

Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum
held at the Deanwater Hotel
at 7:30 pm on Monday 2 Mar 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 Mrs Maxine Wood (MW)		√
Mr Ron Beatham (RBe)		
Mr Alan Bramwell (AB)		
Mr Colin Moody		√
Mrs Janet DeVeChis	√	
Mr Nigel Hancock	√	

	Action
<p>1. Welcome TB chaired the meeting and welcomed attendees.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies Apologies received from RBB, CG (<i>and MW later</i>).</p>	
<p>3. Minutes from previous meetings Minutes from the 2 Feb meeting approved with correction of 2 minor typos.</p>	
<p>4. Matters Arising Questionnaire distribution done <i>(Not mentioned at meeting but EF wrote to rev David Russell and enclosed 4 charities and clubs questionnaires for Church and clubs).</i></p> <p>EF reported that a resident with a business in Woodford had asked when SMBC would consider brownfield/Green Belt boundaries because GB restrictions are affecting his business plans. JK supplied the answer that this will now be under the Greater Manchester Planning Framework and that boundaries are not likely to change within 3-5 years.</p>	
<p>5. Report from meeting with SMBC JK reported that it was a good meeting attended by Emma Curle (EC, head of planning), Richard Wood (RW, policy officer), David Johnstone (DJ) and Jane Chase (JCh) from the development management team. Points discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little chance of including aerodrome in WNF Neighbourhood Area until the PA conditions have been discharged in 5-10 yrs time. • WNF Neighbourhood Plan will influence SMBC conditions. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WNF want integration of old and new villages. EC supportive. • RW talked about GM plan and benefits of WNF having a plan for it to cascade down to. • Green Belt boundary will not be reviewed before GM plan. • DJ to supply list of SMBC policies so that WNF can identify gaps. Anything below borough level is ok for WNF to have a go at. JK to chase up if needed. • Housing figures: SMBC planning to update SHLAA on back of GM work. Still do not have a 5 year housing supply. Implications for Woodford: GB protection still there. • No accurate timings on phasing provided. • As the proposed consultative forum with Harrow had not yet been set up, EC made a phone call to set up a meeting. • CIL: preliminary draft charging schedule (roof tax) may be ready after the May elections. Aerodrome PA is under s106. If a full PA should come in later, then CIL will apply unless all those issues are dealt with under reserved matters when it will be existing s106. • Avro Heritage (AH): TB reported that he updated SMBC attendees on the current status. There will be a joint press release by BAe and Conlon. AH Trust will take possession of their new quarters on 22 Apr. Then anyone can visit site as part of lease conditions. Opening to public at end Aug. A vulcan to vulcan bike ride from Woodford to Doncaster is planned for May 2. There have been issues over flags. 	<p>JK</p> <p>RBu</p>
<p>6. Neighbourhood Plan sub-group report</p> <p>RBu noted that WCC will be point of contact for demolition and construction issues and WNF to address who is involved on behalf of forum.</p> <p>RBu reported that the 5 members of the NP sub-group met on 13th Feb. Minutes of the meeting had been circulated. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Vision Statement will continue as working vision but may be revisited. • Group hoping to get business and charities surveys back by mid to end March. NH will collate results with help from others. • Another workshop will be set up. • Objectives had been rationalised into themes (see notes in appendix of plan group minutes). • There will be a public exhibition over 3 days with open sessions and manned sessions. • Evidence base to be developed. Some will need consultants. Use our own input as well to liaise with consultants. • Movement was seen as an important issue. EC thought they could supply digital data and put footpaths on it. Useful to build database. Liaison with Adlington suggested. Walking group proposed. Liaison with Redrow would be useful. Some information is in the PA. • Architecture, landscape etc. Tease out what it is that people like about Woodford. Try to visualise this in some way. JS would be useful here. • RBu had made contact with Redrow as they have done a lot of work on network and flows. • SMBC will look at policies for us. • Aiming to complete our Plan by end of year. • Will need to bring other forum members in on tasks once identified. 	<p>Plan group/All</p> <p>Plan group/JS</p> <p>All</p>

<p>improperly. An individual may get compensation. There could be a group claim. For example, there could be complaint when it is finished if traffic is greater than predicted.</p> <p>c. LAP meeting: RBB cannot attend. RBU will attend.</p> <p>d. Cheshire East Enquiry: PG reported that notes from the latest meeting are on the web site. They don't provide answers to the questions raised. CEC are duty bound to report to the inspector once a month. The next round of meetings are expected around Easter. The notes describe a role for ARUP which differs from that described at the meeting.</p> <p>The government has published the latest housing population projections which are lower than expected which would suggest a housing need for around 35K new houses in Cheshire East. This is lower than the Inspector's prediction of 40K. Approved methodology used for housing predictions has been used. An assessment of brownfield sites in Macclesfield will have to done.</p> <p>There are two options: rerun enquiry starting at specific sites. Or start again with major modifications.</p> <p>Parish councils in CE have been encouraged to develop NPs. Some have asked for a hold on development because it affects an emerging NP.</p> <p>A few cases where government given some weight to emerging NP. SoS has chucked some out because it not in line with emerging NP.</p> <p>There is tension between the bottom up and top down approaches. Too much allocation in NP could make the development plan process less comprehensive.</p> <p>e. 2014 Grant: RBB had supplied the information that WNF had received a remittance advice for £666 which is the remainder of 2014 grant.</p>	<p>RBu</p>
<p>Next meeting 13th April</p>	<p>All</p>

Evelyn Frearson 30 Mar 2015 (amended 8 May 2015)