



**Plan Working Group**

**Notes of Meeting No 18. 19<sup>th</sup> February 2016**

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

Doreen Roberts was welcomed as a new member of the Plan Group.

Apologies: Terry Barnes, Alan Bramwell (corresponding)

		Action
1.	The notes of meeting 17 on 5 <sup>th</sup> February were accepted as a true record, subject to minor corrections, and will be circulated to the Forum	RB/EF
2.	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
	<p>2.3.3.1. The Brereton Study and Aecom’s scope/quotation for Woodford had been circulated (via FilesAnywhere).</p> <p>2.4.4.2 The potential introduction of new exceptions in the NPPF alongside ‘affordable homes’ was further discussed relative to Stockport Homes’(SH) position. JK had provided a short note of key points which would need to be discussed with them. Other Forum’s have had meetings with HAs or invited them to their meetings. It was agreed that we would have a conversation with SH, invite them to a meeting with the Group and provide them with the note as a basis for the discussion. A formal record of the meeting would be made. A key question would be regarding the provision arising from the Aerodrome development. We may wish to consider influencing allocation policy towards those with a local connection. JK note to be circulated.</p> <p>3.3.2. RB had prepared and circulated a note on sustainability, submitted to SMBC and received two response from Angie Jukes. These confirmed Stockport’s current position and had again been circulated</p> <p>4.4.4. David Johnston had attended the presentation at the Area Committee. The view was that the presentation went well and was a worthwhile exercise. There was a particularly good response to our views on integration with the extended village.</p>	<p>JK</p> <p>EF</p>

<b>3</b>	<b>Progress</b>	
	<p>3.1. The group had been individually reviewing other Plans with a view to developing policies as allocated at the last meeting (3.3.3). Citing Transport as an example, PB noted that the SMBC core strategies were in this respect particularly comprehensive. We should not need to restate them but to identify gaps where new areas might need to be introduced. It was currently unclear what additional policies were needed. RB noted that there may be advocacy around the findings of the Transport Study to enable improved non-vehicular movement around the village.</p> <p>3.2. JK tabled a plan showing the relationship of the Poynton By-pass, Adlington</p>	



	<p>Business Park and the SMBC boundary. A zone in this location has been 'safeguarded' to 2030 but could thereafter become an opportunity for development.</p> <p>3.3. The Housing policy was again discussed in regard to infill and its definition. The Norley Plan has allowed up to two new dwellings to be permissible in a gap. We could offer this as an option, with a single dwelling the other, in our draft policies for further consultation. Although currently covered by an SPD we should consider the requirement for on-site parking associated with dwellings.</p> <p>3.4. All the policy areas are allocated to members of the team - Development: JK, Environment: EF/JC, Movement: PG, Community: JS, Employment: DB, Integration: RB – and it was agreed that drafts would be prepared for circulation and consideration at the next meeting.</p> <p>RB will also prepare policies in terms of Sustainability</p> <p>3.5. The next Redrow liaison meeting was on 1<sup>st</sup> March at 3pm. The group were interested to know when the first residents would take possession and when the Plan Area might be reconsidered. The group is also interested in any progress on the Bodycote site and the commercial and care home element of the Redrow masterplan.</p> <p>3.6. The liaison meeting would follow an open meeting with an introduction by PBA to discuss the findings of their Movement Study.</p> <p>3.7. It was noted by JK that the Airport had a compensation fund which allowed grants to communities affected by airport development. With the A6-MARR in progress it was felt that we might qualify. A candidate for this could possibly be improvements to the Community Centre.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>RB</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Next steps</b>	
	4.1 Preparation of policies by individuals. Circulate for discussion at the next meeting	All
<b>5.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	<p>5.1. RB noted that he had recently made an application for a house on an infill plot in Woodford which may be relevant to our discussions.</p> <p>5.2. JS advised that she has the plans for the A555 and Redrow roadworks for inclusion in our plans although not in CAD format</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
	<p>The next meeting of the Plan Working Group will be Friday 4<sup>th</sup> March at 4.00pm (and fortnightly thereafter).</p> <p>Venue: The Deanwater</p>	