

FEEDBACK FROM COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL:
12 2024

Policy DE-1:

14.1

Cookham Parish Council welcomes this policy, which reinforces the conclusions of the existing Borough Building height and tall buildings SPD.

We suggest, if possible, that the MNP considers wording which further discourages the building of further landmark tall buildings as high as 10 and 16 residential stories, as they will encroach on views from surrounding more rural neighbourhoods, including Cookham. If the rationale for a landmark tall building in DM1 is not clear, as remarked in the MNP, we suggest that you include wording in the MNP to discourage it.

14.2

4.2 We support the design principles set out in the Appendix, particularly for:-

Character Areas CA1 and CA2. Cookham residents would benefit greatly from a better designed and more attractive local town centre in which to work, shop and enjoy leisure activities.

Character Area CA9 - Settlement Fringe. We strongly support the Design Guidance and Codes in this section, particularly CA9-01 -CA9.05 inclusive, which include recommendations that development in the areas of settlement fringe is resisted and that Green Belt and Strategic Gaps should be protected and enhanced.

This is particularly important in the very narrow undeveloped areas between Cookham and Maidenhead; we would request you to consider adding wording to this effect. We would also encourage any additional wording which more strongly discourages unbuffered building up to the very edge of the Maidenhead boundary, such as at the existing north side of Furze Platt. To this end, we would suggest that Figure 99 is more tightly linked to a written point of design guidance, and that the words in the key to Figure 99 existing properties should be replaced by New and existing properties

Policy HO-1

14.3

Cookham Parish Council suggests that to the following guidance

Affordable housing should be indistinguishable from and have the same external appearance as private housing with integrated access arrangements.

you add a requirement that affordable housing is fairly positioned in equal proportions in all parts of a new development, with no greater proportion of affordable housing in less attractive areas such as next to adjoining busy roads, utilities or industrial estates.

Policy HO-2

14.4

We strongly support this policy as it aims to accommodate family housing within Maidenhead and avoids unfairly pushing large areas of low-density housing into adjoining more rural settlements such as Cookham. We would suggest that if intended for families, some wording might be added that dwellings should have easy access to public or private outside space.

Policy GA-1

14.8

Map 6.1-1 Cookham Parish Council notes this map is labelled as needing completion. We would suggest the inclusion of the integrated walking/cycle route along the Switchback Road, National Cycle Route 50 along the Greenway, and Thames tow-path routes in this map. These all provide cycling/walking access between Cookham and Maidenhead. Improved integration of these routes with other walking/cycling routes within Maidenhead should be encouraged.

We would suggest that to reduce traffic congestion in Maidenhead, you might include wording that encourages regular, frequent, reliable bus services between Maidenhead and neighbouring villages such as Cookham, particularly during rush hour and school run.

Policy GA-2

14.9

We suggest, if possible, you make minimum parking and cycle storage standards mandatory rather than advisory, so must rather than be expected.

We suggest that, if possible, you add a statement that developments with more than a very small proportion of tandem parking spaces (where cars are parked in a row nose to tail, with an outer car needing to move to let an inner car out) will not be deemed acceptable. Tandem parking should only be used as a last resort in exceptional cases, and for two parking spaces in a row (including those in garages) as a maximum. It may be possible to consider counting the outermost parking space as 1, the next one back as $\frac{1}{2}$ and any further back as zero, when calculating compliance with full parking standards

Policy B1-2 Sustainable Drainage Systems

14.5

Cookham Parish Council suggests that, if possible, you make this condition stronger:

Proposals must demonstrate that

a) there is adequate water drainage infrastructure to serve the development, without surcharge to foul drainage, in place before construction starts

Where SuDs are proposed as a part of any development

we suggest that you include a sub-policy that flat bottomed open SuDs infiltration basins will not be counted as usable areas for public recreation, as they may well be damp and muddy for large parts of the year.

Policy SS-1: Waterway Corridor:

14.6

Cookham Parish Council strongly supports this policy as it enhances valuable cycling and walking connectivity with Cookham.

14.7

Cookham Parish Council supports the draft Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (MNP), which we expect to benefit both Cookham and Maidenhead residents.

Generally, we note that much wording in the draft Plan includes should, or is expected to. It is important to very carefully consider whether must or is required to would be more effective.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets List

14.10

This is a welcome step to maintain some of the buildings (of various architectural styles and merit), which are not listed but which provide interest in the community and are well worth listing.

We wish you every success in the completion of the Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan.