



**Plan Working Group**

**Notes of Meeting No 17. 5<sup>th</sup> February 2016**

Attendees: John Knight, Paul Goodman, Evelyn Frearson, Judith Craig, Jane Sandover, David Buszard, Roger Burton

Apologies: Terry Barnes, Alan Bramwell (corresponding)

		Action
1.	The notes of meeting 16 on 15 <sup>th</sup> January were accepted as a true record and will be circulated to the Forum	RB/EF
<b>2.</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
	<p>2.3.3.1. It was noted that communication and community engagement had been discussed at the committee meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> February.</p> <p>3.3.1. RB had forwarded final response to questions to Aecom. No response yet but RB would check for next meeting. In the meantime, the Brereton Study and Aecom’s scope/quotation for Woodford would be circulated.</p> <p>4.3.3 Further relevant plans had been circulated as reference for the development of our own policies. JK noted that there was a variation in the form that these took and that Inspectors appear relaxed about the formats put forward. We would have input to the selection and interview process for our Inspector in due course. We would, for instance, be able to ask for experience relative to our size and green belt location.</p> <p>4.4.2 Due to the potential introduction of new categories which may be development exceptions in the NPPF alongside ‘affordable homes’, e.g. ‘starter homes’ , Stockport Homes position may be changing and needs to be understood. JK will provide a short note of key points which would need to be discussed with them.</p> <p>4.4.4. The Ardingley Plan had been circulated as a reference. Some obvious differences to our situation, e.g. our Green Belt location, but that was now through examination, with some changes recommended, and at referendum stage. Felt that all should look at this example.</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>JK</p> <p>All</p>

<b>3</b>	<b>Progress</b>	
	<p>3.1 The group focussed initially on a single policy objective, that of Development. Areas for specific policies included:</p> <p>Infill. As Norley, this may be expressed as a single dwelling or up to two in an existing frontage. To be of similar scale and character. With no greater impact on or incursion into green belt. JK suggested that we draft a policy option and discuss with Emma Curle (possibly invite to a meeting?)</p> <p>Undercrofts. To be sympathetic to the landscape.</p> <p>Previously developed land – see Norley.</p>	



	<p>The only real gap in this policy is how we plan for affordable homes. Design principles. Some thought to be given to any guidance in addition to SMBC policy.</p> <p>3.2 RB raised the issue of Sustainability and suggested that this should for an element of our development policy. The SMBC SPG on Sustainability to be circulated and also the link to the interactive planning tool to determine sustainability by location. RB proposes a meeting with Angie Jukes at SMBC and will circulate a note setting out this need.</p> <p>3.3 All the policy areas were allocated to members of the team. Development: JK, Environment: EF/JC, Movement: PG, Community: JS, Employment (unallocated); Integration: RB. Progress on Environment policy development will be held back until the studies are completed, Movement until the presentation by PBA .</p>	RB
<b>4</b>	<b>Next steps</b>	
	<p>4.1. All to identify 'liked' policies from the various Plans in circulation</p> <p>4.2. Details of FilesAnywhere to be circulated so that the 'cloud' can be used for data transfer</p> <p>4.3 Policy drafting to commence</p> <p>4.4. David Johnston to be invited to the Area Committee presentation.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>RB</p> <p>All</p> <p>RB</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	No other business was raised.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
	<p>The next meeting of the Plan Working Group will be Friday 19<sup>th</sup> February at 4.00pm (and fortnightly thereafter).</p> <p>Venue: The Deanwater</p>	