

Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum
held at the Woodford Community Centre
at 7:30 pm on Monday 1 Feb 2016

Attendance	Present	Apologies received
Mr Robin Berriman (RBB)	√	
Mr David Buszard (DB)	√	
Mrs Helen Buszard (HB)	√	
Mr Paul Rodman (PR)		√
Evelyn Frearson (EF)	√	
Mr John Knight (JK)	√	
Mr Paul Goodman (PG)	√	
Mr Terry Barnes (TB)	√	
Mr Bryan Leck (BL)		√
Mr Roger Burton (RBU)	√	
Mr Robin Brammar (RBR)		
Mrs Dorothy Chesterman (DC)	√	
Ms Jane Sandover (JS)	√	
Mrs Jude Craig (JC)	√	
Ms Maxine Wood (MW)	√	
Mr Ron Beatham (RBe)		√
Mr Alan Bramwell (AB)		
Mrs Janet DeVeChis (JDV)		√
Mrs Morag White (MWh)	√	
Mrs Doreen Neil (DN)	√	

	Action
<p>1. Welcome TB chaired the meeting and explained that Nigel Hancock had resigned from the committee.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies PR, JDV, BL, RBe</p>	
<p>3. Minutes from previous meeting on 4th Jan Approved.</p>	
<p>4. Matters arising 4.1. Provide Barry at Deanwater with dates for plan group meetings. Still to be done 4.2. Response to GMSF. Done</p>	EF
<p>5. Funds, expenditure and grants RBB reported that due diligence submitted to Groundwork UK on 11 Jan. The new grant will be paid once the unused £225 from the earlier grant has been repaid, which is imminent. The new grant needs to be spent by the end of March</p>	
<p>6. Presentation to Area Committee DB ran through the power point presentation on screen. A few small amendments to the wording were suggested and noted. Action DB to make amendments. Committee members to attend Area Committee meeting on Thu 11th Feb at 6.30 pm in Village Hall, Lumb Lane, Bramhall.</p>	DB All
<p>7. Objectives Refresher The presentation provided an opportunity review the objectives. The word “beneficial” in the development objective was queried because it is subjective and different for different individuals. It was agreed that it would not be changed for the presentation but the group would revisit the discussion at a future date.</p>	All

<p>8. Report from meeting of 11 Jan TB reported that an Extraordinary Meeting had been held to discuss different viewpoints that had arisen. Misunderstandings were cleared up and he hoped the group would move forward as one. Minutes had been circulated. The action list in those minutes shows how the issues were sorted out and how we move forward. Questions were invited but none arose.</p>	
<p>9. Neighbourhood Plan update</p>	
<p>9.1 Report from Plan Group meeting on 15 Jan RBU reported that draft minutes of the meeting had been circulated and cover the discussions in detail. The points were summarised under the agenda items below.</p>	
<p>9.2 Policy development Focussing on hardest element first: development. Looking at Green Belt issue and studying other neighbourhood plans in Green Belt.</p> <p>There is no detailed definition of infill in NPPF or SMBC development plans. Planning decisions appear to be made on the basis of custom and practice. It was agreed that WNF needs to set up a meeting with Emma Curle to understand her interpretation of policy.</p> <p>Other issues discussed in the plan group meeting included: The NPPF states that replacement buildings should not be materially larger than the original but interpretation of this seems to be done on the basis of custom and practice.</p> <p>Advocacy approach could be considered for things outside WNF Area and which we can't influence directly.</p> <p>WNF will be presenting policy options to residents, possibly via an exhibition which could use existing grant funding earmarked for questionnaire.</p>	<p>Plan Group</p>
<p>9.3 Movement study (PBA) Will feed into policy.</p>	
<p>9.4 Landscape study Reply to Sam Rosillo's (AECOM) questions has been submitted. No response from them yet.</p>	
<p>9.5 Wildlife study (CWT) Awaiting confirmation that WNF can make payment via Avro Heritage account.</p>	
<p>9.6 Habitat survey On hold due to EF busy with other activities and poor weather conditions for surveying.</p>	
<p>9.7 Footpath survey Data collection sheets created and issued. Volunteers (JC, HB, DB) have put their names by some routes. JDV is willing but not back here until March. RBr has volunteered by not responded via email. HB to supply phone number. EF + Kris completed surveys 4 of the footpaths DN suggested adding a note on whether the footpath signs are visible and legible. EF agreed to add to sheet.</p>	<p>HB EF</p>
<p>9.8 Consultation with residents It was agreed that more work needs to be done with residents on consultation and explanation of plan development. Ideas had been gleaned from other groups developing plans, such as newsletters and meetings with local groups. JC noted that more needs to be done to encourage use of website and Facebook. The Communications Team (TB, JC and EF) agreed to pick up the task of improving communication and consultation. DN volunteered to join. Comms Team will meet to discuss ways forward.</p>	<p>TB, JC, EF, DN</p>

<p>9.9 Consultation with SMBC It was agreed than WNF will need to take the initiative. RBU to invite David Johnston to Area Committee meeting</p>	<p>RBu</p>
<p>10. WCC report on Church Lane and Blossoms Lane traffic problems HB had circulated the report submitted to local cllrs. HB explained that this issue arose at the WCC AGM. A note asking for responses was included in WCC newsletter, but only 1 response resulted. A letter inviting comment on the problems and potential solutions was then distributed to all (75) residents on Church Lane and Blossoms Lane. There have been 33 responses (45%) all highlighting the same problems: excess speed, increased volume and dangerous mix of road users.</p> <p>A wide variety of solutions had been put forward, including suggestions for bumps, blocks, and Quiet Lane status. TB included a suggestion to delay traffic calming on Moor Lane until all road works were completed to assess final situation.</p> <p>All responses have been collated plus summary plus photographic evidence and sent to local cllrs, copied to MP, requesting urgent temporary action while a permanent solution is sought.</p> <p>Status of traffic calming on Moor Lane is not known but HB had sent enquiry to Kevin Brooks</p> <p>RBB suggested considering whether these problems be translated into a policy</p>	<p>Plan Group</p>
<p>Website It was agreed that it is currently up to date.</p>	
<p>CEC Local Plan update PG reported that the Inspector asked CEC to prepare final plan to be subjected to full consultation. Inspector accepted CEC proposal to not consult on new sites first. Series of CEC meetings planned then consultation. Inspector said CEC must then take all responses (likely to be 20,000+) into account. Earliest examination can reopen is Sep 2016. Crucial in the equation is how many houses have been built since plan started 5 years ago. Could be 2017 before examination of sites (including Handforth) commences.</p>	
<p>PBA and Redrow liaison meeting 1 Mar 2016 All set up. EF to invite Emma Curle, Kevin Brooks, John Brown, David Johnston to the PBA presentation.</p>	<p>EF</p>
<p>AVRO Heritage Museum update TB reported that demolition at far end may not be completed until end of year. Price of steel is a problem. Problems expected to arise with nesting birds. Problem with vintage cars stored in hangar has resulted in court case. A PA will be submitted soon to move care home element to Lancaster club area. It will thus be nearer road and shops.</p>	
<p>AOB A PA on the Poynton Relief Road had been expected by now, but hasn't been submitted yet.</p>	
<p>Next meetings Next plan group meeting: 5 Feb at Deanwater Hotel, 4:30 pm Next main committee meeting: 7 Mar at Community Centre 7:30 pm (Apologies from TB, DB to chair) TB to enquire whether we can meet at Avro Heritage on Mon 4th Apr Main committee meetings on May 9, Jun 6, Jul 4 will be at the Centre.</p>	<p>TB</p>

Evelyn Frearson 2 Feb 2016 (revised)