



**Plan Working Group**

**Notes of Meeting No 16. 15<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

Attendees: John Knight, Paul Goodman, Terry Barnes, Evelyn Frearson, Judith Craig, Jane Sandover, Roger Burton

Apologies: Nigel Hancock, Alan Bramwell (corresponding)

		Action
1.	The notes of the meeting on 21 <sup>st</sup> December were (subject to minor corrections to action column) accepted as a true record and will be circulated to the Forum	RB/EF
<b>2.</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
	<p>2.4.4.1 The Liaison meeting with Redrow and SMBC was expected to take place on March 1<sup>st</sup> and PBA had confirmed their availability to attend and discuss the findings of their Movement Study.</p> <p>3.3.1 Draft questions which might be the basis of the further Questionnaire had been amended and circulated for the committee to discuss in advance of the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> January. It was decided at that meeting that it would not proceed. JS expressed her view that the work of the Plan Group should be underpinned by the views of the community and was disappointed that the proposed survey would not proceed. RB felt that it was essential that we did work harder to engage with the community, particularly to ensure that we ultimately had a meaningful response to the referendum. We should consider further consultation to include mailshots, an exhibition, feedback, posters and the use of the website and social media. Grant aid already received for the second questionnaire should be allocated to support this.</p> <p>4.4.3 RB had liaised with Aecom regarding progress with the Landscape Study and a few further qualifying questions had been raised. JK and RB had prepared a response which had been circulated.</p>	All and committee

<b>3</b>	<b>Progress</b>	
	<p>3.1 The response to AECOM questions regarding the Landscape Study to be finalised taking account of comments. This would be recirculated for prompt approval and return to AECOM</p> <p>3.2 Concerns had been raised at the EGM regarding the proposed contact with Stockport Homes. JK explained that since both local policy and the NPPF included exceptions to the Green Belt policy which would permit the development of affordable homes. It was necessary to better understand this potential and while there may be risks it would enable us to identify any safeguards which might be incorporated in our Plan Policies. JK agreed to write a short note to explain this for circulation to the committee.</p> <p>3.3 The development of Plan policies was discussed with an initial focus on those relating to aspects of Development. A number of existing plans for other villages in</p>	<p>RB/JK</p> <p>JK</p>



	<p>the Green Belt had been circulated as starting point for discussions by JK and a further Plan for Norley by EF. It was felt that Chaddersley and Linton had similar characteristics in terms of demand but that Linton was better as a reference. Key points of reference are the NPPF, and particularly those policies applying to development in the Green Belt, and the Local Plan (although it was noted that in certain respects the Local Plan would not comply with the NPPF which would anyway take priority). The Forum could set policy where there was ambiguity in these overarching policies. To have an effect any policy would need to be capable of standing up in any future public enquiry.</p> <p>For instance, the NPPF restricts any development in the Green Belt but with exceptions which may be applied to Woodford - one of which relates to infill. Given that this is not defined in either the NPPF or Local Plan it might form part of our Plan. It was felt that we might offer a number of policy variants in this respect, e.g. 'no, one or two dwellings in an otherwise built up frontage' and offer these for consultation, ideally with examples. It was also noted that any changes from agricultural to domestic use, e.g. garden extensions, is already not acceptable without planning permission.</p> <p>Policies relating to partially or previously developed sites were discussed. There are potentially a lot of brownfield sites and policies may be needed to control such development particularly in view of the fact that changes resulting from the development of infrastructure, e.g. improved connections to the airport, could influence its nature.</p> <p>Alterations and extensions to existing buildings might also benefit from additional definition to prevent overdevelopment of sites and a change in character. The current requirement for replacement dwellings to be 'not materially larger' and the provision of basement extensions might need supplementary policies.</p> <p>Advocacy policies could be established to influence development activity beyond our neighbourhood. For instance, while the Redrow development falls outside our neighbourhood area, information which we have derived from community consultation may be a basis of discussions regarding future demand and its delivery. This may embrace any identified need for affordable housing which could not be satisfied within the area.</p> <p>JK and PB agreed to begin drafting policies to discuss at the next meeting.</p>	<p>JK/PB</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Next steps</b></p>	
	<p>4.1. Amend and circulate the response to Aecom in order for the Landscape study to be progressed</p> <p>4.2. Prepare a note on affordable housing and any necessary discussion with Stockport homes</p> <p>4.3. Prepare draft policies relating to development as discussed</p> <p>4.4. Relevant Plans for reference to be circulated</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>JK</p> <p>JK/ PG</p> <p>JK</p>



<b>5.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	No other business was raised.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
	The next meeting of the Plan Working Group will be Friday 5 <sup>th</sup> February at 4.00pm (and fortnightly thereafter). Venue: The Deanwater	

RB 31/01/2015