

Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum
held at the Deanwater Hotel
at 7:30 pm on Monday 17th August 2015

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)		√
Colin Griffin (CG)	√	
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	√	
Mr Nigel Hancock	√	

	Action
<p>1. Welcome DB chaired the meeting and welcomed attendees. DB expressed condolences to JDV on behalf of the committee.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies Apologies received from TB, PR, AB (and later DC)</p>	
<p>3. Minutes from previous meetings Approved.</p>	
<p>4. Matters Arising New members from Exhibition: DB reported that new members have been added to WCC and WNF mailing lists, apart from 7 email addresses which were unintelligible. PG reported that he had met Mr Kingsley. The case had gone to the court of appeal, so the development on the Aerodrome site is still at risk.</p>	
<p>5. Neighbourhood Plan update 5.1 Housing assessment report from JK JK had circulated a report on the AECOM Housing Needs Assessment. He noted that the whole of Woodford, including the Aerodrome site, is in Green Belt, so is under same policies. He reported that WNF Neighbourhood Plan will have to comply with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SMBC current Development Plan which is 2 docs dated 2006 and 2011. Neither now completely compliant with NPPF. 2. NPPF. 3. Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) which will still be in work progress by the time we submit NP. NP can be updated when appropriate. 	

<p>AECOM have supplied planning advice for local gov planning advisory service. Their methodology is recommended good practice.</p> <p>We have a housing number from AECOM which we have to incorporate into the NP. Although there is some uncertainty over the number calculations, JK thought it about right.</p> <p>NP could make an allocation to protect things such as shops and community centre. HB noted that the AECOM assessment report states that the number could be met by Aerodrome development.</p> <p>JK stated that a policy in the NP could be that all future housing needs will be met by Aerodrome. However this may not meet all needs.</p> <p>JK had provided a set of options in his report. The following points were discussed in the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify an area as the village. For example, we could identify the Aerodrome site plus a bit adjacent in the NA as the village. The area within the village boundary would have less stringent controls over development under the NPPF. - NP could simply repeat the criteria in NPPF - Affordable houses: committee could write into NP a preference for Woodford residents <p>As it stands under current policy, someone with land in Woodford could sell land to a housing association for affordable housing.</p> <p>HB asked that, in order to avoid confusing the lay person, we have a term for low cost housing on the general market which is different from “affordable housing” as defined in the NPPG. JK noted that the NPPG specifically excludes low cost housing on the general market.</p> <p>It was noted that Redrow may sell some land for affordable housing.</p> <p>PG made the suggestion that, as this area is going to change so much with development on the Aerodrome site and in Cheshire East, which will include affordable housing and smaller homes nearby at Handforth East, we should keep this area as Green Belt. WNF NP policy should mention the assessed need for 20-25 houses and go no further. This suggestion was supported by some committee members.</p> <p>JK noted that there may be some support for self-build. These would be different in style to houses on the estate. Self-build was defined in the meeting as arising from an individual with a local connection who project manages the building of a house on a plot of land in Woodford which he/she owns. The NP could have a policy which encourages self-build if desired. SMBC have no policy on it, so it is only covered by the NPPF.</p> <p>It was noted that it is possible that the housing needs could be met by self-build, conversions and brown field sites.</p> <p>JK recommended that the committee do consultation and give residents options.</p> <p>BL noted that we should continue to pursue SMBC for inclusion of the Aerodrome site in our NA. It was noted that this should be raised in discussions with Redrow also. Process to include liaison with Mary Robinson MP and local cllrs.</p> <p>PG pointed out that we need to continue to develop the NP because inclusion may not happen in a suitable timescale, if at all.</p> <p>JK suggested that, as a starting point, the committee could identify which of the</p>	<p>Exec committee Deferred action</p>
--	--

<p>options members of the committee rule out, then consult residents on the others.</p> <p>Other points raised during the discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community right to build: Could we build a small group of retirement homes under this scheme? Could the NP set criteria that people have to have lived here for a certain length of time? - Agricultural buildings which are being used for employment. Would community favour keeping for employment or use for housing? - Could our NP can prevent upsizing? JK noted that it could because current policy allows replacement as long as it is not materially larger. - Could we set a rate limit on any development in the existing settlement? JK thought this would be difficult. 	
<p>JK suggested that we develop the preferred policy areas discussed and put words together for discussion at the next meeting on 7 Sep.</p>	<p>Plan grp</p>
<p>AECOM report to be sent from WNF Chair (TB) to SMBC and Redrow, Poynton and Adlington</p>	<p>TB, EF</p>
<p>5.2 Other studies</p> <p>Movement study. May have a draft report for AGM. RBu will chase this.</p> <p>Footpath survey proposed to record state of paths, pavements, cycle tracks and bridleways and linkage to other areas using standardised information collection sheets. Photographs to be taken. Enthusiastic volunteers for the walking group included: JDV, HB, EF, JC.</p> <p>Landscape survey. AECOM have bought a company which does landscape surveys. RBu chasing them to do one for WNF. They have done studies for other Forums.</p> <p>Wildlife study. Aiming to set this up with Cheshire Wildlife Trust. Will be modest costs. EF and members of Plan group to liaise with Rachael Giles of CWT.</p>	<p>RBu</p> <p>HB, EF, JDV, JC</p> <p>RBu</p> <p>EF, plan group</p>
<p>5.3 Business survey.</p> <p>Lack of response to our business questionnaire was discussed. It was noted that as there were no responses outside of the committee then we could start again with a fresh approach. JK reported that the Bollington group achieved over 80% response rate by knocking on doors of businesses and conducting a survey on the spot using a standardised data collection sheet. It was agreed that we would follow this example. JK to get Bollington business information sheets.</p>	<p>JK (see post meeting notes)</p>
<p>5.4 Review of vision of objectives</p> <p>This item is covered by AGM report. See item 6.4.</p>	
<p>JK note that the Community Centre is important. JS noted that SMBC are saying that some of D2 space allocation for Aerodrome could be used on community centre site.</p>	
<p>5.5.Consultation with residents</p> <p>The form of consultation was discussed. A short questionnaire was suggested, possibly on two or three aspects, for example development and employment. It was agreed that Plan team would identify the areas for consultation and a questionnaire would be constructed by communications team after the AGM.</p>	<p>Plan Team and Comms Team after AGM</p>
<p>5.6 Timescales</p> <p>Plan team noted that it is difficult to predict at present as there are many uncertainties. Need to get figures exactly right for planning permissions already granted, for example.</p> <p>Committee can do Plan drafting. Divide up topics. Plan group plus others.</p>	

<p>When we hand over to SMBC there will be much less work for the committee.</p> <p>5.7 Report from meeting with SMBC and future liaison JK reported on a meeting between David Johnston of SMBC and JK and RBU. Notes from this meeting had been circulated.</p> <p>5.8.Support/input for additional tasks (planning audit, heritage assets,) A number of time consuming tasks need completing. Plan group resources are stretched. Help from wider committee needed with tasks including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business survey (see post meeting notes) - Finding out more details of new housing in Woodford 2001-2011* - Checking on the SMBC website to find out what planning permissions are in the pipeline after 2011.* HB volunteered for this task upon receipt of a brief from the Plan group. - A 300 page document [<i>Cheshire East Council Local Plan</i>] needs a volunteer to read carefully. No volunteers came forward. - Local listings: we can suggest buildings which should be protected? JS has compiled a list of already listed buildings in Woodford from database. Some inaccuracies in the SMBC database were noted. <p>PG pointed out that this information* would be available and SMBC must have records of numbers of housing. AECOM will have used info from SMBC.</p> <p>NH reported that AB is struggling for time and has offered his place on Plan team to a replacement.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Plan team, HB</p> <p>Volunteer?</p> <p>All</p>
<p>6. WNF AGM</p> <p>6.1 to 6.3 Notices, publicity, agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notices to go out no later than 21 days prior to AGM. JC to dig out last year's notices - JC to set up mail chimp for circulation. - EF, HB, JC to prepare nomination form for people wishing to be on the committee next year. These need to be returned no later than 7 days before the AGM. - Wider Forum members to be notified a.s.a.p. EF, JC - DB to send members spreadsheet to JC - Date for AGM confirmed as 23rd Sep - CG suggested we issue a members card at the AGM for ease of identification of members. This was agreed. Card to be produced. - Invitees to include: SMBC, Redrow, MP, cllrs, members, neighbouring groups, residents. - A flyer to be prepared for distribution to all residents - Agenda items to be the same as last year plus Plan report - Urgently need new people to help on committee. Ability to read documents a useful skill. <p>6.4 Plan Report RBU RBU had circulated a draft "end of term report". He emphasised that this is very much "work in progress" and would still be such at the AGM. Members of the plan group are sharing the task of drafting sections of the report. The intention was to remind people about constitution and provide an opportunity to look at the Vision and Objectives. It was suggested that a document be published in full on the web site, and a summary document and a power point presentation be prepared for the AGM. RBU suggested slight changes to the Vision and the Employment Objective to reflect feedback and findings from surveys and consultation so far. Members of committee to read the draft and send comments to RBU.</p>	<p>EF, JC, HB</p> <p>Plan team/Comms team/All</p>

<p>JK suggested that we make the document available to attendees before AGM so that it stimulates response.</p> <p>The Plan group suggested that we might need a little exhibition on the housing/development issue. EF suggested a small tweak to the wording of the development objective from “manage” to “control” could make it acceptable to all.</p> <p>Employment review. RBU to ask AECOM for any information they have for Woodford. HB pointed out that land is allocated on Aerodrome site for employment. JK noted that this is unlikely to be used due to costs.</p>	All
<p>7. WNF response to GMSF</p> <p>A suggested response had been prepared by JK and circulated. This was approved for submission by EF before hol on 26 Aug (deadline 1 Sep).</p>	EF
<p>8. SMBC consultation on Statement of Community Involvement</p> <p>EF to request as Hon Sec that SMBC notifies the forum on any planning applications in Woodford, including the Aerodrome site. HB to do the same on behalf of WCC.</p>	EF
<p>9. CEC local plan</p> <p>JK and PG reported that the Inspector is going to resume Examination. CEC are going to consult on submission sites. It will go on a long time and is very messy. There are contradictions between the new and old information that has been submitted. The base date of the Plan cannot be changed so there will only be 15 years left once it is implemented. Handforth East plan has effectively collapsed due to timescales. Forum needs a small group of people to respond on behalf. It was suggested that this should be members of the Executive Committee.</p>	Exec Committee
<p>10. Harrow and Redrow liaison meetings</p> <p>Next Harrow meeting Thu 20 Aug. RBB and DB to attend. RBU requested his name is dropped from attendees list.</p> <p>Next Redrow meeting 22nd Sep, Small Hall, Community Centre.</p>	
<p>11. AOB</p> <p>PA has been submitted for the Poynton bypass. Funding is likely to be achieved. Consultation in progress.</p>	
<p>12. Next meeting:</p> <p>7th September, Deanwater Hotel</p> <p>Apologies received from RBU, MW, HB, DB</p>	All

Evelyn Frearson 22nd August 2015

Post meeting notes

1. Bollington business information capture form has been adapted for Woodford. A short list of main businesses in Woodford has been prepared. Volunteers to print form and go door knocking include: RBB, DB, JS, TB, EF, KH.
2. Confirmation that the examination into the CEC Local Plan will resume this Autumn has been received. JK has supplied the following notes: The inspector has raised a number of matters on which he requires further information and clarification. If satisfied, he is proposing the timetable for the resumption would be as follows:
 - a. late Sep/early October – procedural meeting to sort out arrangements for resumption
 - b. late October/early November – resume examination into new material including strategic policies
 - c. Inspector would then issue further interim views as to whether his concerns at a strategic level have been adequately addressed

- d. Following that, examination would consider strategic site allocations and “omission sites” (those put forward by developers, landowners etc)
 - e. At some stage CEC would consult on their Proposed Modifications to the Plan, normally dealt with through written procedure but may need to reopen examination.
3. EF and JS attended a meeting on 20 Aug on environmental issues and proposed mitigation measures for the Poynton bypass. It was billed as “Initial Environmental Forum for Poynton Relief Road”. Attendees including Cheshire Wildlife Trust, and someone from RSPB were invited by David Skeet, Strategic Highways and Transportation, CEC. WNF was not invited but hopefully will be invited to subsequent meetings. Sue Stevenson (?) of SMBC attended and invited us to get in touch over any environmental data they may have which would help with our NP. JS will supply notes of the meeting in due course.
 4. It was noted during this meeting that the northern section of the Poynton bypass is very close to or in our Neighbourhood Area. Need to check when not looking at upside down map.
 5. EF and JS had discussions with Rachael Giles of Cheshire Wildlife Trust after the meeting above. CWT could do a desk survey using information already available about the area to identify key habitats in our Neighbourhood Area. This could be supplemented with surveys on the ground but would significantly increase costs. RG confirmed that a team of locals assessing local habitats on the ground would be very useful and would reduce costs. The focus should be on habitat types and listing of species as: Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare. RG would be happy for EF to lead ground surveys because qualifications and experience are appropriate. Summer is better as many plant species die right back and “disappear” over the winter, but autumn would provide some useful information. RG to send current habitat guides to EF. (EF downloaded them for the Handforth Eco Survey, but it would be good to have them directly from an ecology specialist.)