

## APPENDIX C

### Response to Questionnaire and additional comments

<b>Question 1. Do you support changing the name of the conservation area from Cookham High Street Conservation Area to Cookham Village Conservation Area?</b>		
<b>Consultation Response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
All but one of those responding supported the name change. The exception, seems to have misunderstood the question.		Change name to Cookham Village Conservation Area.
<b>Question 2. The draft identifies significant non-listed buildings within the conservation area, are there any additional buildings, structures or features that you would like to see included?</b>		
<b>Consultation Response</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
No additional buildings were identified for inclusion.	Some respondents used this section to address the issue of the CA boundary. These comments are dealt with below.	No further work required
<b>Question 3. Do you consider that the boundaries of the conservation area are appropriate, are there any other areas that you think should be included, or removed from the conservation area?</b>		
19 responses considered boundaries appropriate.		
Marsh Meadow, extend boundary to the river including the Sailing Club.	This proposal is supported by the Parish Council, Cookham Society and RBWM own Arboricultural Co-ordinator. The sailing club was removed from the CA in 1991. It was considered to have no special quality. It was on the edge of the CA so excluding it created no additional problems. If Marsh Meadow to the riverbank were included then excluding the sailing club would become anomalous.	Part included
Odney Common	Parish council and a small number of others	Decline

	<p>recommend inclusion. This is a very popular green space which is open to the public. In 1991 it was considered that this land should not be included in the CA as it was isolated from the main part of the village and not immediately associated with the village group. Conservation area designation would not usually be regarded as an appropriate way of protecting countryside outside of settlements. Where open land is included in this CA it is because it is integral to the development of the settlement and/or associated with the work of Sir Stanley Spencer.</p>	
Romanlea	<p>A nineteenth-century terrace of houses facing onto the Pony Field and the Primary School. The street has heritage merit, but this area was developed as a consequence of the railway. It is not of similar character to The Pound. This would open up the prospect of the CA being extended towards and beyond the railway in future. The Ponyfield and Poundfield mark a clear boundary.</p>	<p>Consideration given to whether a new CA is appropriate for the post-railway developments around the station. This would be beyond the scope of this exercise.</p>
Nursery School	<p>The School is a significant example of post-war school architecture. It is not clear why it was excluded in the first place.</p>	<p>Consider for inclusion</p>
Cookham Rise up to Primary School.	<p>Beyond the scope of this project. See response re Romanlea.</p>	<p>Decline</p>

<p>Black Butts Cottages, Woodmoor End and Sutton Close.</p>	<p>Three residential developments all off the Sutton Road. Together this would be a substantial addition to the CA. This would represent a separate Character Area of largely suburban style development. A detailed assessment would be necessary. There would be a danger of watering down the character of the existing CA.</p>	<p>Decline Woodmoor End and Sutton Close, include Black Butts Cottages</p>
<p>School Lane from the Primary School to Sutton Road</p>	<p>Houses and bungalows of no particular architectural character or merit. Inclusion would not enhance the conservation area.</p>	<p>Decline</p>
<p>Houses on the west side of Poundfield Lane</p>	<p>A collection of large detached twentieth-century houses with gardens backing onto the railway and facing onto Poundfield. No particular character or architectural distinction. Inclusion would not enhance the conservation area.</p>	<p>Decline</p>
<p>Exclude from the conservation area land known as Philo Field along a line between Romanlea and houses west of Poundfield Lane.</p>	<p>Report by Barton Willmore for Copas Farms. Long section on the setting of the listed Engelfield House. Agree with the conclusions that Philo Field, or at least the western side of it, is not in the setting of Engelfield House. I would also agree that this parcel of land has relatively little landscape or heritage value. There are views into this area that are important An important argument against removing this area from the conservation area is the desirability of boundaries</p>	<p>Decline Removal would necessitate a further public consultation.</p>

	<p>following either <b>natural or</b> man-made features. The line proposed by the consultant runs across the field between the corner of the last property in Roman Leigh and the last property facing onto Poundfield Lane. This follows no discernible line or feature. The railway line provides a clear boundary feature. The alternative would be for the boundary to follow the lane, but that would be a serious reduction and would impact on views and the setting of Engelfied House.</p>	
<p><b>Other comments on the draft document</b></p>		
<p><b>Pages 2 and 3</b> Since the original draft of this document was produced Historic England has updated its guidance<sup>1</sup> which, we suggest should be referred to in this section.</p>		<p>Agree include</p>
<p><b>Page 4; para. 3</b> The paragraph overlooks the “high communal value” which the village places on its open spaces. These are appreciated not only for their contribution to the fabric of the settlement, but are all actively used for recreation purposes. You might like to consider the following addition:-</p> <p><i>“The Moor and Marsh Meadow have high communal and recreational value to the many residents and visitors who use them for walking and attend events held on them. The</i></p>		<p>Agree</p>

<p><i>land through the Poundfield is an important “green route” from the station and shopping centre out to Winter Hill and beyond. During the summer the moorings along Bellrope Meadow and Marsh Meadow provide very attractive stopping sites for cruising boats which add to the visual interest of the area.”</i></p>		
<p><b>Pages 7 &amp; 8</b> The section entitled ‘Historical development’ overlooks one fundamental point about the shape of Cookham’s development - the liability for flooding which in the past would have been even more prevalent than it is today. It was this factor which caused the expansion of the settlement into the area of The Pound when the potential for further development on the dry island of the original village became exhausted.</p>	<p>This is dealt with elsewhere.</p>	<p>Page 10 updated</p>
<p><b>Page 10: 6 Spacial analysis</b> It seems to us that the content of this section does not reflect the requirements of the sub-title. Much of it reiterates historical information quoted previously and the chapter does little to reflect the actual spacial characteristics and relationships inherent to the village. In this connection we would refer you to the advice contained on page 4 of Heritage England’s updated Advice</p>		<p>Undated</p>

<p>Note 1 referred to above. We would also draw your attention to Chapter 4 of the VDS (p.10 <i>et seq.</i>) and the heading: "Cookham is defined by its green spaces". So far as the conservation area is concerned, these have effect on 3 levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Moor and Marsh Meadow separate the original village from the later area of The Pound while the Pony Field and the Poundfield behind it separate The Pound from later development on Station Hill;</li> <li>2. Bellrope Meadow and the extensive grounds of the Odney Club provide open space immediately adjacent to built development;</li> <li>3. Odney Common, the land to the south of Moor Hall and the land between Terrys Lane and the river are, in effect, open countryside.</li> </ol> <p>In our view a re-formulation of this section would greatly enhance the value of the document as a whole.</p>		
<p><b>Pages 19/20.</b> Despite being included in the schedule of Locally Significant Buildings, in p.66, Moor Hall is not mentioned in pages 19 or 20. Overall it is a very substantial complex, which acts as a containment to the</p>	<p>The section mentioned is not intended as a list of all Locally Significant Buildings. The list appears in the appendix at the back.</p>	

<p>south side of The Moor. <u>In fact the reference to this property appears as the second para. on p. 21 under 'Rural Green Spaces' and needs to be moved into the earlier section.</u> We agree that the part shown in the photo on p.66 is of particular interest, but would also suggest that the modern portion on the south side is a most interesting example of high quality, late 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture.</p>		
<p><b>Page 19; last para.</b> This does seem to give undue prominence to a building whose main claim to fame is its appearance in a pre-war exhibition. It turns its back on the street and adds little to the environment of School Lane.</p>	<p>Do not agree with this view</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p><b>Page 20; para. 3.</b> There is no war memorial in Cookham Dean church. It is actually situated some distance away, on the village cricket green.</p>		<p>Updated</p>
<p><b>Page 20; under 'Riverside'</b> If the conservation area were extended, as we are suggesting, the document should include the former Grove Farm, on the north side of Odney Lane. Some 5 years ago this derelict farmstead, which had recently been used as a pottery, was completely reconstructed and now houses the John Lewis textile archive. It was the recipient of the Society's</p>	<p>See comments in response to boundary changes suggested.</p>	

<p>first Design Award. No mention is made of the Sir Bernard Miller Conference Centre, which is both substantial and of a design which is intended to be environmentally friendly.</p>		
<p><b>Page 21; Rural Green Spaces</b> This section actually has virtually nothing to say about Rural Green Spaces. Without wishing to reiterate our comments in 2.2 above, we believe much more should be made of this topic, especially in view of para 129 of the NPPF, Historic England’s Advice Note 1 and their comments about the settings of heritage assets.</p>	<p>This is because this is a sub-section of a section on Significant non-listed buildings. ‘Rural Green Spaces’ is used here to identify the Character Area.</p>	<p>No action needed.</p>
<p><b>Pages 24 - 26 Character assessment - The Village Core</b> There appears to be no mention of Sutton Road, which is the main road through the village from Maidenhead. The last para., about Berries Road, underplays the character of the street, which inherently reflects its original Edwardian houses.</p>	<p>A4094 is noted and Berries Road description considered appropriate</p>	<p>No action needed</p>
<p><b>Page 30: Key negatives</b> The bridge was last painted in 2000. It urgently requires re-painting and its missing quatrefoils replaced. The bullet point about litter bins is out of date. The situation has improved significantly since the Royal Borough assumed responsibility for them in 2016.</p>	<p>Re bins, noted</p>	<p>Revised</p>
<p><b>Page 33.</b> Many people would argue that the informal signage on the</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Not revised</p>



<p>Pony Field's fence is the sign of a vibrant community. The array of permanent road signs in this area is more visually intrusive.</p>		
<p><b>Page 34: Spaces.</b> There is no restriction on large vehicles in the Pound and they do use the Pound in significant numbers. There is a regular bus service (partially double decker), coaches (including several regular school services), many delivery vehicles together with builders' and farm vehicles and rubbish lorries. Large cars are a problem, but they are not the only problem.</p>		<p>Comment noted</p>
<p><b>Page 37; Objective 2</b> The Society fully supports the reduction in the impact of traffic signage of all types provided there is not corresponding reduction in road safety. It is unclear, however, how the Planning Department intends to ensure that this objective is met.</p>		
<p><b>Page 37; Objective 3</b> If this objective is to be anything other than a well-intentioned aspiration, the Planning Department will need to take active steps to communicate with residents and others. How is the Department intending to achieve this in the period to 2023 and beyond?</p>		