

Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

held in the Large Hall, WWMCC
at 7:30 pm on Monday 3rd February 2014

Present

Mr Stephen Taylor (SJT), Mr Terry Barnes (TB), Mr Roger Burton (RBu), Mrs Jude Craig (JC), Ms Jane Sandover (JS), Mr Robin Brammar (RB), Mr Paul Goodman (PG), Mr John Knight (JK), Ms Evelyn Frearson (EF), Mr Paul Rodman (PR), Mrs Maxine Wood (MW), Mr David Buszard (DB), Mrs Helen Buszard (HB), Mr Robin Berriman (RBB), Mr Ron Beatham (RBe), Mrs Dorothy Chesterman (DC), Mr Bryan Leck.

Welcome

SJT chaired the meeting, and welcomed those attending.

Apologies

Mr Colin Griffin (CG), Mr Alan Bramwell (AB).

Minutes from previous meetings

PR requested that his name be removed from the attendees list as he was not present.

RBu suggested that in future all amendments should be picked up in the meeting rather than via email prior to the meeting. This was agreed.

Matters Arising

1. SEMMMS update

PG reported that he watched the recent SMBC council meeting on SEMMMS via the web cast. Labour members had voted against it because, in their view, it represents too much money being spent to help the richer parts of the borough. The PA was approved by SMBC. CEC and Manchester City Council have yet to vote on it. Each council has to vote and then pass it on to the SoS.

The following points arose during this discussion:

- CEC support the Poynton bypass and funding is likely to be found.
- SMBC adopts the policy of not publishing conditions associated with PAs before the meeting. This means they are not subject to open and informed debate.
- Poynton Update and News reported that bore hole hill drilling will commence across the SEMMMS site (see appendix 1).

2. RIBA, funding and accounts

RBu reported that RIBA will hold our funds through an organisation called Places Matter. They would prefer payment arrangements to be as simple as possible. RBB reported that there are two options: 1. WNF pays suppliers and then claims it back from the fund. 2. The fund pays suppliers directly. There was a restriction in that the fund cannot directly reimburse WCC or WU. The options were debated. The potential transfer of WU funds to WNF was discussed. This had been raised at the WCC AGM and there were no objections raised. However, PG noted that there may be potential future legal fees if so it was agreed to leave funds in the WU bank account.

RBB requested three authorised signatories for the WNF fund account. RBB proposed SJT, RBB and EMF. SJT seconded the proposal and members present were all in favour.

3. WNF consultation: statutory, local businesses, and residents list

TB reported that he has written to RW but at that time had received no reply. The electoral roll is available but may not be a complete list as it is possible to choose not to be listed in it. The next stages require the questionnaire to be ready. It was agreed that two explanatory posters in the hall would be helpful. EF and JC volunteered help with these.

ACTIONS

TB, EF, JC to progress forum questionnaire-completion day and associated communications when questionnaire is ready.

The WWMCC had been booked but the slot will be too early. A new slot was agreed and booked by JC: **10:00 to 14:00 on 15th March.**

4. WNF questionnaire

There was a general discussion. It was agreed that a few changes were needed, including an introductory page explaining what the Forum can and cannot influence, particularly with respect to the Green Belt. Although the Neighbourhood Plan has to be pro-development, the numbers referred to in the housing development questions were thought to be too high and potentially alarming. It was agreed they should be reduced. The question about public conveniences is to be deleted. A line at the beginning is to be included stating: "Please tick as appropriate."

RBu suggested that the group establish the time frame for the questionnaire, which was agreed as follows:

1. Test questionnaire on Forum members at Community Centre on 15th Mar.
2. Printing and distribution by 4th week in March 2014.
3. Forms returned by end Apr 2014.
4. Statistical analysis by end May 2014.

Options for statistical analysis were discussed which include enlisting the help of a professional organisation or spreading the load around the Forum management committee. JK noted that there is an official list of contractors.

ACTIONS

DB to write introductory page for questionnaire.

SJT and PG to revise questions as agreed above.

RBu and SJT to meet to discuss options for analysis of questionnaire.

5. WNF response to Harrow Plans for Aerodrome site

A proposed response in the form of three documents had been drafted based on expert advice from JK and circulated via email prior to the meeting. These comprised: Heads of Terms (requested amendments to the conditions); Planning Statement (details of the breaches of local and national policies); Reasons for Refusal (summary of key WNF objections). There had been extensive debate via email on the pros and cons of objecting and on the detailed content of the response, which had been collated into a final version by EF and SJT. The consensus among the management committee was that there were extensive grounds for objection and we should do so in order to be consistent and tenacious. JK explained that the target audience for the Planning Statement was council planning officers. It was approved by the committee with minor amendments and to be subject to final proof reading before submitting. A short summary of the key points aimed at local councillors had been drafted by PG for and was approved.

Potential for discussions with Harrow was discussed but it was agreed that they had been made little or no attempt to enter a dialogue with WNF and no route was open at present.

The decision on Harrow planning application has to be determined by SMBC Strategic Planning Committee.

6. CEC Core Strategy/Local Plan update (SMBC report for Area Committee meeting)

BL highlighted the key points in a report on the CEC Local Plan which has been circulated around Area Committee and is being discussed at each Area Committee meeting. Key issues for SMBC with respect to the plans for Handforth East include the loss of Green Belt and the increase in local traffic, including the fact that the plan was not included in the SEMMMS plan (see Appendix 2). The report was on the agenda for discussion at the Bramhall South Area Committee

7. WCC update

PR stated that there was little to report since WCC had not held a meeting since 16th Dec 2013, which was before the previous WNF meeting. The next WCC meeting was scheduled for the following week – Monday, 10th Feb 2014. He noted that WCC had submitted comments on the three Planning Applications endorsing the views being put forward by WNF.

8. Legality of SMBC processes

It was suggested that the problem with processes is a matter for the Ombudsman.

It was agreed that WNF should inform the press that we are objecting to the PA and provide a copy of our objections.

ACTION

TB to contact Stockport Express regarding WNF objection to Harrow PA.

9. AOB

First case of NP rejection

JK reported on the first case of rejection of an NP. The reason was failure to comply with European legislation on habitat protection.

Mr Kingsley

Mr Kingsley continues to pursue the issue of the SPD with SMBC through legal channels. If SMBC approve the Harrow PA, it is likely that he will take out an injunction.

Council decision on Harrow PA

JK enquired whether the planning committee can pass the decision on the PA to the full council. And the answer was.....anyone?

AVRO Heritage Centre new buildings for sale

TB reported that he is now a volunteer at the AVRO Heritage Trust. The museum display items were being moved to other storage sites, including the wind tunnel, and were having to be moved out again because the property was up for sale. There was discussion about the ownership of the buildings.

10. Next Meeting: Mon 3 Mar 2014 at 7:30 pm, Woodford Community Centre Large Hall

Evelyn Frearson, 18th Feb 2014

Appendix 1.

From Poynton News Update

The main contractor for this [SEMMMS] road scheme, Carillion Morgan Sindall (CMS), will be carrying out ground investigation works for around 6 weeks, starting on **Wednesday 19th February 2014**. This will involve some 250 trial pits/trenches or boreholes along the length of the scheme. Letters will be issued to the 20 or so landowners affected. For more information contact the CMS Engineering Manager, John England, T. 0161 9278220, e-mail john.a.england@carillionplc.com

Appendix 2.

Extracts from SMBC report on CEC Local Plan with regard to Handforth East proposals

Road infrastructure

6.2.5 Taking these factors into account officers have recently agreed the need for a multi-modal strategic study of this segment of Cheshire East (although excluding the A6 / Buxton rail-line corridor as that is subject to a similar existing and ongoing study which is expected to report shortly). It has been agreed that this study should be undertaken jointly by CEC and Stockport but probably also with the involvement of Manchester City Council, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and, potentially, Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council given possible impacts further to the west. Work is now being undertaken to prepare a specification for the study and it has been agreed that the study needs to be sufficiently advanced to allow Stockport Council to take an informed view as to whether or not it can support CEC's strategy.

Sustainability

6.2.6 Beyond the matter of transport impacts, it could be considered concerning that the Sustainability Appraisal which has informed the strategy does not clearly identify other areas where mitigation is required. This is because it appears that where any negative impact is identified it has been presumed that adequate mitigation measures would be implemented and, therefore, a positive score has been given. Sustainability Appraisal should be undertaken without this presumption so as to identify negative impacts that require mitigating; it is then for the strategy to propose adequate mitigation – if it is not possible to implement adequate mitigation measures then it would either mean a site could not be taken forward or significant over-riding justification would have to be provided as to why it achieves benefits that outweigh the identified detrimental impacts. It should be appreciated that many impacts will no doubt be mitigated by detailed proposals as they emerge but in the absence of impacts being clearly identified by the Sustainability Appraisal it is arguably not possible to clearly ascertain whether this is adequate or encompassing of all matters that it needs to be

Green Belt

6.1.2 At an officer level it has been confirmed to CEC that the strategic argument in favour of releasing the Handforth site is understood. Its proximity to the GM boundary, with associated labour market opportunity and infrastructure is acknowledged. However, concerns remain regarding whether the assessment adequately or clearly demonstrates why a proportion of development needs must be met at sites within the Green Belt and, if it does, whether those sites justifiably include that at Handforth. The assessment document subsequently informed the Pre-Submission Core Strategy which was published for consultation in November / December 2013, as detailed above.

6.1.3 Perhaps the main and obvious purpose of the North Cheshire Green Belt is to constrain the outward sprawl of the Greater Manchester conurbation, limiting its coalescence with and maintaining separation from other settlements. In doing this it acts to focus the market on the regeneration of urban sites within the conurbation, something which, arguably, it has been exceptionally successful in doing since its inception. It is perhaps unfortunate that the current economic climate has placed great financial limitations on the ability of developers and local authorities to regenerate remaining urban sites and that this has arguably coincided with largely only the most difficult / expensive regeneration projects remaining given the success of other projects over recent decades. However it is also acknowledged that much of Cheshire now acts as a functional part of the Greater Manchester travel to work area, and as such siting new homes in proximity to key growth sites within the conurbation has some strategic justification.