

Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum
held at the Deanwater Hotel
at 8:00 pm on Monday 6th July 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 RBB chaired the meeting and welcomed attendees.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies Apologies received from TB, CG, JK</p>	
<p>3. Minutes from previous meetings Minutes from the 1st June meeting approved.</p>	
<p>4. Matters Arising None</p>	
<p>5. Exhibition feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was reported that there were 150 attendees and 26 responses. RBU handed over the attendee sheets to EF who passed them on to DB for addition of email addresses to the database • Positive comments had been received about the presentation. EF was thanked for the work on the presentation. EF noted that the amount of time spent was partly self-inflicted due to the high spec chosen for the design and layout. • Learning points for future exhibitions were noted again including: circulate copy for approval in Word format well before the deadline to allow full committee review and ease of editing, and produce the layout in Power Point as more members are familiar with it compared with Publisher so the task could be shared. • It was reported that a number of people misunderstood the remit and thought it would be about new development on the Aerodrome site. It appeared that many residents have not noticed that we have moved on from 	

<p>our previous WU campaign. Communication would be needed to rectify this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PG suggested that at the next public consultation it would be useful to have the outline PA for BAe site so that people understand it. • It was pointed out that the Aerodrome site is not part of our NA. PG advised that issues of transport and linkage can be part of our NP and the group should not feel constrained. 	
<p>6. Neighbourhood Plan review</p> <p>6.1. Review of residents views</p> <p>Collated exhibition questionnaire responses and a refresher of Aug 2014 questionnaire responses to development and employment questions had been circulated prior to the meeting. These were not discussed.</p> <p>The discussion moved on to the NP. The debate explored concerns about and explanations for the current strategy, which included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern about the proposal for development in the existing village with a 900+ new development on the doorstep. It was noted that some residents assume we are about protection of the Green Belt and resisting development. • Plan group members explained that Woodford is vulnerable under the current NPPF in some respects, for example, we have no affordable housing. An NP is our best defence. An NP would give us a say in type of development here. • The plan sub-group have arranged for a housing-needs survey (see below). This will identify what the housing needs are. The aim is to produce a framework that says what we would like to do. If the housing study says we need housing, then we go back to the community in consultation. • How we define a village could strengthen greenbelt outside of village boundary. • Evidence is important for gaining approval for the NP by SMBC. • It is too early to decide what type of plan would suit us best. This will be determined by the evidence acquired. • Moving quickly with an NP is an advantage because SMBC are currently involved with preparation of the Manchester Spatial Framework. • AB stated that he attended a meeting on behalf of the NF where it was stated that Councils are under pressure to find places for houses. There might have to be some limited development in the existing village in order to comply. • In answer to the question of whether our NP could be trumped by SMBC, PG advised that, so far, NPs have held up well in court. • A communication exercise is needed to ensure that residents understand what we are doing now. • A presentation of progress to date, to the Area Committee was suggested by Brian Bagnall and thought to be a good idea. • A presentation rather than a static exhibition at the AGM was suggested and thought to be a good idea. • Conclusion: Proceed with the studies ongoing and consultation with residents. 	<p>Action carried forward Plan subgroup/ Comms team</p>
<p>6.2. Current work streams ongoing or proposed</p> <p>i) Housing needs study by AECOM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is underway. AECOM are doing the work in consultation with 2 local estate agents, aiming to generate evidence about housing needs which can go to SMBC to defend our position. This is technical support from Locality without need to specify amount of work needed. The proposal had not been circulated around the committee but JK has been closely involved. 	<p>JK All¹see post meeting notes</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing needs assessment will look at the broader region in order to assess need in Woodford. The new Aerodrome development will supply housing need for broader area. It could increase demand for houses in existing village. It could also defend the NF position against the Greater Manchester Strategy pressures. <p>ii) Movement Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A proposal has been received from PBA. They have defined in more detail what we will get. PG stated that Forum will get a good report at a bargain price because they have done the work for Redrow. Connectivity with new site was seen as an important issue. All agreed that it is an important and useful study. The fee is £3,000 with £500 allocated for additional meetings. The need to control expenditure of the grant funding was noted. The clause in PBA t&cs which permits interest charges to be made if invoices are not paid within 28 days was discussed. The company was known to 3 committee members who gave reassurances that the company would be flexible over timing. Pre-payment was also suggested as an option to avoid potential for late payment <p>i) Landscape study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JK is looking into whether Cheshire Wildlife Trust could do this study for WNF. Predicted cost around £1k. Rachel Giles of CWT will come to a plan subgroup meeting. EF will attend. PG suggested a wildlife study in Woodford similar to the Handforth ecological survey perhaps involving the community. PG volunteered to join plan subgroup. <p>ii) Other studies which may be needed</p> <p>Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS noted that Centre is doing an assessment. Bramhall Health Centre will be approached about potential facilities at Community Centre. The existing 2 containers have full PA, so could use that area. JS reported that she had spoken to Emma Curle and Jane Chase who had said that some of the D2 space allocation for Redrow development could be transferred to our Community Centre, and the centre can be increased in size by a third under existing rules. <p>Employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of response to local business questionnaires was noted again. The plan group suggested using evidence from Greater Manchester that employment sites are needed.⁴ The Plan subgroup will raise with Adlington and Poynton groups the possibility of a joint study. It will be brought to a later consultation. RBu reported that there is potential for conversion of existing developed sites, e.g. Bodycote which is in our Plan area. There could be a good case to put to SMBC that it should be retained for employment as so many jobs were lost at BAe and there will be little employment provision on the new site. It could be the basis of small business units or managed workspace which might encourage the development of small businesses to our benefit. 	<p>RBu/RBB² see post meeting notes</p> <p>JK</p> <p>EF?³ see post meeting notes</p> <p>WWMCC</p> <p>Plan subgroup All⁴ see post meeting notes</p>
<p>7. WNF AGM⁵ This will be held on Wed 16th Sep at 8 pm in the Large Hall. Agenda and notices to be discussed at the next meeting on 10th Aug</p>	<p>EF, JC see post meeting notes</p>

<p>8. Harrow meeting update</p> <p>PR reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rumours about reasons for delays were not correct. Reasons were: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They had found a buried building with oil contamination. They have started digging to find extent of it. Taking contaminated soil out and leaving it to bacterial action. 2. Black-backed gulls are nesting on the building so they have to wait until they fledge. 3. Machinery breakdowns • Now approx. 6 weeks behind. • Proposing to use an 80 ton crusher. PR asked them to position it as far away from residences as poss. • An area had been handed over to Redrow. • Name of development was discussed. They reported that Jennie Daly raised the issue but the chairman likes the name Woodford Garden Village, so it is not likely to change. • Naming of the streets was discussed. Redrow or SMBC may name them. Streets could be named after aircraft, famous people associated with air industry (who are dead). Now is the time for suggestions to be submitted. • A couple of neighbours are in correspondence with them. • Next meeting in one month. 	All
<p>9. Redrow meeting report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes had been circulated by JC and Redrow. • RBu reported that Redrow had fielded a big team. They are gearing up to start infrastructure on site. • Road works having a serious impact especially now with 3-way controlled lights. • 1st occupation expected July 2016. Traffic calming on Moor Lane will be put out to consultation soon with a view to implementation next year. • HB enquired whether it is sensible to restrict Moor Lane until A6Marr is finished.⁶ 	
<p>10. CEC local plan</p> <p>PG reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deadline for submission of revised plan in July seems unlikely to be met. • Several deadlines missed, including monthly letter of update to Inspector. • Workshop notes have not been issued. • A cabinet meeting didn't happen. • Duty to cooperate issues with other councils have arisen again. • No time blocked out in Inspector's diary for any restart of Examination. • All the signs point towards CEC having to start again with a new plan. 	
<p>11. A6MARR</p> <p>PG reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work has started and the roundabout construction will commence in September. The intention is to build a second temporary roundabout to the west of the existing which may enable the junction to continue to operate reasonably efficiently while the bridge works on the alignment of Woodford Road are undertaken. Excavations and earth shift have commenced at the Eastern end by Brookside. Work at the Woodford Road junction has been delayed by newt protection but has now commenced with demolition works to the industrial unit by the roundabout • Phasing will be difficult. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people didn't realise that footprint would be so wide. Some space will be occupied by bunds and some will be green again, eventually. • Hard core down in places. 	
<p>12 AVRO Heritage Museum update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to open end Sep. • Another Vulcan flyover planned in Oct. Harrow reported some hurdles to overcome around insurance. 	
<p>14. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RBU now has the plan for the entrance to Redrow roundabout. RBU had circulated the plan previously when received from Kevin Brooks of SMBC in draft form. • PG reported that there was a problem with entrance to Aldi site in Poynton. 	
<p>15. Next meeting: 10th Aug⁷</p>	<p>All see post meeting notes</p>

Evelyn Frearson 7th July 2015, revised 28 July 2015

Post –meeting notes

¹ Since the meeting the AECOM draft report has been circulated around the whole committee for comments which have been collated and sent back to AECOM.

² RBB has spoken on the telephone to the credit controller at PBA and explained that payment would be made by RIBA, who are fund holders on behalf of the Forum and have already received the relevant grant funds. The PBA credit controller accepted WNF procedure with RIBA, appreciated the fact that using a third party for payment could make the process more cumbersome, and agreed to giving WNF 45 day terms.

³ If the Cheshire Wildlife Trust survey is focussed on landscape then EF is happy to conduct/organise a Handforth style ecological/wildlife survey of Woodford, if it would be useful and complementary to the CWT survey. Summer/early autumn would be ok to do surveys, which could be less intense in style compared with the Handforth one. (Please note that the Handforth one took 2 people 6 months of fairly intensive effort over a winter and spring, including surveying and writing up.)

EF time is limited over the summer and it may not fit in, if were trying to rush a Plan through and include this data. EF would be happy to do it as an enjoyable and interesting exercise at own pace, whether or not it is ever used in a Plan.

Ditto a walking group to explore footpaths and potential linkages with neighbouring communities.

⁴ There are alternative views among committee members on this finding:

- a. It suggests that local businesses have no unmet needs for employment premises that should be addressed by the NP. There will be some provision on the Redrow site.
- b. It means that we will need to use evidence from Greater Manchester that employment sites are needed.

⁵ The AGM date is to be moved as the 16th Sep is difficult for RBU and impossible for TB.

⁶ This has been discussed by WCC.

⁷ The date of the next meeting has been moved to 17th August.