

**Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum**  
held at the Community Centre 7:30 pm Monday 9 May 2016

Attendance	Present	Apologies received
Mr Robin Berriman (RBB)		√
Mr David Buszard (DB)	√	
Mr Paul Rodman (PR)		√ Corresponding
Evelyn Frearson (EF)	√	
Mr John Knight (JK)	√	
Mr Paul Goodman (PG)	√	
Mr Terry Barnes (TB)	√	
Mr Bryan Leck (BL)	√	
Mr Roger Burton (RBU)	√	
Mr Robin Brammar (RBR)		Corresponding
Mrs Dorothy Chesterman (DC)	√	
Ms Jane Sandover (JS)	√	
Mrs Jude Craig (JC)		√
Ms Maxine Wood (MW)		√
Mr Ron Beatham (RBe)	√	
Mr Alan Bramwell (AB)		Corresponding
Mrs Janet DeVeChis (JDV)		√
Mrs Morag White (MWh)	√	
Mrs Doreen Neil (DN)	√	

\*Corresponding members wish to be kept in the loop but cannot routinely attend meetings

	Action
<p><b>1. Welcome</b> TB chaired the meeting and welcomed those present. TB informed the meeting that HB had resigned. EF explained that the reasons included disillusionment with our likely levels of influence with local authorities regarding planning matters, given events. TB and EF thanked HB for her contributions to the team.</p>	
<p><b>2. Apologies</b> RBB, JDV, MW, JC</p>	
<p><b>3. Declaration of conflicts of interest</b> None</p>	
<p><b>4. Minutes from previous meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> Apr</b> Approved.</p>	EF
<p><b>5. Matters arising</b> Covered by agenda items.</p>	
<p><b>6. Funds, expenditure and grants</b> RBB was on holiday. In response to a question from DN, RBU explained that the AECOM project will be technical support. KN noted that a potential large future expense may be preparation plan report. We should check whether SMBC will pay for this.</p>	
<p><b>7. Communications Team report</b> EF reported that posters area about to be printed. Following a message from the printer it was agreed to request a sample A3 and A4 sheet to check that we are happy with the quality of the image prior to bulk printing.</p>	EF to ask for samples

<p><b>8. Neighbourhood Plan update</b></p>	
<p><b>8.1. Policy Development progress</b></p> <p>Prior to the meeting two documents had been circulated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compilation of draft policies under the objective headings prepared by JS containing the policies drafted by different individuals in the group.</li> <li>- Compilation of some of the relevant policies from NPPF and SMBC</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that the team needed more time to read and comment, but there was some preliminary discussion.</p> <p>Points raised during the meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rather than go down the legislative route for Assets of Community Value, which is a separate bit of legislation to Neighbourhood Planning, we could make a list in our Plan of “Local Features of Value”. Could include buildings and areas of land.</li> <li>- Designated Green Spaces have additional protection over and above Green Belt. The criteria are explained in the NPPF and the Kirkwells report suggested considering areas we might like to designate. The criteria include: should be special to the community; should not be extensive tracts of land.</li> <li>- Habitat Survey and CWT reports are not expected before end of June at the earliest</li> <li>- JK noted that, in addition to the SMBC Core Strategy DPD document referred to by EF, there is another important SMBC policy document which needs referring to in our NP [saved policies from the unitary development plan; <a href="http://www.stockport.gov.uk/services/environment/planningbuilding/planningpolicy/ldf/udp/...">http://www.stockport.gov.uk/services/environment/planningbuilding/planningpolicy/ldf/udp/...</a> He pointed out that when it comes to preparation of the Plan document there will be large amounts of information to include in Appendices, providing all the supporting evidence we have gathered from survey and studies.</li> <li>- The evidence could even be an email or letter</li> <li>- We may need to look at a tourism policy</li> <li>- JK commented that as Woodford is in a metropolitan borough it is not viewed as ‘rural’</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that all comments and questions should be sent via email to Roger by May 23, copied in to the whole team so that all are in the discussion. Comments will be reviewed in Plan group meetings and a revised version will be issue on 31 May ready for main committee meeting on 6 June.</p> <p>This will be followed, when all study results are in and tables completed, by circulation to forum members and then wider residents.</p>	
<p><b>9. CEC Local Plan update</b></p> <p>Over 7,000 representations have now been posted on portal. PG reported that the Examination is due to start again in September. There has been an exchange between the Inspector and CEC over the proposal to start the Examination in Congleton and then move it to Macclesfield. A procedural meeting is needed first. 24 sitting days have been booked.</p>	
<p><b>10. Harrow liaison meeting 5 Apr report</b></p> <p>RBu reported on the meeting but we are still awaiting a note from Tim Booth.</p>	<p><b>RBu to remind Tim Booth about note</b></p>

<p><b>11. Avro update</b> Applying for an extension. Vulcan to be repainted by end July.</p>	
<p><b>12. Website review</b> The latest approved minutes need to be added.</p>	EF/JC
<p><b>12. AOB</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JS reported that Redrow have offered a £1k donation to WWMCC.</li> <li>2. DC enquired about progress on the Redrow entrance r.a.b. which doesn't seem to match expectations. RBU reported that he has sent two enquiries via emails to Carl Taylor about it but received no response.</li> <li>3. DB enquired about efforts to market the Poynton area as "Gateway to the Peak". JK reported that this is not new but has been resurrected.</li> <li>4. PG raised the issue of implementation: At present there is no organisation in Woodford set up to address implementation. WNF needs to decide whether it wants to do this in future. DB reported that, currently, WCC considers major planning issues but doesn't respond to individual PAs. JK noted that while some NPs are silent on implementation, others have a chapter on it. He suggested WNF NP has a chapter on it.</li> <li>5. Two PAs for infill development in Woodford (Jenny Lane and Chester Road) raise the question how wide is a gap for infill?</li> <li>5. DN noted that there is a proposal to reinstate the allotments behind Moor Lane.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>13. Next meetings</b> Mon 6 June</p>	All

Evelyn Frearson 11 May 2016