress in protecting archaeological assets is required now. A revised Local Plan seems to be a long way off.	Comment noted. Recommendation 3.2 states that the creation of a ‘local list’ is an initiative that has now been put in place within the Cookham community.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	4.2 (page 10)	Comment	Agree that agriculture is the best way to preserve the countryside but to insinuate farmers for the loss of countryside is wrong.	Agreement to agriculture is the best way to preserve the countryside is noted. The text is not intended to suggest that farmers are responsible for the loss of countryside but that changes in farm practices have an effect on the countryside. The following amendment has been made to Section 4.2:  <del>“Many of these fields have now fallen out of purely agricultural use, largely as a result of changes in agricultural practice. In particular, the increased size of equipment has meant that the farming of small, irregularly shaped fields has become progressively less viable, whilst the buildings that once</del>

			<p>To state that changes in farming should be gradual and moderate can delay agricultural land from remaining viable and increase the likelihood of non-farming uses being established.</p>	<p><del>housed farm equipment have become too small to meet modern farming needs</del> <u>Changes in agricultural practice, in particular increased mechanisation, has resulted in larger fields and a need for different forms of building.</u></p> <p>In parallel, <del>changes there have been</del> <u>changes in farming subsidies have</u> <del>Payments for uneconomic cultivation have reduced and there are new</del> <u>introduced</u> rewards for environmental stewardship.”</p> <p>The text is intended to suggest that family businesses are more likely to introduce change sensitively into the locality rather than the specific time frame. The following amendment has been made to Section 4.2:</p> <p>“It is widely recognised that one of the best ways of ensuring a healthy long-term future for the countryside is the maintenance of a viable agricultural industry. This means, on the one hand, an acceptance that changes in farming practice will have an impact on the land that farming uses and, on the other hand, <u>responsiveness an acknowledgement</u> by farmers to the</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p><u>fact that people can be concerned with how that the countryside is changing, particularly if the reasons are not understood a fragile and finite resource, which can be damaged or lost.</u></p> <p>One of the ways in which a ‘covenant’ between farmers and the community can be maintained is through the continuity of land-owning operations in the hands of family businesses, helping to ensure that farm localities are properly understood by farmers and that change is <u>sensitively integrated gradual and moderated.</u>”</p>
John Bowley	Box 3 (page 11)	Comment	Does not believe that White Place Farm has belonged to the Edwards family.	The White Place Farm website states that the farm belongs to the Edwards family who have worked the farm since the late 1960s.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	4.4 (page 12)	Comment	Sutton Farm is farmed as part of White Place farm. Not aware of any land around the watercourse being excluded from the sale.	<p>Comment noted. The following amendment has been made to 4.4 to update the text:</p> <p>“Sutton Farm is an arable and pasture farm of some 80 hectares (198 acres) <u>between the A4094 and the railway line and forms forming</u> a significant part of the narrow band of unspoilt open countryside between Cookham</p>

				<p>and Maidenhead (see Box 8, page 14). <u>It is currently farmed as part of White Place Farm.</u> The farm lies fully within the Green Belt. <del>It has recently changed hands following the issue of sales particulars which highlight its 'development potential' in respect of various elements that are located close to existing residential areas of Cookham or Maidenhead. In reality any such potential is very limited and might have to be the result of changes in present planning policies, or in the form of Rural Exception Sites (see Section 6.15).</del> <u>It was recently purchased by adjacent owners, Summerleaze Ltd., who operate a gravel pit off Summerleaze Road, on the north side of Maidenhead. Summerleaze Ltd's existing holding includes a substantial area of land with planning permission for gravel extraction, which has yet to be worked.</u></p> <p>Sutton Farm also has existing mineral rights which, according to the sales prospectus, were to be retained by the vendor, Hall Aggregates Ltd. The purchaser, Summerleaze Ltd, is expert in mineral extraction and operates a gravel quarry within</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>adjoining land in Maidenhead. It appears that any proposal for the extraction of minerals from this land would have to be the result of co-operation between vendor and purchaser. Any such initiative would remain subject to the necessary planning permissions. <u>While it seems likely there are significant reserves of gravel at Sutton Farm.</u> However, proposals to extract gravel from areas within Cookham parish met with considerable local resistance some years ago and were rejected at a public inquiry (see Box 3, page 11). Whilst it is outside the remit of the VDS to suggest whether commercial minerals extraction should, or should not, take place in the parish it is difficult to see how such extraction could avoid a highly damaging effect on Cookham's countryside during the extraction process, with possible ecological damage extending well into the future. For this reason Guidance Note 4.3, page 13 is focused on the minimisation of damage and subsequent remediation.</p> <p>Watercourses through Sutton Farm include Fleet Ditch, Strande Water and White Brook. All of these water</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				courses and the land immediately at the edge of them are areas of ecological importance (see Section 17). <del>All have been excluded from the recent sale.</del> "
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	4.4 (page 12)	Comment	<p>It is understood that Richard Simmonds chicken houses have been converted to alternative uses.</p> <p>Copas Farms has a cherry orchard at Lower Mount Farm and the only old orchard worthy of preservation at Bigfrith at the boundary with Bisham. If cherry trees are wanted, they should be allowed to operate in a viable way.</p> <p>Winter Hill Farm is now partly farmed by Simon Fisher.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the land owned by Summerleaze just north of Maidenhead which has permission for gravel extraction.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The following amendment has been made to 4.4:</p> <p>"Activities include <del>poultry rearing</del>, the stabling of horses and the letting of small units to local business."</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Reference is made in 4.4 to the existing Summerleaze operation on the edge of Maidenhead.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.1 (page 13)	Object	The recommendation should also recognise the advantage of public access, sport and recreational use. A similar paragraph supporting sport and	The National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan both advise that the provision of appropriate outdoor sport and outdoor

			recreational use should be added, e.g. Marsh Meadow, John Lewis Golf Course etc.	recreation are considered appropriate forms of development in the Green Belt provided they preserve openness and do not conflict with including land in the Green Belt. A further recommendation is not considered necessary.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.2 (page 13)	Comment	Success will depend on the community responding in a practical way in discussions and actions.	Comment noted.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.3 (page 13)	Comment	Success will depend on the community responding in a practical way in discussions and actions.	Comment noted.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G4.1 (page 13)	Object	Offers to remove redundant buildings should be welcomed but queries why farms should incur cost without any benefit.  The guidance could also encourage the repositioning of buildings closer to existing developments.	G4.1 does not require the removal of redundant buildings but states that an offer to remove them should be seen as a positive factor.  Comment noted. Guidance G13.2 seeks new farm building to be positioned as part of farmsteads where possible. It is outside of the scope of the VDS to encourage the repositioning of buildings, however, this guidance would apply where repositioning was being considered.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G4.2 (page 13)	Object	Why should farmers have to offer community facilities without receiving	Agree in part. The following amendment has been made to G4.2:

			some benefit? Alternative uses of Lower Mount Farm in exchange for Marsh Meadow as public open space have benefitted everyone.	“Offers to donate needed community facilities may be a helpful element of <del>planning proposals made by farm businesses or large landowners, but under no circumstances should an unsuitable development be approved as a result</del> <u>recognised as a positive factor in relation to planning proposals made by farm businesses or large landowners. In such situations, positive and negative factors should be carefully considered. Whether positive factors are sufficient to outweigh harm would be judged on the circumstances at the time of the planning application</u> ”
Pablo Dubois	4.6 (page 14)	Support	The VDS rightly stresses the importance of connection between the built environment and the countryside.  It is right that the countryside should be protected and the identification of the narrow strip of countryside between Cookham and Maidenhead as crucial is spot on.	Support noted.  Support noted.
Copas Farms Copas Partnership  Barton Willmore	Box 8 (page 14)	Comment	The box highlights the importance of the land between Cookham and Maidenhead, describing it as 700m wide. To clarify such measurement is	The distance of 700m is taken from eastern section of Long Lane, Cookham to Hungerford Drive, Maidenhead. This represents the



Nick Patterson-Neild			<p>taken from Long Lane to the edge of Maidenhead.</p> <p>Land at Lower Mount Farm can be developed without reducing the width of open land. The land also benefits from defensible boundaries to the north, south, east and west. The development would also be no closer to Cookham Dean.</p>	<p>closest point between the excluded settlements of Cookham Rise and Maidenhead. The adopted Local Plan does not provide a definition or define the extent of a gap.</p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need and implications for land supply will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 8 (page 14)	Object	The gap between Cookham and Maidenhead is not one of the smallest green gaps between settlements in the borough.	<p>It is accepted that Green Belt gaps between other settlements within the borough are smaller, however describing the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead as narrow is considered suitable. The following amendment has been made to Box 8:</p> <p>“It is only some 700 metres wide at its narrowest point, <del>one of the smallest green gaps between any two settlements in the Royal Borough.</del>”</p>
Michael Johnson	Box 8 (page 14)	Support	Support the explanation of the importance of the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead.	Support noted.

Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G4.4 (page 14)	Object	The word narrow should be removed as the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead is wider than other villages and Maidenhead.	It is accepted that Green Belt gaps between other settlements within borough are smaller, however describing the gap between Cookham and Maidenhead as narrow is considered suitable.
Copas Farms Copas Partnership  Barton Willmore Nick Patterson-Neild	G4.4 (page 14)	Object	<p>The statement within G4.4 that Cookham Parish is highly valued and must be protected from development which detracts from its attractive appearance generally and in accordance with its status as Green Belt is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and urges the positive planning to provide housing and services.</p> <p>There is no reason why Cookham Parish cannot, with sensitively designed schemes, support development. Development at Lower Mount Farm would not compromise the setting of the village or Green Belt policy.</p>	<p>Disagree. The National Planning Policy Framework must be read as a whole. The NPPF includes statement that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surrounding and materials.</p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need and implications for land supply will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
Pablo Dubois	G4.5 (page 15)	Support	Poundfield is a key example of the contribution of green spaces to the character of the village. G4.5 statement that proposals which detract from the	Support noted.

			role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge and historic setting should not be permitted is right.	
Harding- Newman, Elsdon and Gilbert-Scott  WYG Planning and Environment	G4.5 (page 15)	Object	Object to the move to establish Poundfield as a green wedge where proposals which detract from this role should not be permitted. It is not clear what type of development would, or would not, be permitted. The commentary in Box 9 is selective on only referring to residents. In the 1991 inquiry, the Secretary of State found that listed buildings could be harmed by development but also concluded that the site could not be said to be countryside as it is not entirely rural and was enclosed by buildings, gardens and trees.	<p>The Poundfield area is within the Cookham High Street Conservation Area. The associated statement recognised the area as an important open space and containing a number of views, some of which are connected to Stanley Spencer. It seeks to ensure that proposals do not detract from its role; G4.5 recognises that some proposals might be suitable. To improve clarity, the following change have been made to G4.5:</p> <p>“The role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge separating The Pound from <u>the Station Hill area</u> and Cookham Rise, together with its provision of a setting to the historic environment and the related Stanley Spencer paintings, should be recognised. Proposals <del>which detract from</del> <u>should not compromise</u> this role <del>should not be permitted</del>”</p> <p>It is outside the scope of the VDS to propose and design specific developments. The past Secretary of State decision notes that whilst</p>

			<p>Residential development of the lower land at the Station Hill frontage would not impact the Stanley Spencer connection, views from the footpath or the Conservation Area. The area is not in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The designation of a green wedge is in conflict with the Habitat Regulations screening which states that the Cookham VDS does not guide whether development should take place in principle.</p> <p>G4.5 is not evidence based and should be removed.</p>	<p>Poundfield could not be called countryside, that the openness of the site is an important part of the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>The land fronting Station Hill is not associated with Stanley Spencer, however, the land is within the Cookham High Street Conservation Area Statement which identified the land as being important open space and containing a number of other views.</p> <p>The NPPF includes statements that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surrounding and materials. The VDS provides design guidance to support existing planning policy. There is no conflict between the VDS and the Habitat Regulations Screening to which Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency have all indicated their agreement.</p> <p>G4.5 is evidenced. As noted above, the Poundfield area is already recognised as an important open</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				space and containing a number of views by the Cookham High Street Conservation Areas statement. The Townscape Assessment makes similar conclusions.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G4.5 (page 15)	Object	<p>The Pound and Station Hill are positioned east and west of each other and connected. Poundfield is north of The Pound and Station Hill and so Poundfield is not a “wedge between The Pound and Station Hill” as written.</p> <p>Poundfield is also not the setting for undisturbed historic environment.</p>	<p>Agree in part. The text should refer to the Station Hill area and Cookham Rise and not the road Station Hill. The following amendment has been made to G4.5:</p> <p>“The role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge separating The Pound from <u>the</u> Station Hill <u>area</u> and Cookham Rise, together with its provision of a setting to the historic environment and the related Stanley Spencer paintings, should be recognised. Proposals <del>which detract from</del> <u>should not compromise</u> this role <del>should not be permitted</del>”</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
Copas Farms Copas Partnership  Barton Willmore Nick Patterson-Neild	G4.5 (page 15)	Object	<p>Poundfield cannot be described as a large area of grassland. It is 6 small fields of 13 acres.</p> <p>Poundfield is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Not a broad green slope rising to the</li> </ul>	<p>Agree in part. The following amendments have been made to Box 9:</p> <p><del>“A large area of grassland which lies</del> <u>The fields</u> to the north and west of The</p>

			<p>north</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not visible from The Moor or the village except from the top of Cookham Dean</li> <li>○ Not a thriving area of wildlife</li> <li>○ Not the setting of Englefield House, which is surrounded by modern residential development, woodland, Pounfield Lane and gardens of other properties</li> </ul>	<p>Pound <del>is</del> <u>are</u> known as ‘Poundfield’ and <del>is</del> <u>are</u> shown in the aerial photograph on this page. Cookham residents have fought long and hard to defend this green area, which has been the subject of several major planning applications and appeals.”</p> <p>“Ecological and rurality-related factors. <u>From the south at Maidenhead Road, Poundfield’s undeveloped frontage facing Maidenhead Road, and the glimpse of its more distant slope rising to the north are its broad green slope rising to the north,</u> are signals of the <del>openness and essentially</del> rural character of Cookham. Poundfield <del>is visible not only from the Maidenhead Road but also, for example, from the Moor and village.</del> It forms a green wedge of <del>unspoilt countryside</del> at the heart of Cookham, dividing the picturesque narrow roadway of The Pound (the edge of Cookham village) from Cookham’s more commercial areas (<u>the Station Hill area and Cookham Rise</u>). <u>It is also visible from The Moor and the eastern end of the causeway.</u> Poundfield is considered to be a <u>valuable thriving</u> wildlife area.”</p> <p>The past Secretary of State decision</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Poundfield can accommodate sensitively designed development to meet the needs for housing into the future.</p>	<p>found that Poundfield was important to the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>Comment noted. In seeking to ensure that proposals do not detract from its role, G4.5 recognises that some proposals might be suitable. It is outside the scope of the VDS to propose and design specific developments. To further improve clarity the following change has been made to G4.5:</p> <p>“The role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge separating The Pound from Station Hill <u>area</u> and Cookham Rise, together with its provision of a setting to the historic environment and the related Stanley Spencer paintings, should be recognised. Proposals <del>which detract from</del> <u>should not compromise</u> this role <del>should not be permitted</del>”</p>
Pablo Dubois	Box 9 (page 15)	Support	<p>Poundfield is a key example of the contribution of green spaces to the character of the village. G4.5 statement that proposals which detract from the role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge and historic setting should not be permitted is right.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas</p>	<p>Box 9 (page 15)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Poundfield cannot be described as a large area of grassland. It is 6 small fields of 13 acres.</p> <p>Poundfield is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not a broad green slope rising to the north</li> <li>○ Not visible from The Moor or the village except from the top of Cookham Dean</li> <li>○ Not a thriving area of wildlife</li> <li>○ Not the setting of Englefield House, which is surrounded by modern residential development, woodland, Pounfield Lane and gardens of other properties</li> </ul>	<p>Agree in part. It is agreed that the physical description of Poundfield is incorrect. The past Secretary of State decision found that Poundfield was important to the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>The following amendments have been made to Box 9:</p> <p><del>“A large area of grassland which lies</del>  <u>The fields to the north and west of The Pound is are</u> known as ‘Poundfield’ and <del>is are</del> shown in the aerial photograph on this page. Cookham residents have fought long and hard to defend this green area, which has been the subject of several major planning applications and appeals.”</p> <p>“Ecological and rurally-related factors. <u>From the south at Maidenhead Road, Poundfield’s undeveloped frontage facing Maidenhead Road, and the glimpse of its more distant slope rising to the north are its broad green slope rising to the north,</u> are signals of the <del>openness and essentially</del> rural character of Cookham. <del>Poundfield is visible not only from the Maidenhead Road but also, for example, from the Moor and village.</del> It forms a green</p>
---------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------	--	---



			<p>At the time of the 1991 appeal, there was no proven need for housing. Permission should be approved if there is a need for housing should be explained in the text.</p>	<p>wedge of unspoilt countryside at the heart of Cookham, dividing the picturesque narrow roadway of The Pound (the edge of Cookham village) from Cookham's more commercial areas (<u>the Station Hill area</u> and Cookham Rise). <u>It is also visible from The Moor and the eastern end of the causeway. Poundfield is considered to be a valuable thriving wildlife area.</u>"</p> <p>Comment noted. Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need and implications for land supply will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
<p>Copas Farms Copas Partnership</p> <p>Barton Willmore Nick Patterson-Neild</p>	Box 9 (page 15)	Object	<p>Poundfield cannot be described as a large area of grassland. It is 6 small fields of 13 acres.</p> <p>Poundfield is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not a broad green slope rising to the north</li> <li>○ Not visible from The Moor or the village except from the top of Cookham Dean</li> </ul>	<p>Agree in part. The following amendments have been made to Box 9:</p> <p><del>"A large area of grassland which lies</del> <u>The fields</u> to the north and west of The Pound <del>is</del> <u>are</u> known as 'Poundfield' and <del>is</del> <u>are</u> shown in the aerial photograph on this page. Cookham residents have fought long and hard to</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not a thriving area of wildlife</li> <li>○ Not the setting of Englefield House, which is surrounded by modern residential development, woodland, Pounfield Lane and gardens of other properties</li> </ul> <p>Poundfield can accommodate</p>	<p>defend this green area, which has been the subject of several major planning applications and appeals.”</p> <p>“Ecological and rurally-related factors. <u>From the south at Maidenhead Road, Poundfield’s undeveloped frontage facing Maidenhead Road, and the glimpse of its more distant slope rising to the north</u> <del>are its broad green slope rising to the north,</del> are signals of the <del>openness and essentially</del> rural character of Cookham. Poundfield <del>is visible not only from the Maidenhead Road but also, for example, from the Moor and village.</del> It forms a green wedge of <del>unspoilt countryside</del> at the heart of Cookham, dividing the picturesque narrow roadway of The Pound (the edge of Cookham village) from Cookham’s more commercial areas (<u>the Station Hill area</u> and Cookham Rise). <u>It is also visible from The Moor and the eastern end of the causeway.</u> Poundfield is considered <u>to be a valuable thriving wildlife area.</u>”</p> <p>The past Secretary of State decision found that Poundfield was important to the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>Comment noted. In seeking to ensure</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			sensitively designed development to meet the needs for housing into the future.	that proposals do not detract from its role, G4.5 recognises that some proposals might be suitable. It is outside the scope of the VDS to propose and design specific developments. To further improve clarity the following change has been made to G4.5:  “The role of Poundfield in providing a green wedge separating The Pound from Station Hill <u>area</u> and Cookham Rise, together with its provision of a setting to the historic environment and the related Stanley Spencer paintings, should be recognised. Proposals <del>which detract from</del> <u>should not compromise</u> this role <del>should not be permitted</del> ”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	4.8 (page 16)	Comment	Reference should be made to the major part of Cookham’s ancient commons exist now in the Maidenhead area.	Comment noted. The following amendment has been made to Section 4.8:  “... of the built environment <u>and in some instances extend beyond Cookham parish into surrounding areas.</u> ”
Chris Brown	Box 10 (page 16)	Comment	Comments that ice skating at Cockmarsh was possible more recently in 2000.	Comment noted. It is accepted that skating may have been possible in more recent years. Notwithstanding

				<p>this, the paragraph has been deleted. The following change has been made to Box 10:</p> <p><del>“Local people can remember skating on Cockmarsh as recently as the 1970s, but the apparent reduction in winter flooding has meant there has been insufficient water on the marsh in recent years.”</del></p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 10 (page 16)	Comment	Reference should be made to the Cockmarsh chalk slope being maintained by grazing farm animals. Unfortunately the areas of hawthorn and bramble continue to increase.	Comment noted. A management plan has been put in place for the area by the National Trust. It is expected to address issues for this slope balancing all key factors.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 10	Comment	The other reason why skating has not occurred is the lack of extreme cold weather.	<p>Comment noted. It is accepted that cold weather is required to freeze flood water. Notwithstanding this, the paragraph has been deleted. The following change has been made to Box 10:</p> <p><del>“Local people can remember skating on Cockmarsh as recently as the 1970s, but the apparent reduction in winter flooding has meant there has been insufficient water on the marsh in recent years.”</del></p>
Copas Farms	Photograph	Comment	The photograph shows three distinct	Comment noted. The following

Geoffrey Copas	(page 16)		<p>areas: chalk slope, wetland grazed commons and an arable field.</p>	<p>change has been made to the photograph caption:</p> <p>“A beautiful vista showing the Winter Hill escarpment <del>and the flat plain of Cockmarsh, the wetland grazed commons of Cockmarsh and an arable field,</del> with the river just visible amid the tree line beyond. Two distinct habitats, the a steep chalk slope and flat, marshy meadows, are rarely found so close together and part of the area has been designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Water fowl breed on lower ground whilst kestrels, sparrow hawks and red kites soar above.”</p>
Philip Nugus	Box 10 (page 16)	Object	<p>Attention is drawn to the land above Gibraltar Lane being a steep slope which relies on the root system of vegetation to prevent erosion.</p> <p>Alterations to the binding effects of vegetation could damage the water retaining characteristics of the slope and result in structural damage and claims by affected property owners.</p> <p>The status quo provides a habitat for owls, rabbits, voles, deer, foxes and birds.</p>	<p>Box 10 makes the observation that the character of the south western section of Winter Hill has changed as vegetation has matured and changed. It is agreed that the presence of vegetation can bring benefits in terms of water run off and may also provide alternative habitat. Box 10 has been amended to as below.</p> <p>“...<del>sadly the</del> <u>The</u> south western end has gradually changed <u>as vegetation has matured and species establish themselves.</u> <del>It is no longer an area of</del>”</p>

				<p>open chalk downland, but has become invaded by scrub and bushes. <u>Whilst larger vegetation helps bind the soil, it also</u> This has the effect of both reducing the visual impact of a notable landmark and of blocking some of the panoramic views from Winter Hill Road.</p> <p><u>In recognition of all the factors mentioned above, a management plan for the area has been put in place by the National Trust. This will reduce scrub and improve chalk grassland and associated views over a 10 year period.</u></p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.5 (page 17)	Object	A grass surface is not possible due to the extreme use of the Moor car park. Rustic fencing creates an unnatural feature. Low hedging should be used.	<p>Agreed. Whilst grass would be a preferable surface it is accepted that this may not prove practical across the car park.</p> <p>A further change made to ensure against the guiding of development has resulted in the deletion of the reference to the potential relocation of the car park within R4.5:</p> <p>The following change has been made to R4.5:</p> <p><del>“Whilst we do not wish to close the</del></p>

				<p>longstanding topic of an alternative location for the present <u>The Moor</u> car park, we would point out that the <del>existing site</del> is in poor condition and unsightly. It is a National Trust principle that a car park of this nature should not be 'urbanised' with hard standings. However, there are modern materials which might be explored with a view to providing an improved <del>but still grassy</del> surface. <u>Low hedging or rustic</u> perimeter fencing might also be considered as both of these soften the appearance of parked cars whilst leaving a car park open to public view (see Section 6.20)."</p> <p>Rustic fencing is given as an example of how the appearance of parked vehicles can be reduced while allowing for some visibility. It is accepted that low hedging might also be an appropriate boundary where they do not inhibit security. See 6.20.</p>
Michael Johnson	R4.5 (page 17)	Comment	<p>Comments that the recommendations avoid the two controversial issues of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) parking, including the possible use of Marsh Meadow, and</li> <li>2) The Pound, at least of a footpath diversion to give pedestrians safety.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted. It is outside the remit of the VDS to state where new car parks should be located. The VDS refers to issues regarding The Pound in Box 14.</p>

Michael Johnson	R4.6 (page 17)	Comment	<p>Comments that the recommendations avoid the two controversial issues of:</p> <p>1) parking, including the possible use of Marsh Meadow, and</p> <p>2) The Pound, at least of a footpath diversion to give pedestrians safety.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is outside the remit of the VDS to state where new car parks should be located. The VDS refers to issues regarding The Pound in Box 14.</p>
Philip Nugus	R4.6 (page 17)	Object	<p>Attention is drawn to the land above Gibraltar Lane being a steep slope which relies on the root system of vegetation to prevent erosion.</p> <p>Alterations to the binding effects of vegetation could damage the water retaining characteristics of the slope and result in structural damage and claims by affected property owners.</p> <p>The status quo provides a habitat for owls, rabbits, voles, deer, foxes and birds.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the presence of vegetation can bring benefits in terms of water run off and may also provide alternative habitat.</p> <p>R4.6 seeks to recommend that Winter Hill and Cockmarsh are appropriately managed to ensure its continued enjoyment. It does not suggest that all vegetation should be removed. It is recognised that such action would be harmful. To improve clarity and in light of the current programme of works by the National Trust the following change has been made to R4.6:</p> <p><u>“Winter Hill and Cockmarsh are important parts of the natural assets of the parish. The management of these areas should seek to maintain public views whilst recognising the importance of vegetation to wildlife, erosion and rainwater run-off. It is understood that the current National</u></p>



				<u>Trust management programme, approved by National England, is in cognizance of all these issues</u> <del>The problems of scrub and erosion (Box 10, page 16)</del> should be addressed.”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.6 (page 17)	Comment	<p>Agree that the commons are available to meet community needs and therefore use as a community car park should be encouraged subject to needs outweighing amenity value and alternatives.</p> <p>Existing car parks which are detrimental should be relocated where alternatives are available.</p> <p>Any reduction in the grazing area would require the agreement of the Commoners who have grazing rights.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. R4.5 recognises that the Moor Car Park is unsightly, however the VDS is not the right planning tool to progress an issue as complex as the potential relocation of the car park.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
Copas Farming Geoffrey Copas	G4.6 (page 17)	Comment	The Moor car park position must be considered to be the biggest blot on the village and under G4.6 would never have been approved.	Comment noted. R4.5 recognises that the Moor Car Park is unsightly, however the VDS is not the right planning tool to progress an issue as complex as the potential relocation of the car park. G4.6 reflects Local Plan Policy N4.

Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	4.9 (page 18)	Comment	Queries what area of new woodland has been planted in the southern side of Winter Hill?	The tree planting has occurred in proximity to the telecommunications mast situated between Winter Hill and Alleyns Lane.”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.7 (page 18)	Object	Woodland in the Green Belt does not affect the openness with Green Belt policy. Trees create important vistas and may replace others.	<p>R4.7 recommends that landowners carefully consider the impact of tree planting.</p> <p>A4.7 advises that the Green Belt purpose of keeping land permanently open does not apply to trees or other forms of planting, but goes on to say that the openness and views across the countryside are valued and planting which maintains this would be preferred.</p> <p>The following change has been made to A4.7 to increase clarity:</p> <p>“However, it is important to note here that ‘openness’ of the <del>Green Belt</del> <u>countryside is valued and that planting which maintains this and does not block vistas is preferred and that tree lines can compromise this openness and block vistas.</u>”</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	4.11 (page 19)	Object	Growing grass to be grazed by animals and market gardens are agricultural operations and cannot be grouped with	Agree in part. It is agreed that market gardening comes under the definition of agriculture, however, whilst the

			accommodation land as not being used for agricultural purposes.	grazing of horses also does, the keeping of horses does not and is classified as sui generis. The following amendment has been made to 4.11 to provide clarity:  “... is now used for the keeping of horses, <del>allotments, market garden land,</del> play areas and <del>so on</del> <u>other non farming uses.</u> ”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G4.7 (page 19)	Object	You cannot protect every inch of grass verge. The word “large” should be added and “to” removed before the word “diminution.”	Agree. The following change has been made to G4.7 to increase clarity:  “Proposals <del>which would</del> <u>should not</u> lead to <del>diminution or</del> <u>an unacceptable</u> loss of green verges <del>should not be permitted.</del> Opportunities should be taken to reinstate green verges in areas where they are characteristic.”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G4.8 (page 19)	Object	Preferred boundary of land should be hedges and fencing should only be used to protect the hedge while it establishes.  Post and rail fencing in structure is more visible and urban in character.	Disagree. Whilst agreeing that hedging is ideal, post and rail rustic fencing provides another suitable form of fencing.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R4.10 (page 20)	Comment	Should encourage more community use of green space.	Comment noted. No change is required.

Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	5 (page 21-22)	Object	The recommendations duplicate matters dealt with by the Borough Council. It is too prescriptive	Section 5 provides factual information on flooding and signposts the reader to places where further information can be found such as the Environment Agency or the Borough Council. The section does not set out guidance. No changes are required.
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	5 (page 21)	Comment	Mistype. Correct "Strategy" to "Strategic" in the first line of the 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.	Correction made.
Richard Scarff	5 (page 21)	Comment	The quality of the maps needs to be improved. Past flash flooding in Cookham Dean was not related to river flooding.	The resolution of maps has been improved. Online versions may have a lower quality to satisfy download limits. Whilst the maps show fluvial flooding the importance of flooding from other sources is recognised by a change to 5.1.
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	5 (page 22)	Comment	The title and text of R5.1 should be amended to refer to flood resilience measures, rather than flood adaptation measures, to bring it in line with current phraseology.	Agree. The following change has been made to R5.1:  "Flood <del>adaptation</del> <u>resilience</u> measures R5.1 It is recommended that any development in areas at risk of flooding should incorporate flood <del>adaptation</del> <u>resilience</u> measures such as..."
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	5 (page 22)	Comment	A5.6 reference to the 8m buffer strip is accurate however it is sought for	Agree. The following change has been made to A5.6:

			<p>biodiversity purposes as well as access.</p> <p>Although fluvial flooding is important in the Cookham area, mention should also be made to surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk in the design of developments.</p>	<p>“... to enable access for maintenance and provide a wildlife buffer.”</p> <p>Agree. The following change has been made to R5.1:</p> <p>“It is recommended that any development in areas at risk of <u>fluvial or other forms</u> of flooding should incorporate flood <del>adaptation</del> <u>resilience</u> measures such as...”</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	5.1 (page 21)	Comment	A major flood has not occurred since 1947. The level of each flood would be listed at Cookham Lock along with the usual river level and road height.	Comment noted. A number of significant flooding events have affected Cookham parish since 1947. It is accepted that the extent and number of properties flooded differs for each event.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	A5.3 (page 22)	Comment	The marshy area at the base of Cockmarsh is not a watercourse but where water rises from the ground.	<p>Agree. The following change has been made to A5.3 to provide clarification:</p> <p>“Such waterways include Maidenhead’s North Town ditch or York Stream, White Brook (from Strande Water to the Thames), Fleet Ditch and Strande Water, Lulle Brook, <del>the Cockmarsh watercourse along the bottom of Winter Hill, the watercourse from Grange Farm in Grange Road to</del></p>

			<p>The watercourse from the River Thames to Strand Water via White Brook does not drain into the Thames but flows to the York Stream.</p> <p>The Borough Council had the rights to use part of the low land at Lea Farm as a flash flood storage area.</p>	<p><del>Cookham Moor</del>, and the North Town ditch from Strande Water to the parish boundary at North Town.”</p> <p>Agreed. The following amendment has been made to A5.3:</p> <p>“... White Brook (from Strande Water to the Thames <u>York Stream</u>), ...”</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	A5.3 (page 22)		<p>There is no watercourse between Grange Farm and Grange Road. There is a very large drainage pipe from Kings Coppice Farm to The Moor that resolved problems of flash flooding.</p>	<p>Agree. The following change has been made to A5.3 to provide clarification:</p> <p>“Such waterways include Maidenhead’s North Town ditch or York Stream, White Brook (from Strande Water to the Thames), Fleet Ditch and Strande Water, Lulle Brook, <del>the Cockmarsh watercourse along the bottom of Winter Hill, the watercourse from Grange Farm in Grange Road to Cookham Moor</del>, and the North Town ditch from Strande Water to the parish boundary at North Town.”</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R5.1 (page 22)	Comment	<p>Should first incorporate that buildings are constructed on stilts above the</p>	<p>Comment noted. The use of pier foundations is generally not</p>

			water thereby no loss of water storage or restriction to water flow.	recommended by the Borough Council and the Environment Agency due to the risk of voids being used as storage.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	6 (page 23-34)	Object	<p>References to where development should occur should be removed. The VDS is about design and not where development should take place.</p> <p>The following should be removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6.1 - the first two bullet points</li> <li>○ 6.2 - Opportunities for development</li> <li>○ 6.3 - Context of Development Opportunities</li> </ul>	<p>Agree in part. The intended purpose of Section 6.1 is to outline objectives for design across Cookham. Sections 6.2 and 6.3 provide background on the type of development that is supported under existing planning policy and might therefore be anticipated.</p> <p>On reflection, these sections could be simplified and their clarity improved. The following changes have been made to 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3:</p> <p><del>“6.1 Introduction and key objectives</del></p> <p>The three settlements of Cookham have their own characteristics, which the VDS addresses in subsequent sections. There are, however, certain themes, which affect all of the built-up parts of the parish and these are dealt with in the present section.</p> <p><u>6.2 Key objectives</u></p> <p>There is no single unifying design characteristic in Cookham, but the</p>

				<p>intention behind the general guidance expressed in this section is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Ensure that the right opportunities are identified when new development (including property conversions and extensions) is thought to be needed and that development is not allowed to occur in unsuitable locations.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that change reflects and complements the built character found in Cookham parish, including building, settings, scales, styles and features and materials.</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that changes reflect</u> <del>Ensure that the rural and semi-urban character of Cookham's built areas is respected and that 'creeping urbanisation' is not allowed to occur</del> <u>Cookham, each where it currently exists.</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Ensure that new development reflects and complements those building scales, styles and features and materials that predominate throughout Cookham parish, as well emphasising the need for specific harmonies within each locality.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that change has</u> <del>Ensure that all new development is designed with proper regard to sustainable design factors</del></li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>(see also Reference 17) with priority being given to the need for energy <u>and water</u> efficiency.</p> <p>6.2 <u>Context Opportunities for development</u></p> <p><u>Most of Cookham village and Cookham Dean lie within Conservation Areas, whose extent is shown in Section 7.2 and Section 9.2, respectively. Many other areas in and around Cookham village are situated within the Thames flood plain. Most of the green areas surrounding Cookham village and Cookham Rise, and also the whole of Cookham Dean, are designated as Green Belt. In line with national planning policy, Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt statuses all influence the nature and opportunity for development.</u></p> <p><del>Whilst the nature of Cookham means there are relatively few opportunities for development within the built up areas, some small scale development might be anticipated. The main opportunities are: <u>Over the last 10 years the type of development that has occurred in Cookham parish has been small scale changes which</u></del></p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p><u>include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Extensions and other alterations to existing buildings.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> One for one replacements of existing houses.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment of existing houses/gardens to provide a greater number of homes.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment or conversion of local offices or commercial premises.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Redevelopment of the former gas holder site on Whyteladyes Lane.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Development within special small sites known as 'Rural Exception Sites' created specifically for the provision of 'affordable housing'</del></li> </ul> <p>Whatever the scale of <u>future</u> change, it is important that development takes into account the general character of Cookham and the immediate area.</p> <p><del>6.3 Context of development opportunities</del></p> <p><del>Most of Cookham village and Cookham Dean lie within Conservation Areas, whose extent is shown in Section 7.2 and Section 9.2, respectively. Many other areas in and around Cookham village are situated within the Thames flood plain. Most of</del></p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the green areas surrounding Cookham village and Cookham Rise, and also the whole of Cookham Dean, are designated as Green Belt. In line with national planning policy, Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt statuses all strictly limit the nature and extent of new development. Accordingly, the opportunities for creation of additional homes in Cookham can be further clarified as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There are possibilities of conversions of larger houses into smaller dwelling units (see Section 6.10). This would apply largely to houses that are not in the Green Belt and not in the Thames flood plain. VDS guidelines do make such conversions possible, subject to constraints which include not altering the character of an area. The possibility of conversions into smaller dwelling units may also arise where homes are within the Cookham High Street Conservation Area, or are listed, but in both instances additional conditions would apply (see Section 7.2.)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is the possibility for land to be taken from existing residential plots for the construction of new homes in a</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>manner that may or may not include demolition of existing homes. In most instances this would apply to land outside of Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt. This has already happened on occasion in Cookham but will in future be subject to VDS guidance on spacing and layout. (Sections 6.9 and 6.11). It may be that opportunities will arise for the introduction of new houses in single or small numbers in any one such location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ There are possibilities for the redevelopment or conversion of local offices, commercial premises or retail units into residential units. Applications for such conversions should, however, be treated with caution to avoid an increasingly 'dormer village' character to Cookham, currently a place where people can both live and work locally, and/or also to avoid a diminution in retail convenience and vibrancy.</li> <li>☐ The only location for possible housing redevelopment in Cookham that most residents appear agreed upon is the site of the former gas holder in Whyteladyes Lane (Box 27, page 48).</li> <li>☐ Where there is proven need on the</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>part of people with specific connections to Cookham, it may be possible that small areas of land could be brought forward as 'Rural Exception Sites'. These are small sites, usually adjacent to, but outside, the built-up area of the village, such that they would not normally receive planning permission (see Section 6.15)."</p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
Lysette Penston	6 (page 23-34)	Support	There is no recommendation out of place.	Support noted.
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	6 (pages 23-34)	Comment	Note the inclusion of energy efficiency and request similar inclusion of water efficiency which may have implications for the design of developments.	<p>Agree. The following amendments have been made to 6.25 and G6.22:</p> <p><u>"6.25 Energy efficiency Sustainable Design</u></p> <p>The Borough Council's 'Sustainable Design and Construction' Supplementary Planning Document</p>

				<p>(Reference 17) provides a wealth of information on measures that could be incorporated into new development to enhance <del>energy efficiency</del> <u>environmental performance</u>. The information is also useful for improving <del>the energy efficiency</del> of existing properties.</p> <p>A very real challenge in Cookham, most particularly but not exclusively in its Conservation Areas, is that of <del>maximising energy efficiency</del> <u>incorporating sustainable design</u> whilst minimising adverse visual impacts outside the property. In supporting sustainable design and technology, suitable balances must be achieved between the advantages of <del>energy reduction</del> <u>sustainable design</u> and the need to retain the visual attractiveness of Cookham's character. 'New generation' technologies designed to provide greener energy are, therefore, particularly relevant to Cookham. Many of these are specifically focused on the reduction of visual intrusiveness. It is expected that this trend will continue into the future."</p> <p>"G6.22 The incorporation of sustainable design and construction</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				techniques and technology is welcomed but care must be taken to balance the advantages of <u>energy efficiency environmental performance</u> with the need to avoid negative impacts on the visual attractiveness of a building or its surroundings.”
Michael Johnson	6 (page 23-34)	Comment	Section 6 is of questionable value. Terms are expressed in generalised and unspecific terms. Virtually all important points are repeated in later sections.	Disagree. The VDS is considered to contain appropriate and consistent information within each section.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	6.1 (page 23)	Comment	The section states that there is no single unifying design characteristic in Cookham but goes on to say that new development should reflect and complement building scales, styles and features and materials. Therefore any style that exists is acceptable as long as similar already exists.	Section 6.1 explains that whilst there is no single unifying characteristic, the purpose of the general guidance outlined in Section 6 is to address specific themes which are common across Cookham. This avoids unnecessary repetition.  It should be noted that emphasis is placed on building scale, styles, features and materials that predominate. Developments should have regard to their specific local area. Other sections within the VDS provide additional description of character for specific areas and associated guidance. It is incorrect that any style is appropriate if similar

				exists elsewhere.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	6.2 (page 23)	Object	The VDS states that change will happen and that the purpose of the VDS is not to judge whether development should take place. Therefore Sections 6.2 and 6.3 have no place in the document.	<p>Agree in part. The intended purpose of Section 6.1 is to outline objectives for design across Cookham. Sections 6.2 and 6.3 provide background on the type of development that is supported under existing planning policy and might therefore be anticipated.</p> <p>On reflection, these sections could be simplified and their clarity improved. The following changes have been made to 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3:</p> <p><del>“6.1 Introduction and key objectives</del></p> <p>The three settlements of Cookham have their own characteristics, which the VDS addresses in subsequent sections. There are, however, certain themes, which affect all of the built-up parts of the parish and these are dealt with in the present section.</p> <p><u>6.2 Key objectives</u></p> <p>There is no single unifying design characteristic in Cookham, but the intention behind the general guidance expressed in this section is to:</p> <p><del>□ Ensure that the right opportunities</del></p>



				<p>are identified when new development (including property conversions and extensions) is thought to be needed and that development is not allowed to occur in unsuitable locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that change reflects and complements the built character found in Cookham parish, including building, settings, scales, styles and features and materials.</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that changes reflect</u> Ensure that the rural and semi-urban character of Cookham's built areas is respected and that 'creeping urbanisation' is not allowed to occur <u>Cookham, each where it currently exists.</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Ensure that new development reflects and complements those building scales, styles and features and materials that predominate throughout Cookham parish, as well emphasising the need for specific harmonies within each locality.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that change has</u> <del>Ensure that all new development is designed with proper regard to sustainable design factors (see also Reference 17) with priority being given to the need for energy and</del> <u>water efficiency.</u></li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>6.2 <u>Context Opportunities for development</u></p> <p><u>Most of Cookham village and Cookham Dean lie within Conservation Areas, whose extent is shown in Section 7.2 and Section 9.2, respectively. Many other areas in and around Cookham village are situated within the Thames flood plain. Most of the green areas surrounding Cookham village and Cookham Rise, and also the whole of Cookham Dean, are designated as Green Belt. In line with national planning policy, Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt statuses all influence the nature and opportunity for development.</u></p> <p><del>Whilst the nature of Cookham means there are relatively few opportunities for development within the built up areas, some small scale development might be anticipated. The main opportunities are: Over the last 10 years the type of development that has occurred in Cookham parish has been small scale changes which include:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Extensions and other alterations to existing buildings.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> One for one replacements of existing houses.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment of existing houses/gardens to provide a greater number of homes.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment or conversion of local offices or commercial premises.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Redevelopment of the former gas holder site on Whyteladyes Lane.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Development within special small sites known as 'Rural Exception Sites' created specifically for the provision of 'affordable housing'</del></li> </ul> <p>Whatever the scale of <u>future</u> change, it is important that development takes into account the general character of Cookham and the immediate area.</p> <p><del>6.3 Context of development opportunities</del></p> <p><del>Most of Cookham village and Cookham Dean lie within Conservation Areas, whose extent is shown in Section 7.2 and Section 9.2, respectively. Many other areas in and around Cookham village are situated within the Thames flood plain. Most of the green areas surrounding Cookham village and Cookham Rise, and also the whole of Cookham Dean, are</del></p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>designated as Green Belt. In line with national planning policy, Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt statuses all strictly limit the nature and extent of new development. Accordingly, the opportunities for creation of additional homes in Cookham can be further clarified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There are possibilities of conversions of larger houses into smaller dwelling units (see Section 6.10). This would apply largely to houses that are not in the Green Belt and not in the Thames flood plain. VDS guidelines do make such conversions possible, subject to constraints which include not altering the character of an area. The possibility of conversions into smaller dwelling units may also arise where homes are within the Cookham High Street Conservation Area, or are listed, but in both instances additional conditions would apply (see Section 7.2.)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is the possibility for land to be taken from existing residential plots for the construction of new homes in a manner that may or may not include demolition of existing homes. In most instances this would apply to land</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>outside of Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt. This has already happened on occasion in Cookham but will in future be subject to VDS guidance on spacing and layout. (Sections 6.9 and 6.11). It may be that opportunities will arise for the introduction of new houses in single or small numbers in any one such location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ There are possibilities for the redevelopment or conversion of local offices, commercial premises or retail units into residential units. Applications for such conversions should, however, be treated with caution to avoid an increasingly 'dormer village' character to Cookham, currently a place where people can both live and work locally, and/or also to avoid a diminution in retail convenience and vibrancy.</li> <li>□ The only location for possible housing redevelopment in Cookham that most residents appear agreed upon is the site of the former gas holder in Whyteladies Lane (Box 27, page 48).</li> <li>□ Where there is proven need on the part of people with specific connections to Cookham, it may be possible that small areas of land could</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>be brought forward as 'Rural Exception Sites'. These are small sites, usually adjacent to, but outside, the built-up area of the village, such that they would not normally receive planning permission (see Section 6.15)."</p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	6.3 (page 23)	Object	The VDS states that change will happen and that the purpose of the VDS is not to judge whether development should take place. Therefore Sections 6.2 and 6.3 have no place in the document.	<p>Agree in part. The intended purpose of Section 6.1 is to outline objectives for design across Cookham. Sections 6.2 and 6.3 provide background on the type of development that is supported under existing planning policy and might therefore be anticipated.</p> <p>On reflection, these sections could be simplified and their clarity improved. The following changes have been made to 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3:</p> <p>"6.1 Introduction and key objectives</p>

				<p>The three settlements of Cookham have their own characteristics, which the VDS addresses in subsequent sections. There are, however, certain themes, which affect all of the built-up parts of the parish and these are dealt with in the present section.</p> <p><u>6.2 Key objectives</u></p> <p>There is no single unifying design characteristic in Cookham, but the intention behind the general guidance expressed in this section is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Ensure that the right opportunities are identified when new development (including property conversions and extensions) is thought to be needed and that development is not allowed to occur in unsuitable locations.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that change reflects and complements the built character found in Cookham parish, including building, settings, scales, styles and features and materials.</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that changes reflect</u> <del>Ensure that the rural and semi-urban character of Cookham's built areas is respected and that 'creeping urbanisation' is not allowed to occur</del> <u>Cookham, each</u></li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>where it currently exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Ensure that new development reflects and complements those building scales, styles and features and materials that predominate throughout Cookham parish, as well as emphasising the need for specific harmonies within each locality.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Provide guidance to help ensure that change has</u> <del>Ensure that all new development is designed with proper regard to sustainable design factors (see also Reference 17) with priority being given to the need for energy and</del> <u>water efficiency.</u></li> </ul> <p>6.2 <u>Context</u> <del>Opportunities for development</del></p> <p><u>Most of Cookham village and Cookham Dean lie within Conservation Areas, whose extent is shown in Section 7.2 and Section 9.2, respectively. Many other areas in and around Cookham village are situated within the Thames flood plain. Most of the green areas surrounding Cookham village and Cookham Rise, and also the whole of Cookham Dean, are designated as Green Belt. In line with national planning policy, Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt</u></p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p><u>statuses all influence the nature and opportunity for development.</u></p> <p><del>Whilst the nature of Cookham means there are relatively few opportunities for development within the built up areas, some small scale development might be anticipated. The main opportunities are: Over the last 10 years the type of development that has occurred in Cookham parish has been small scale changes which include:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Extensions and other alterations to existing buildings.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> One for one replacements of existing houses.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment of existing houses/gardens to provide a greater number of homes.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment or conversion of local offices or commercial premises.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Redevelopment of the former gas holder site on Whyteladyes Lane.</del></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <del>Development within special small sites known as 'Rural Exception Sites' created specifically for the provision of 'affordable housing'</del></li> </ul> <p>Whatever the scale of <u>future</u> change, it is important that development takes into account the general character of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Cookham and the immediate area.</p> <p>6.3 Context of development opportunities</p> <p>Most of Cookham village and Cookham Dean lie within Conservation Areas, whose extent is shown in Section 7.2 and Section 9.2, respectively. Many other areas in and around Cookham village are situated within the Thames flood plain. Most of the green areas surrounding Cookham village and Cookham Rise, and also the whole of Cookham Dean, are designated as Green Belt. In line with national planning policy, Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt statuses all strictly limit the nature and extent of new development. Accordingly, the opportunities for creation of additional homes in Cookham can be further clarified as follows.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are possibilities of conversions of larger houses into smaller dwelling units (see Section 6.10). This would apply largely to houses that are not in the Green Belt and not in the Thames flood plain. VDS guidelines do make such conversions possible, subject to</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>constraints which include not altering the character of an area. The possibility of conversions into smaller dwelling units may also arise where homes are within the Cookham High Street Conservation Area, or are listed, but in both instances additional conditions would apply (see Section 7.2.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is the possibility for land to be taken from existing residential plots for the construction of new homes in a manner that may or may not include demolition of existing homes. In most instances this would apply to land outside of Conservation Areas, flood plain and Green Belt. This has already happened on occasion in Cookham but will in future be subject to VDS guidance on spacing and layout. (Sections 6.9 and 6.11). It may be that opportunities will arise for the introduction of new houses in single or small numbers in any one such location.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are possibilities for the redevelopment or conversion of local offices, commercial premises or retail units into residential units. Applications for such conversions should, however, be treated with caution to avoid an increasingly</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><del>'dormer village' character to Cookham, currently a place where people can both live and work locally, and/or also to avoid a diminution in retail convenience and vibrancy.</del></p> <p><del>☐ The only location for possible housing redevelopment in Cookham that most residents appear agreed upon is the site of the former gas holder in Whyteladies Lane (Box 27, page 48).</del></p> <p><del>☐ Where there is proven need on the part of people with specific connections to Cookham, it may be possible that small areas of land could be brought forward as 'Rural Exception Sites'. These are small sites, usually adjacent to, but outside, the built up area of the village, such that they would not normally receive planning permission (see Section 6.15)."</del></p> <p>Strategic planning matters such as the level of future development need will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Documents are the wrong planning tool to consider such matters and are therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Chris Harris	6 (page 23)	Comment	Agrees that the gas holder site is suitable for residential redevelopment but it would benefit from more prominence so as to illustrate to young people that the older population recognise their social responsibilities towards the housing shortage.	<p>Comment noted. The allocation of the Cookham Gas Holder site is currently being considered through the Borough Local Plan process.</p> <p>Changes made to simplify and improve the clarity of 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 have resulted in the deletion of reference to the gas holder site in this section. The reference to the site remains in Box 27.</p>
Cookham Parish Council Derek Fry	6.1 (page 23)	Object	The statement under 6.1 of avoiding creeping urbanisation is contradicted by the statement under 6.2 that a main opportunity is the redevelopment of existing houses / gardens to provide a greater number of homes.	<p>The purpose of Section 6.1 in the draft VDS was to explain in brief that Cookham's built up area has a rural or semi-rural character. The term "creeping urbanisation" is used to explain change which harms this aspect of character. It is more fully explained in 6.7.</p> <p>Changes made to simplify and improve the clarity of 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 have resulted in the deletion of reference to creeping urbanisation in this section.</p> <p>The VDS provides guidance to help ensure that new developments resulting from the redevelopment of existing houses and gardens respect the rural and semi-urban character.</p>

Cookham Parish Council Derek Fry	6.2 (page 23)	Object	The statement under 6.1 of avoiding creeping urbanism is contradicted by the statement under 6.2 that a main opportunity is the redevelopment of existing houses / gardens to provide a greater number of homes.	The purpose of Section 6.1 in the draft VDS was to explain in brief that Cookham's built up area has a rural or semi-rural character. The term "creeping urbanisation" is used to explain change which harms this aspect of character. It is more fully explained in 6.7.  Changes made to simplify and improve the clarity of 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 have resulted in the deletion of reference to creeping urbanisation in this section.
National Grid Property Holdings  Capita Symonds Simon De Vere	6.2 (page 22)	Support	Welcome the recognition that the Gas Holder Site at Whyteladyes lane should be redeveloped for new homes. Comments that work is required in respect to a remediation strategy and the precise form of development.	Support noted.
National Grid Property Holdings  Capita Symonds Simon De Vere	6.3 (page 22)	Support	Welcome the recognition that the Gas Holder Site at Whyteladyes lane should be redeveloped for new homes. Comments that work is required in respect to a remediation strategy and the precise form of development.	Support noted.
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	G6.1 (page 24)	Object	The text "modest scale being of the essence in Cookham" is too vague and	Agree. The following amendment has been made to G6.1:

			<p>should be deleted. In relative terms, buildings outside Cookham centre tend to be large detached houses rather than of modest scale. G6.1 should be amended to read:</p> <p>“The size of proposed buildings and their plots must be considered in relation to their context. New buildings should sit comfortably in their surroundings, <del>modest scale being of the essence in Cookham.</del>”</p>	<p>“New buildings should sit comfortably in their surroundings, <del>modest scale being of the essence in Cookham.</del>”</p>
John Bowley	Photograph (page 25)	Comment	<p>Queries whether the top right photograph has been inserted back to front?</p>	<p>The photograph was correctly shown. However it has been replaced by one taken more recently.</p>
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	6.7 (page 25)	Object	<p>G6.4 should be amended to delete the phrase “creeping urbanisation” which is meaningless. Development that respects the character of Cookham is correctly encompassed by the first part of the policy.</p>	<p>The term “creeping urbanisation” is used to explain change which harms the rural or semi-rural character. It is more fully explained in 6.7. Suitably designed developments will respect the rural and semi-urban character.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the text has been amended to improve the explanation of the term “creeping urbanisation.”</p> <p><u>“Changes from rural to urban character often occur in small steps</u></p>

				<p><u>and may then be known as 'creeping urbanisation'</u>. Most of the following attributes are mentioned elsewhere in the VDS, but it is helpful to bring them together at this point, since they all play a role in the maintenance of rural character <del>and the avoidance of creeping urbanisation.</del>"</p>
<p>Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter</p>	<p>G6.4 (page 25)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>G6.4 should be amended to delete the phrase "creeping urbanism" which is meaningless. Development that respects the character of Cookham is correctly encompassed by the first part of the policy.</p>	<p>The term "creeping urbanisation" is used to explain change which harms the rural or semi-rural character. It is more fully explained in 6.7. Suitably designed developments will respect the rural and semi-urban character.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the text has been amended to improve the explanation of the term "creeping urbanisation."</p> <p><u>"Changes from rural to urban character often occur in small steps and may then be known as 'creeping urbanisation'</u>. Most of the following attributes are mentioned elsewhere in the VDS, but it is helpful to bring them together at this point, since they all play a role in the maintenance of rural character <del>and the avoidance of creeping urbanisation.</del>"</p>



<p>Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas</p>	<p>G6.4 (page 25)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The words “and avoid creeping urbanisation” should be removed as it is not about design but about where development takes place.</p>	<p>The term “creeping urbanisation” is used to explain change which harms the rural or semi-rural character. It is more fully explained in 6.7. Suitably designed developments will respect the rural and semi-urban character. Ensuring development avoids creeping urbanisation will have an impact on the design of new developments.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the text has been amended to improve the explanation of the term “creeping urbanisation.”</p> <p><u>“Changes from rural to urban character often occur in small steps and may then be known as ‘creeping urbanisation’.</u> Most of the following attributes are mentioned elsewhere in the VDS, but it is helpful to bring them together at this point, since they all play a role in the maintenance of rural character <del>and the avoidance of creeping urbanisation.</del>”</p>
<p>Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas</p>	<p>G6.6 (page 26)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The words “modestly sized and” should be removed.</p>	<p>Agree. The following amendment has been made to G6.6:</p> <p>“New developments involving several dwellings should be <del>modestly sized</del>”</p>

				and adequately spaced....”
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	6.11 (page 26)	Object	To take account of semi-detached and terraced forms of development that do not have a gap to the boundary, G6.8 should be amended to refer to “buildings” rather than “property.”	Section 6.11 clarifies that G6.8 is not intended to apply to areas characterised by terraces or small plots. The following amendment has been made to G6.8 to provide clarification:  “ <del>There should be room for gardens around properties to</del> <u>Development should be designed to provide gardens and maintain</u> green space. The spacing of buildings should follow the pattern of building in the immediate and nearby area. As a normal minimum the gap between a <del>property</del> building and the <u>property</u> boundary should be no less than 1.5m.”
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	G6.8 (page 26)	Object	To take account of semi-detached and terraced forms of development that do not have a gap to the boundary, G6.8 should be amended to refer to “buildings” rather than “property.”	Agree in part. Section 6.11 clarifies that G6.8 is not intended to apply to areas characterised by terraces or small plots. The following change has been made to G6.8 to provide clarification:  “ <del>There should be room for gardens around properties to</del> <u>Development should be designed to provide gardens and maintain</u> green space.”

				The spacing of buildings should follow the pattern of building in the immediate and nearby area. As a normal minimum the gap between a <del>property</del> building and the <u>property</u> boundary should be no less than 1.5m.”
John Bowley	G6.8 (page 26)	Comment	Comments that whilst a gap of 1.5 m is desirable it has seldom been achieved.	Comment noted.
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	G6.12 (page 27)	Object	G6.4 should be amended to delete the phrase “creeping urbanism” which is meaningless. Development that respects the character of Cookham is correctly encompassed by the first part of the policy.	The term “creeping urbanisation” is used to explain change which harms the rural or semi-rural character. It is more fully explained in 6.7. Suitably designed developments will respect the rural and semi-urban character. No changes are required.
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	G6.15a (page 30)	Object	The guidance on commercial premises in G6.15a is outside the remit of a VDS.	Agree. The status of G6.15a has been changed to a recommendation and the following amendment made:  “ <del>Small and individual developments of new commercial premises in appropriate locations in Cookham parish, or the change of use of existing properties to commercial,</del> <u>Local employment</u> should be welcomed <u>where appropriate</u> as contributing to Cookham’s status as a village where people live and work <u>but</u>

				<u>any development to support this objective should be in accordance with G15a to G15c. An industrial estate or industrial area, no matter how small, is not suitable for Cookham.</u>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G6.15a (page 30)	Object	The words “an industrial estate or industrial area no matter how small, is not suitable for Cookham” should be removed to satisfy the status as a village where people live and work and to reduce the need to travel.	Agree. The status of G6.15a has been changed to a recommendation and the following amendment made:  “ <del>Small and individual developments of new commercial premises in appropriate locations in Cookham parish, or the change of use of existing properties to commercial,</del> <u>Local employment should be welcomed where appropriate as contributing to Cookham’s status as a village where people live and work but any development to support this objective should be in accordance with G15a to G15c. An industrial estate or industrial area, no matter how small, is not suitable for Cookham.</u> ”
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	G6.16 (page 30)	Object	This repeats guidance already set out in previous guidance in the document.	The VDS is considered to contain appropriate and consistent information within each section.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	6.18 (page 30)	Object	Whilst the paragraph mentioned that modest commercial premises are to be welcomed, G6.15a states that an	Agree in part. The status of G6.15a has been changed to a recommendation and the following

			<p>industrial area, no matter how small is not suitable. In addition Lower Mount Farm is ignored as an employment area.</p>	<p>amendment made:</p> <p><del>“Small and individual developments of new commercial premises in appropriate locations in Cookham parish, or the change of use of existing properties to commercial, Local employment should be welcomed where appropriate as contributing to Cookham’s status as a village where people live and work but any development to support this objective should be in accordance with G15a to G15c. An industrial estate or industrial area, no matter how small, is not suitable for Cookham.”</del></p> <p>The letting of buildings at Lower Mount Farm as business units is referenced in Box 4 (page 11)</p>
<p>Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas</p>	<p>6.20 (page 30)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Car parks should be enclosed by low hedges rather than “rustic perimeter fencing.”</p>	<p>Rustic fencing is given as an example of how the appearance of parked vehicles can be reduced while allowing for some visibility. It is accepted that low hedging might also be appropriate where they do not inhibit security. The following amendment has been made to 6.20 to provide clarification:</p> <p><u>“Low hedging can be a suitable</u></p>

				<u>boundary for village car parks. Rustic perimeter fencing is also a particularly useful technique...</u>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G6.18 (page 31)	Comment	Gates should only be restricted to a height of 2m to allow residents to have privacy.	Comment noted. G6.18 seeks to avoid tall solid gates. Taller gates with an open character would meet the requirements of G6.18.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	6.22 (page 31)	Comment	Suggests trees are pruned to allow a view below the leaf canopy.	Comment noted.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G6.20 (page 31)	Object	The words "only" and "strictly" should be removed. The planting of trees and bushes should be encouraged. Text under 6.21 encourages planting.	Agree. The following change has been made to G6.20:  " <del>Screening should be used only when strictly necessary.</del> Where screening is <u>used it</u> # should be carefully designed, with due regard to its seasonal and future mature appearance."
John Bowley	Page 31	Comment	Comments that the trees alongside the access road to Moor Hall provide a screening effect to the cars parked there. Suggests that trees could also be used to screen the National Trust car park. The Moor can only have an open aspect if the cars are removed.	Comments noted.
Paul Strzelecki	G6.22	Comment	Comments that the most significant contribution to the energy issue would be the saving of energy through	Comment noted. The inclusion of insulation and boilers do not effect the external appearance of a property or

			<p>efficiency measures such as insulation. Planning standards should be tightened to require better thermal standards or efficient boilers.</p> <p>Agrees with the statement that technologies such as solar panels should be subject to the look and feel of the village.</p>	<p>its setting and therefore outside the scope of the VDS.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G6.23 (page 32)		Word “strictly” should be removed.	<p>Agreed. The following amendment has been made to G6.23:</p> <p>“Exterior lighting should be used only when <del>strictly</del> necessary.”</p>
Chris Harris	6.25 (page 32)	Support	The guidance note relating to ecohomes is well made.	Support noted.
Michael Johnson	6.28 (page 32)	Comment	Comments that the recommendations avoid the two controversial issues of: 1) parking, including the possible use of Marsh Meadow, and 2) The Pound, at least of a footpath diversion to give pedestrians safety.	Comments noted. It is outside the remit of the VDS to state where new car parks should be located. The VDS refers to issues regarding The Pound in Box 14.
Cookham Society David Ashwanden	6 (page 33)	Support	There is not a recommendation out of place in the summary of general guidance for Cookham’s built areas. If principles are adhered to, there will not be ugly, inappropriate, clashing, overdeveloped or unsustainable design.	Support noted.

Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 14 (page 38)	Comment	Cannot find reference 2.3 re. footpaths.	Details of references are provided in the Annex of the same name on page 79. Reference 2.3 refers to the Revised traffic and Transport section of the Cookham Plan.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 14 (page 38)	Comment	Photographs should be included of the houses north of Terry's Lane near the railway bridge.	Comments noted. Unfortunately only limited space is available for photographs.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 18 (page 40)	Comment	Photographs should be included on one of the boxes of Lower Mount Farm with its residential property.	Comments noted. Unfortunately only limited space is available for photographs.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G7.2 (page 42)	Object	The words "may Club" and "Moor Hall" should be removed. The VDS is a design statement and does not guide where development should occur.	The Odney Club and Moor Hall are provided as examples of where more innovative architecture might be suitable. G7.2 is not intended to direct development to either site and therefore the following change has been made to provide clarity:  " <del>Large developed sites such as the Odney Club and Moor Hall can offer opportunities for the</del> <u>The use of cutting edge architecture may be suited to larger self contained sites,</u> provided that the General Guidance of Section 6 is followed and that:..."
Rob Acker	8 (page 43-50)	Support	Excellent document that beautifully	Support noted.



			describes Cookham Rise. Fully supports the recommendations which are well thought through with clear reference to environmental and architectural aspects.	
Rob Acker	8.1 (page 43)	Comment	Mistype. Correct "themid" to "the mid-" in the first line.	Correction made.
Chris Brown	8.1 (page 43)	Comment	Mistype. Correct "themid" to "the mid-" in the first line.	Correction made.
Ann Danks	Box 23 (page 45)	Comment	The information about the date of Sleekstone Cottages is unclear. They are also 1930 architecture, being depicted by Spencer in 'Cookham Rise 1938' when they were relatively new.	Agree. The following change has been made to Box 23:  "A number of houses were built on the western side of the road in the 1920s to 1930s, whilst the eastern side of the road <del>is predominantly</del> <u>includes</u> 1950s architecture, <del>including</del> <u>and</u> Sleekstone Cottages, a striking row of semi-detached houses with a central (shared) gable and half-hipped roofs. <u>These were built in the 1930s and depicted by Stanley Spencer in his painting 'Cookham Rise 1938'.</u> There <del>is then</del> <u>follows</u> a stretch of road bounded by farmland, before the next houses at the northern end of the road, also built in the 1950s but larger in scale. There are some further individually-styled properties in

				Grange Lane.”
Cookham Parish Council Derek Fry	Box 26 (page 47)	Comment	Mistype. Correct “Further east of High Road...” to “Further west off High Road...”	Correction made.
Fiona Hewer	Box 26 (page 47)	Comment	Mistype. Correct “Further east of High Road...” to “Further west off High Road...”	Correction made.
National Grid Property Holdings  Capita Symonds Simon De Vere	Box 27 (page 48)	Support	Welcome the recognition that the Gas Holder Site at Whyteladyes lane should be redeveloped for new homes. Comments that work is required in respect to a remediation strategy and the precise form of development.	Support noted.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 27 (page 48)	Comment	Photographs should be included on one of the boxes of Lower Mount Farm with its residential property.	Commented noted. Unfortunately only limited space is available for photographs.
Rob Acker	Box 28 (page 48)	Comment	Mistype. Correct “shot” to “short” in the 1 <sup>st</sup> line of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph.  Mistype. Correct “east” to “west” in the 1 <sup>st</sup> line of the 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph.	Correction made.  Correction made.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R8.2 (page 50)	Object	The recommendation should be removed as it is specific to where development should occur.	Agree. The status of G8.2 has been changed to an advisory note. The site is already promoted for redevelopment by the Borough Council through a development brief and is one of a

				<p>number of sites being considered for allocation through the Borough Local Plan. The recommendation has been revised to an advisory note.</p> <p><del>“Progress should be made with a future development of the</del> <u>The former has holder site in Whyteladyes Lane is already promoted for development by the Borough Council through an existing development brief and is one of a number of sites being considered for allocation through the Borough Local Plan (Box 27, page 48 and Reference 11).”</u></p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G8.2 (page 50)	Object	<p>The guidance should be removed as it is only included to highlight the VDS’s resistance to any development of the Poundfield site. The VDS is about design, not where development occurs.</p> <p>The aspect cannot be considered that important compared with other views to be highlighted.</p>	Disagree. G8.2 refers to particular views that are important to the character of Cookham Rise and the Station Hill area and as such their inclusion in the VDS is appropriate.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G8.4 (page 50)	Object	<p>The guidance should be removed. A major drainage project has resolved the problem.</p>	Flash flood events affected properties in the Cookham in 1988 and 1989. The subsequent construction of a drainage scheme was completed to reduce the risk of a similar event occurring.

				G8.4 seeks to ensure in respect of new development that any particular risk of surface water run-off is addressed. It does not suggest that measures implemented to address past events are unresolved. No changes are necessary.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Box 31 (page 52)	Comment	Photographs should be included of the developed area of Kings Coppice Farm.	Commented noted. Unfortunately only limited space is available for photographs.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G9.3 (page 58)	Object	The guidance should be removed. It refers to a specific site and not about design principles.	Disagree. G9.3 provides guidance encouraging improvements to the former Cookham Dean Post Office Stores. Such guidance within VDS is appropriate.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G9.5 (page 58)	Object	The guidance should be removed. The flooding problem has been resolved.	Flash flood events affected properties in the Cookham in 1988 and 1989. The subsequent construction of a drainage scheme was completed to reduce the risk of a similar event occurring.  G9.5 seeks to ensure in respect of new development that any particular risk of surface water run-off is addressed. It does not suggest that measures implemented to address past events are unresolved. No

				changes are necessary.
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	10.3 (page 60)	Object	<p>Concerns expressed regarding the text but which are not expressed in G10.1.</p> <p>The width to each side of the property may not be possible where there is an existing property which is being rebuilt. Since the effects of rebuilding would be no greater and no more harmful an explanation could be added “save where there is an existing building to consider where the effects would be no greater.”</p> <p>The height of an existing property might already be higher through size or position than its neighbours. The effects of rebuilding would be no greater and no more harmful an explanation should be added. The policy is too prescriptive and may prevent opportunities to improve the setting. Increasing height may give an opportunity to increase gaps to boundaries.</p>	<p>Agree. The following amendment has been made to 10.3 to provide clarity:</p> <p><del>“The height of replacement development on riverside plots should not normally exceed the height of any existing property in the locality. More generally, scale of new or replacement developments should not normally be greater than is characteristic of the neighbourhood. Replacement development should in general avoid having a greater impact on the riverside environment than the existing. Key considerations will be the scale and bulk of the proposal. In assessing the suitability regard should be had to the size of the existing building, the nature of the surrounding area (including topography, tree cover, proximity and character of any nearby properties.”</del></p>
Michael Johnson	Box 43 (page 62)	Comment	Although Long Lane is sunken, there are still views to the south. It would be a pity if hedges or trees were planted.	Comment noted. For clarity the planting of trees and hedges does not require planning permission.
Copas Farms	12.2 (page 63)	Comment	Problems for cars, cyclists and	Comments noted. The VDS refers to

Geoffrey Copas			<p>pedestrians at The Pound could be resolved by creating an alternative route for vehicles to the north of The Pound.</p> <p>The green cycle route from Cookham to Maidenhead is made available by the landowner. The chance of further access improvements to Cookham Moor and beyond increased following Summerleaze purchase of Sutton Farm, however following criticism the proposal was withdrawn.</p> <p>The cycle path from Cookham Moor to the railway bridge has support from the owners of Marsh Meadow. The National Trust are not progressing this due to an objection from the Cookham Society.</p>	<p>issues regarding The Pound in Box 14.</p> <p>Comment noted. Following further consultation, the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point has been amended to read:</p> <p><u>“The Green Cycle Route from Cookham to Maidenhead requires, for no obvious good reason, that bicycles should be lifted over styles <u>occasional lifting of bicycles over a gate.</u>”</u></p> <p>Comment noted. The Cookham Society has indicated that they preferred a route along Poundfield Lane and along the bottom of the golf course and do not oppose a link in principle.</p>
Michael Johnson	12.2 (page 63)	Comment	<p>Comments that the recommendations avoid the two controversial issues of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) parking, including the possible use of Marsh Meadow, and</li> <li>2) The Pound, at least of a footpath diversion to give pedestrians safety.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted. It is outside the remit of the VDS to state where new car parks should be located. The VDS refers to issues regarding The Pound in Box 14.</p>
Michael Johnson	12.2 (page 63)	Comment	<p>The need for a footpath from Sutton Road to the Thames should not be confined to Cookham, since the Maidenhead Civic Society has been</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

			fighting for a link at the other end of White Place Farm.	
Carter Planning Ltd Mark Carter	G13.1 (page 64)	Object	The guidance on demonstrating that agricultural buildings are required G13.1 is outside the remit of a VDS.	The VDS highlights the importance of the countryside to the setting of Cookham's built up areas. G13.1 requests applicants for new farm building to provide evidence of their need where planning permission is required. This is best practice and will not only assist in safeguarding the countryside against unnecessary or poorly located buildings but will also assist in increasing understanding between farmers and residents.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	13.2 (page 65)	Comment	The polytunnels at Lower Mount Farm are not in the gap between Cookham Rise and Maidenhead. They are of permanent construction and have planning permission.	Comment noted. Whilst not at its narrowest point, the polytunnels at Lower Mount Farm are located in the Green Belt between the settlements of Cookham Rise and Maidenhead.
Mobile Operators Association  Mono Consultants Ltd Jacquelyn Fee	13.3 (page 65)	Object	While supporting the inclusion of a telecommunications policy, concern is expressed over the wording of Section 13.3.  Suggest a policy which reads: "Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: 1) The siting and appearance of the	The VDS outlines those aspects of design which are most important within the context of Cookham Parish and telecommunications masts. G13.7 whilst expressed differently is compatible the proposed model policy. No changes are required.  General policy on telecommunications will be considered through the

		<p>proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>2) If on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building.</p> <p>3) If proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibly erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) authority.</p> <p>4) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.</p> <p>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology.”</p> <p>Suggest introductory text which reads:</p>	<p>Borough Local Plan. The suggested model policy will be considered through that process.</p>
--	--	---	--



			<p>“Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document...”</p>	
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	G13.5 (page 64)	Object	<p>The words “however such” to the end should be removed. All tree planting should be encouraged. Trees do not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Development harms openness, however no such provision is suggested for other forms of development</p>	<p>Disagree. Whilst it is accepted that the planting of trees and hedges does not require planning permission, G13.5 refers to screening not being a means by which an unacceptable building might be justified. The guidance refers to vistas and does not refer to Green Belt policy.</p>
Mobile Operators	G13.7 (page 65)	Object	<p>While supporting the inclusion of a</p>	<p>The VDS outlines those aspects of</p>

<p>Association</p> <p>Mono Consultants Ltd Jacquelyn Fee</p>		<p>telecommunications policy, concern is expressed over the wording of Section 13.3.</p> <p>Suggest a policy which reads:  “Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met:  1) The siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area.  2) If on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building.  3) If proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibly erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) authority.  4) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.</p>	<p>design which are most important within the context of Cookham Parish and telecommunications masts. G13.7 whilst expressed differently is compatible the proposed model policy. No changes are required.</p> <p>General policy on telecommunications will be considered through the Borough Local Plan. The suggested model policy will be considered through that process.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology.”</p> <p>Suggest introductory text which reads: “Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document...”</p>	
Copas Farms	17 (page 69)	Object	Reference is made to the old sewerage	Agree in part. Information from the

Geoffrey Copas			site as a rare habitat area without justification. There is no more wildlife than other places.	<p>working group's ecology expert is that the site supports insect communities which provide an important feeding place for Dragonfly and Damselfly, consequently supporting breeding birds in the vicinity. The area is also used by small mammals which support Barn Owl, Little Owl and Kestrel populations. It is accepted that further clarity could be provided by the following change:</p> <p>"The old sewage treatment works at the foot of Winter Hill golf course is <del>another rare</del> <u>provides habitat for insects and small mammals which in turn support Dragonfly, Damselfly, breeding birds and birds of prey.</u>"</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	17 (page 69)	Object	The Poundfield site and its adjoining Rowborough are no different to other areas around any developed area. Cookham Moor is a special area. The only reason for including them is that Poundfield is not in the Green Belt and is more likely to be developed.	<p>Agree in part. The text refers to the importance of open and wooded areas. While Poundfield, Rowborough and the Moor are provided as examples, it is accepted that their ecological value might be no greater than other similar areas. There is overlap with the final bullet which refers to green fingers of land.</p> <p>The following amendment has been made to remove unnecessary text and provide clarification:</p>

				<p><del>“Important open and wooded areas in the vicinity of the three Cookham settlements include Poundfield, Rowborough and the Moor amongst others (see also Section 4.7), we well as numerous green corridors throughout the settlements.”</del></p> <p>“More generally, <u>large open or wooded areas in the vicinity of built up areas and small green fingers of land</u> (Section 4.7), streams and ditches, large wooded gardens, green verges, trees and hedgerows, all of which contain and link wildlife, form further elements of a natural chain through the parish.”</p>
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	17 (page 69)	Comment	Rivers and adjacent land provide an important network allowing the movement of species. A buffer zone will help protect and enhance biodiversity and the ecological status of the river. Suggest a paragraph is included to acknowledge the importance of rivers.	Agree. The following text has been added:  “The River Thames and other waterways which together with their adjoining land provide an important network, allowing the movement of species.”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R17.4 (page 69)	Object	The word “and trees” should be added following “hedgerows” in 2 places.	Agree. The following amendment has been made to R17.4:  “All landowners should be encouraged

				to continue maintaining existing hedgerows <u>and trees</u> and to plant additional hedgerows <u>and trees</u> over time where suitable. <u>However, see also R4.7.</u> "
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	R17.5 (page 69)	Comment	Suggests the emphasis is wrong. Ragwort is poisonous to horses. No awareness of it harming other flora and fauna.  Chopped rubber is no more dangerous than rubber worn off cars which is washed into waterways.	Agree in part. It is the chemical means of control for ragwort can kill other plants. Chopped rubber can leach chemicals and harm wildlife if ingested. The following amendment has been made to R17.5:  "It should be recognised that <u>chemical</u> measures to control ragwort <del>for horses</del> <del>often</del> <u>can</u> kill other important flora and fauna, and that chopped rubber as a ground surface <del>is</del> can be ecologically damaging, as may be other artificial ground surfaces."
National Grid Property Holdings  Capita Symonds Simon De Vere	18.2 (page 70)	Support	Welcome the recognition that the Gas Holder Site at Whyteladyes lane should be redeveloped for new homes. Comments that work is required in respect to a remediation strategy and the precise form of development.	Support noted.
Cookham Parish Council Derek Fry	18.3 (page 70)	Support	Support the statement that "the VDS does not discount the possibility of a new location for the car park in due course"	Support noted. It is recognised that the Moor Car Park is unsightly, however the VDS is not the right planning tool to progress an issue as

			<p>Suggests adding the following to continue the existing text:</p> <p>“... due course, possibly the south east corner of Marsh Meadow (rear of The Crown public house).”</p>	<p>complex as the potential relocation of the car park.</p> <p>Changes made to ensure against the guiding of development has resulted in the deletion of the reference to the potential relocation of the car park within 18.3 as set out below:</p> <p>“Improvements to the Moor car park The Moor car park is in poor condition and unsightly. Recommendation R4.5, page 17 suggests the exploration of modern materials that might provide an improved <del>but still grassy</del> surface. <u>Low hedging or rustic perimeter fencing</u> (see Section 6.20) might also be evaluated with a view to softening the appearance of parked cars whilst leaving the area open to public view. <del>The VDS does not discount the possibility of a new location for the car park in due course.</del>”</p>
Cookham Parish Council Derek Fry	18.3 (page 70)	Object	<p>Suggest the deletion of the text “grazing by goats could be useful in controlling scrub.” Grazing would destroy natural flora, trees and shrubs, aiding soil erosion.</p>	<p>Agree. The following change has been made to 18.3:</p> <p>“Winter Hill The south-western end of Winter Hill has <u>gradually changed as vegetation has established and become more mature.</u> <del>become invaded by scrub, including small</del></p>

				<p>trees, which reduces visual impact and blocks panoramic views from the top of the hill. There is a further problem of erosion of the chalk escarpment, which needs protective action. In Box 10, page 16 and Recommendation R4.6, page 17 it is suggested that the problems of scrub and erosion need to be addressed. It was mentioned to the Working Group by a Cookham farmer that grazing by goats could be helpful in controlling scrub. <u>The 10 year management programme currently being undertaken by the National Trust, as outlined in Box 10, page 16, and Recommendation R4.6, page 17, is understood to be cognizant of the need to achieve a proper balance between restoration of grassland and associated views, on the one hand and issues of rainwater run-off and erosion, on the other.</u>"</p>
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	18.3 (page 70)	Object	A grass surface is not possible due to the extreme use of the Moor car park. Rustic fencing creates an unnatural feature. Low hedging should be used.	Agreed that whilst grass would be a preferable surface this may not prove practical across the car park. In addition to low hedging, rustic fencing is also considered an appropriate means of enclosure. The following change has been made to 18.3:



				“...suggests the exploration of modern materials that might provide an improved <del>but still grassy</del> surface.”
Philip Nugus	Photograph (page 70)	Object	<p>The photograph of Winter Hill is dishonest in purporting to show scrub. What are shown are weeds growing from the spoil from the National Trust car park which has subsequently been grassed over.</p> <p>The Winter Hill section is contradictory. It acknowledges water erosion yet advocates destroying woodland root systems which maintain the cohesion of soil and drainage. The eastern end of Winter Hill does not have dwellings below and is less steep.</p>	<p>Comment noted. A more recent photograph has been used.</p> <p>R4.6 seeks to recommend that Winter Hill and Cockmarsh are appropriately managed to ensure their continued enjoyment. It does not suggest that all vegetation should be removed. It is recognised that such action would be harmful. To improve clarity the following change has been made to R4.6:</p> <p><u>“Winter Hill and Cockmarch are important parts of the natural assets of the parish. The management of these areas should seek to maintain public views whilst recognising the importance of vegetation to wildlife, erosion and rainwater run-off. It is understood that the current National Trust long term management programme, approved by Natural England, is in cognizance of all these</u></p>

				<u>issues</u> The problems of scrub and erosion (Box 10, page 16) should be addressed.”
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	Annex A	Object	<p>The history and present day facts are misunderstood.</p> <p>Human habitation was established where there was a fresh supply of water. The Domesday Book records villages south of the River Thames - Bisham, Cookham, Bray and Windsor.</p> <p>Maidenhead expanded and formed its own council which included Cookham, Bray and Bisham. Maidenhead council was subsequently combined with Windsor council.</p> <p>The Cookham Commons include the area of land known as Maidenhead Thicket.</p> <p>In Cookham, housing was established around the church and was restricted by the river and marsh land.</p> <p>The next area to develop alongside the road that crosses Cookham Moor and became known as Cookham Rise. The area included The Pound.</p>	<p>The 'Investigative Outcomes' summary on page 74 of Annex A shows that there are many anomalies in relation to what may be treated as 'boundaries' between Cookham village, Cookham Rise and Cookham Dean. In this respect, it is important to note that the VDS defines a chosen 'nomenclature' applying to areas and place names, recognising that there were a number of options as to how these matters would be defined and that not everyone would agree with the outcome.</p> <p>The nomenclature used by the VDS gives priority to historical fact, as advised by the Working Group's local history expert, and also to 'where people think they live and how they choose to present their addresses'. The fact that this does not tally with electoral wards is not surprising, since electoral wards are defined differently and generally named after the most prominent 'place' within each ward. In various locations, residents consider that they live in Cookham - not the</p>

			<p>The first development in Cookham Dean was around ponds, where water was easily available.</p> <p>The three areas expanded with the arrival of the railway. Following WW2, areas around Cookham Rise where zoned for housing.</p> <p>History shows 3 areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cookham Parish Council has 3 distinct wards.</li> <li>○ Ordnance Survey shows 3 areas of Cookham.</li> <li>○ When created the Green Belt excluded 3 areas, although Cookham Dean was subsequently inserted into the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<p>village, not the Rise and not the Dean.</p> <p>The working group's local history expert states that Cookham village grew up in two locations, east and, later, west of the moor, with The Pound having been part of Cookham village since the Saxon period. This is also the view taken in the Cookham High Street Conservation Area Statement, which shows that the historic Cookham village was both sides of The Moor, which remained unpopulated because it flooded.</p> <p>Cookham Rise developed west of the railway. There was very little development east of the station until the late nineteenth century and this was classed as simply 'Cookham'. Enquiries with local residents east of the station confirmed that they had always understood that they were in 'Cookham', not 'Cookham Rise', as that they considered that to be located west of the station.</p> <p>The area east of the railway was therefore designated, in the VDS, the Station Hill area of Cookham, recognising nevertheless that it abuts Cookham Rise and that the two form a</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Lightlands Lane Caravan Park, Lightlands Lane and Bass Mead, Long Lane, Maidenhead Roads and Southwood Gardens are not part of Cookham village.</p> <p>Cookham Rise is not known as Cookham Rise and Station Hill.</p>	<p>single settlement.</p> <p>Box 18 addresses areas to the south of The Pound and south of Maidenhead Road. It is correct only the more northerly of the areas mentioned are part of Cookham village. To clarify the following change has been made to Box 18:</p> <p>“Further to the south, <u>areas of housing though outside of Cookham village, are included here for the sake of descriptive convenience.</u> Lightlands Lane and Strande Lane...”</p>
Michael Johnson	Annex A	Comment	It is worth noting that Cookham Parish is not only an administrative title but also an ecclesiastical parish.	Comment noted.
Paul Strzelecki	Annex A	Comment	Comments that the flood depth sign by The Moor should be removed. If retention is required, it should be sensitively designed.	Comment noted. Detail of existing signage is outside the scope of the VDS.
Copas Farms Geoffrey Copas	RA2 (page 73)	Object	The recommendation should be deleted. Why would anyone want to live in Station Hill rather than Cookham Rise?	Agree in part. Annex A provides information on the naming and boundary issues. The approach reflects addresses generally used by residents, however it is recognised that not everyone will agree.

				<p>It is agreed that RA2 should be deleted as below:</p> <p><del>“RA2 In a similar vein to the above it would be helpful to ensure that the addresses of properties in the Station Hill area are corrected wherever they are erroneously stated as ‘Cookham Rise’.”</del></p>
Ann Danks	Annex B	Comment	<p>High Street, Cookham 1929 is in reality most probably the same painting as High Street from the Moor c1937. A photograph in the gallery’s archive shows Spencer painting it with his young daughter Shirin in the background (which dates it as 1929). Keith Bell in 'Stanley Spencer. A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings' 1992 lists only the 1929 painting. It is likely it has been erroneously dated c1937 on the postcard sold in the Gallery, and perhaps elsewhere.</p> <p>Paintings relating to Cookham Rise: Cookham Rise Cottages 1935-6 - could also be the row of cottages in High Rd to the left of Cliveden View (a 1950s photo shows them with identical picket fencing). Cookham Rise 1938 should also perhaps be included in this section - it shows Sleekstone Cottages in</p>	<p>Suitable adjustments have been made to the table under B2 on page 75 regarding the Spencer 1929 and 1937 information provided.</p> <p>A note has been added regarding the second possible location of the 1935–36 painting.</p>

			<p>Grange Rd. This is listed (in paintings relating to Poundfield, Terry's Lane and the Pound) as the view from Poundfield....It is more likely to be the view from Lower Rd, before the houses of Burnt oak / Pearce Drive were built.</p> <p>Cookham's Environs: Rickets Farm, Cookham Dene 1938 - not sure that this is the pigsty at Dean Farm. Information from Ralph Thompson (who came to work for Jim Ricketts during the 2nd WW as a conscientious objector) was that the painting was depicting pigs that were housed up near the reservoir above Pudsey's Close.</p>	
Ann Danks	Annex B	Comment	<p>There could be another couple of sections to Annex B relating to paintings linked to the former brewing / malting industry in Cookham village and to Odney and Odney Common.</p> <p>Paintings relating to the former brewing / malting industry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Betrayal 1914 - shows the buildings behind Fernlea, now the Malt Cottages and Tannery House</li> <li>○ Mending Cows, Cookham 1915 - these buildings no longer have cows but have been converted into the house at the end of the Malt</li> </ul>	<p>Paintings cited in the VDS must reflect either the external appearance of buildings or scenic elements of Cookham's setting. On this basis no additional sections have been added, but the table on pages 75 and 76 has been expanded to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Both versions of The Betrayal</li> <li>● St Francis and the Birds</li> <li>● Bathing in Odney Pool</li> <li>● Girls Returning from a Bathe</li> </ul> <p>A note has been added regarding the possible alternative location of the</p>

		<p>Cottages and Gantry House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Last Supper 1920 - set inside one of the malshouses.</li> <li>○ The Betrayal 1922-3 - as the earlier version, with the buildings depicted in more detail.</li> <li>○ St Francis and the Birds 1935 - once again the buildings at the back of Fernlea, including the conical roof on which a cowl would have sat.</li> <li>○ The Brew House 1957 - already converted into a residence at this point.</li> </ul> <p>Paintings relating to Odney and Odney Common are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bathing in Odney Pool, Cookham 1921 - shows the bridge over the weir and the view towards the hanging woods of Cliveden.</li> <li>○ Girls returning from a Bathe 1936 - in the background depicts the distinctive architecture of the Odney Club (Lullebrook Manor) and its parkland in the distance.</li> <li>○ Landscape with Magnolia, Odney Club 1938 - captures the beautiful gardens at Odney with village properties in the background.</li> <li>○ The Baptism 1952 - the events take place in the Odney Bathing Pool.</li> <li>○ The Bathing Pool, Dogs 1957 -</li> </ul>	<p>painting, Rickets Farm.</p> <p>Reference to the painting Cookham Rise (1938) has been moved to beneath the 'Cookham Rise' heading. The description has been amended to include reference to Sleekstone Cottages and remove an incorrect suggestion as to the viewpoint.</p>
--	--	--	--

			Odney is still a popular dog walking spot today.	
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	Reference List (page 79)	Comment	9.2 mistype. Correct "Strategy" to "Strategic."  9.3 update. The publication date of "Living on the Edge" should be changed to 2012 to reflect its updating.	Correction made.  Correction made.
Fiona Hewer	Reference List (page 79)	Comment	Suggest adding dates to the following references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cookham Plan (2007)</li> <li>o Local Plan (1998?)</li> <li>o NPPF (2012)</li> </ul>	Agree. The text has been updated as below:  "Cookham Plan <u>(2007)</u> Local Plan <u>(1999, amended 2003)</u> NPPF <u>(2012)</u> "
Cookham Society David Ashwanden	Omission	Comment	The VDS's status as a Supplementary Planning Document would be enhanced by a summary or index of guidance notes.	Comment noted. The preparation of a resume of guidance points will be considered following the adoption of the VDS.
Chris Harris	Omission	Comment	It would be helpful if the VDS included a large scale map showing Green Belt, conservation areas and flood plain designations.	The Green Belt and conservation areas are both designations which are shown on the Local Plan Proposals Map. The extent of areas liable to flood is updated quarterly by the Environment Agency.
Chris Harris	Omission	Comment	The scale of the VDS will put many readers off, leading to the likelihood of cherry picking elements. Suggests the	Comment noted. The preparation of a resume of guidance points will be considered following the adoption of



			production of a 2-4 page summary booklet.	the VDS.
Lysette Penston	Omission	Comment	It would be helpful to outline the remit of the VDS and the degree to which it can be insisted on when considering planning applications.	<p>The adoption of the VDS as a Supplementary Planning Document would confirm it as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and appeals.</p> <p>As a design analysis, the Cookham VDS makes reference to matters where change does not constitute development or where change is allowed under permitted development rights. Whilst the complexities of individual planning applications means it is not possible to make a simple statement on its implementation, the introductory section 1.1 has been amended as below:</p> <p><del>“It sets out design guidance for the appearance of any new development in the village, to ensure that it is sympathetic to Cookham’s character</del>  <u>The VDS provides local guidance to those seeking to make changes to their property or land and, where planning permission is required, assist the Borough Council in considering whether the proposed development is sympathetic to the local character.”</u></p>

John Wagstaffe	Omission	Comment	<p>Feels that the VDS lost the opportunity to review existing signage.</p> <p>The VDS does not address the uncontrolled appearance of telecoms boxes.</p> <p>The VDS does not address the recent replacement of white lettering on a green background with white lettering on a black background.</p>	<p>The review of existing signage is outside the scope of the VDS.</p> <p>Telecommunications equipment in most circumstances do not require planning permission but are automatically granted under permitted development rights legislation.</p> <p>The replacement of individual street signs is not considered to be an issue which requires attention within the VDS. Section 6.18 suggests a colour palette for retail and commercial signage.</p>
----------------	----------	---------	---	---

Schedule of other amendments		
Section	Description of amendment	Reason for amendment
1.2 Status of the VDS	<p>The text has been updated to confirm the adoption of the VDS as a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p><del>“Once completed it will be adopted by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</del> <u>The VDS was adopted by the Boorugh Council</u> as a Supplementary Planning Document on DATE TO BE INSERTED.”</p>	To provide clarity.

<p>1.3 Duration, Sponsors and Working Group</p>	<p>The text has been amended to provide clear background to the establishment of the project.</p> <p><u>“The preparation of the VDS began in December 2008 as a result of a recommendation made in the earlier Cookham Plan. The project for the development of a Village Design Statement for Cookham parish was commenced in December 2008. The project was jointly commissioned and sponsored by the Cookham Parish Council as a result of a recommendation made in the earlier Cookham Plan. The work was co-sponsored by <u>and</u> the Cookham Society.</u></p> <p>The VDS <u>was drafted by a Working Group comprised Cookham of residents who had responded to a ‘Request for Volunteers’, issued by Cookham Parish Council. The Working Group and its advisers or supporters included all those in the table below. The names of those engaged at any point in elements of VDS drafting and/or review are marked with a red asterisk. Where special support was provided by an individual who was not a member of the Working Group, the nature of the support is indicated in italics. <u>At all points in the VDS where an individual’s role or position is stated, it is their role or position held at the time that that they made their contributions to the VDS.</u>”</u></p>	<p>To provide clarity.</p>
<p>1.4 The VDS Consultation Programme, including professional surveys</p>	<p>The text has been updated to reflect the formal consultation undertaken in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, including the preparation of a consultation report.</p> <p><u>“The draft VDS was published for a 5-week period of statutory consultation from 23<sup>rd</sup> November to 28<sup>th</sup> December</u></p>	<p>To provide clarity.</p>

	<p><u>2012. The comments received were considered by the Working Group and the Borough Council. Where appropriate, amendments were made to the VDS. The amended VDS was passed to and endorsed by Cookham Parish Council and the Cookham Society as project sponsors before being adopted by the Borough Council. A summary of the consultation process, including the representations made and how they have been addressed in the amended VDS is set out in a separate consultation statement.”</u></p>	
<p>1.6 Guidance Points, Recommendations and Advisory Notes</p>	<p>The text relating to the Guidance and Recommendations has been amended to clarify their purpose and in the case of recommendations to state that these do not supplement existing planning policy and are provided as suggestions only.</p> <p><del>“GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT</del> Guidance Points in yellow boxes under this heading (all commencing with the letter ‘G’) are those that should be followed in any future development. <del>These are for the use of anyone contemplating any new development, whether simple home extensions or much larger projects, and also to assist all persons involved in reviewing or assessing planning applications that relate to Cookham parish</del> <u>considered by people contemplating changes to their property and those reviewing planning applications.</u></p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS Recommendations in light green boxes (and commencing with the letter ‘R’) relate to aspects affecting Cookham parish more generally. Whilst there is an emphasis on the built environment, these</p>	<p>To provide clarity.</p>

	<p>Recommendations also concern the protection of Cookham's ecology and its archaeological heritage. It is beyond the scope of the VDS to designate the party or parties that would need to take action in respect of each individual Recommendation <u>do not supplement existing planning policy but are provided as suggestions.</u>"</p>	
<p>2.5 A very fine green space setting 2.7 A must for protection and enhancement</p>	<p>The text has amended to combine aspects relating to setting.</p> <p><del>"2.5 A very fine green space setting</del> <u>Green and waterside setting</u></p> <p>Few built environments so close to London and major national motorways can boast the 'glory of greenness' that is Cookham. The expression 'Cookham is defined by its green spaces' was used by one of the VDS Working Group's Individual Consultees, ecologist Mr Brian Clews. The VDS Working Group thought this expression to be so apt a description of Cookham that Section 4 of the VDS is named accordingly. In that section, many aspects of Cookham's green spaces are discussed: its Green Belt, its farms, its common land, its woodland and wooded hillsides, and its 'fingers of green' stretching to the heart of the built environment, imbuing the community with a sense of peace and calm.</p> <p><del>2.6 A must for protection and enhancement</del></p> <p>Just as green spaces not only surround the Cookham settlements but also thread through them, so does water in the form of the River Thames and its secondary waterways.</p>	<p>To improve clarity.</p>

	<p>Such was the extent to which the flow of water was seen as a characteristic of Cookham that the state-of-the art extensions to Moor Hall (Section 7.3) incorporated bubbling water flows into the heart of the resulting building complex to echo the ‘feel’ of Cookham.</p> <p>Cookham is a very pretty village in ‘built’ terms (see the descriptions especially in Sections 7, 8 and 9), and already possesses two Conservation Areas. (Section 15 highlights the possibility of creating additional Conservation Areas within Cookham Rise and the Station Hill area). <del>Cookham’s</del> <u>This</u> architectural value is complemented by an attractive riverside and countryside setting, <del>in a setting as unusual as that of this parish, ensures that the whole of Cookham is a most significant jewel in the very real crown of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Its unique character derives, in sum, from the quality of its built environment, set in the context of its exceptional green environment and combined with its river and waterways.</del></p> <p>Cookham is not, and must not be, immune to <del>any</del> change and development, but the best of what Cookham has to offer <del>should</del> <u>deserves</u> to be protected and <u>where possible</u> enhanced. As was found during the VDS Consultation Programme, the importance of Cookham’s character weighs not only with its resident community but with many who live elsewhere in the Borough, who love to visit Cookham, and also with many more living further afield (Section 16.1). Cookham offers refreshing, peaceful and healthy enjoyment to the visitor. Its major amenities are personally uplifting and largely free of charge.”</p>	
--	---	--

4.2 The retreat from agriculture	The title has been amended to “Changes in agricultural practice.”	To improve accuracy.
Box 9 Poundfield	<p>The text relating to the proposed Green Belt change has been amended.</p> <p>“Poundfield was added to the Green Belt in the 1990s through the Royal Borough’s Local Plan process, <del>but much of it was removed from the Green Belt following</del> <u>however a Court of Appeal decision partly quashed this action this confirming most of the land had never legally been within the Green Belt.</u> Subsequently Poundfield was incorporated into the adjacent Conservation Area, affording it a considerable degree of renewed protection.”</p>	To improve accuracy.
4.8 Staunchly defended common land	The title has been amended to “Common land.”	To improve factuality.
4.11 Accommodation land	<p>The text relating has been amended to focus on the integration of accommodation land into the wider countryside.</p> <p>“In the VDS, the term ‘accommodation land’ denotes land on the periphery of the Cookham settlements that was once in use for agricultural purposes, but is now used for the keeping of horses, <del>allotments, market garden land,</del> play areas and <del>so on</del> <u>other non farming uses.</u> The term also covers land which has been purchased simply to ‘maintain a view’ as a perceived amenity against the possibility of development.</p> <p>Intended usage is important to the value of land and accommodation land is valued at prices exceeding those for</p>	To improve focus.

farmland. Although all such land is now used for non-agricultural purposes, it is still in most instances part of the open countryside and must be dealt with as such. While accommodation land may sometimes be relatively hidden from adjacent roads, it is often overlooked from a distance. It is, therefore, important that it does not become urbanised through erection of buildings or the prominence of operational trappings. Neither should it be subject to the introduction of smallscale businesses. To maintain the rural character, accommodation land should integrate with the wider farmland. This can be achieved by avoiding change which introduces features of an urban appearance and, where buildings or other change are necessary, seeking to ensure that their design and materials are sensitively integrated into their location.

~~There has over recent years been a growing demand for land for horse and pony keeping. With this trend has come a proliferation of small horse and pony shelters, food and equipment stores and the parking of horse boxes on land which was formerly open. Equestrian use has also tended to lead to the subdivision of fields by fences rather than hedges (sometimes coloured plastic fences), which does little to promote visual appeal when seen from the public domain, or to safeguard and enrich local biodiversity.~~

~~One-time agricultural land which has passed into the hands of local householders may have a far less certain future than land in continuing agricultural use. Children who ride ponies grow up and move away, leaving accommodation land redundant. The cost of maintaining fences and paddocks can become a burden and a degree of dereliction can set in.~~



	<p><del>Houses are also bought and sold, sometimes together with any accommodation land that they have acquired, sometimes leading to a separate land sale.</del></p> <p><del>The extent of this accommodation land in Cookham parish is substantial and its future is a concern. It appears that, currently, significant areas are being kept only on a care-and-maintenance basis.”</del></p>	
6.7 Rural (or semi-urban) character of Cookham’s built areas	<p>The text has been amended to expand the explanation of the term “creeping urbanisation.”</p> <p><u>“Changes from rural to urban character often occur in small steps and may then be known as ‘creeping urbanisation’.</u> Most of the following attributes are mentioned elsewhere in the VDS, but it is helpful to bring them together at this point, since they all play a role in the maintenance of rural character <del>and the avoidance of creeping urbanisation.”</del></p>	To provide clarity.
18 Opportunities for enhancement	<p>The text has been amended to specifically state that the section does not supplement existing planning policy but highlights opportunities which were raised through the consultation.</p> <p><del>“The VDS follows the lead of Cookham’s Conservation Area Statements in identifying occasional</del> <u>This section identifies</u> elements of Cookham’s built environment that could benefit from enhancement. <del>The present section features ‘nominated eyesores’, in need of action, mostly as they emerged in the VDS Consultation Programme. Reference is also made to other VDS sections where possibilities of enhancement have been mentioned in passing. Finally, three areas for</del></p>	To provide clarity.

	<p><del>possible significant enhancements, not detailed elsewhere in the VDS, are featured on page 71. It does not supplement existing planning policy but is provided to highlight opportunities which emerged during the preparation of the VDS.</del></p> <p>Box 48 has been amended to acknowledge that work to repaint the Thames railway and footbridges has now been commenced.</p>	To provide a factual update.
Various: Guidance Points	Throughout the VDS the title of guidance points has been amended from "Guidance for future development" to "Guidance."	To provide clarity.
Various	Throughout the VDS the use of the term "must" has been replaced by "should."	To conform to the terminology used in existing planning policy and to reflect that the VDS is a material consideration.

**Habitat Regulations Preliminary Screening Opinion  
Schedule of representations and outcomes**

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	Whole Document	Agrees	Agree that the VDS is unlikely to have significant environmental effects and therefore a full Appropriate Assessment is not required.	Agreement noted.
Natural England Francesca Barker	Whole Document	Agrees	Agrees that no likelihood of significant effects of the Draft Cookham VDS have been found and that given the narrow scope of the Draft Cookham VDS and the controls in place in other plans, it is unlikely that in combinations effects would arise. A Appropriate Assessment is therefore not required.	Agreement noted.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment Preliminary Screening Opinion  
Schedule of representations and outcomes**

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
English Heritage Martin Small	Whole Document	Agrees	Agrees that the VDS is unlikely to have significant environmental effects and does not therefore require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.	Agreement noted.
Environment Agency Michelle Kidd	Whole Document	Agrees	Agrees that the VDS is unlikely to have significant environmental effects and therefore does not require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.	Agreement noted.
Natural England Francesca Barker	Whole Document	Agrees	Agrees that the Draft Cookham VDS is unlikely to have significant environmental effects and does not therefore require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.	Agreement noted.