

Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

held in the Davenport Arms
at 7:30 pm on Monday 6th January 2014

Present

Mr Stephen Taylor (SJT), Mr Terry Barnes (TB), Mr Roger Burton (RBU), Ms Jane Sandover JS), Mr Robin Brammar (RB), Mr Paul Goodman (PG), Mr John Knight (JK), Ms Evelyn Frearson (EF), Mrs Maxine Wood (MW), Mr David Buszard (DB), Mrs Helen Buszard (HB), Alan Bramwell (AB),

Welcome

SJT chaired the meeting, welcomed those present and apologised for the need to move venue at the last minute (Community Centre was booked for another event).

Apologies

Mr Paul Rodman (PR), Mr Robin Berriman (RBB), Mr Ron Beatham (RBe) and Mrs Dorothy Chesterman (DC) who had attended the Centre but not followed on to the Davenport Arms.

Minutes from previous meetings

RBU requested an amendment to the minutes from the meeting on 2nd Dec with regard to an action under Funds to read as follows: RBU to explore options for a bank account for WNF funds.

Matters Arising

1. Liaison with other Forums

JS reported to the meeting on discussions on line on how to conduct a survey for a Forum. One Forum recommended an anonymous survey, as two people in the same house may have different views.

2. Bank account and funds

RBU reported that RIBA are interested in association with NFs and will hold an account for us as a pilot study from their office in Liverpool. RBU agreed to put SJT in contact with a lady from RIBA.

JS reported on a comment on line discussing the proportion of fund money that is received by a Forum after costs are deducted. JK reported that costs should be met by the government. New entrants into the fund have been put on hold until Feb but those in the system will continue to receive funding.

3. WNF questionnaire

SJT reported PG had made very useful input into the questionnaire. Emma Curle of SMBC has agreed that they will review it. The next steps were discussed. It was agreed that online methods were not appropriate and it would need to be paper copy. The steps would be as follows:

- a. Management Committee complete it as a test run first.
- b. All Forum members are invited to a meeting at the Centre to complete it as a pilot run 1 month later.
- c. One copy is delivered to every house in Woodford on the extended electoral register, as we did with the WU questionnaire. 2,000 copies to be printed and numbered sequentially in order to track numbers of photocopies made.

4. WNF response to Planning Applications

SJT reported that, although the deadline for response for individuals was 6th January, WNF had been given extra time until 3rd week January (22nd). Note: subsequent arrangements were made to extend until 5th Feb.

SMBC have accepted that the Harrow PA is a departure from the Development Plan. Therefore, the

SoS has to be notified, whether WNF requests that it is called in or not. JK reported that Emma Curle will explain why it is a departure.

Conditions are likely to be covered in legal agreements.

Planning conditions will be approved by council officers. This is the normal route for SMBC but not usually for other authorities. .

Mr Kingsley is still pursuing the SPD through court action, with one more level to go.

The hybrid planning application gives insufficient detail of the later phases of development.

Two options for WNF response were discussed:

1. Look at the detail of the PA
2. Challenge the core planning processes

With regard to option 1, PG noted that the PA is a very competent job on all the detailed technical issues and Harrow has appropriate experience in a complex reclamation job such as this.

PG informed the meeting of the potential consequences of challenging the PA and of the SoS calling it in which included: loss of local control to the SoS; loss of opportunity to influence conditions and legal agreements via liaison with Harrow; delay in development.

With regard to option 2, JK noted that challenging the process gives the Forum thinking time, time for a NP to be drafted and time for the decision on the Daws Hill case to be known.

The pros and cons of submitting an objection were discussed. While disadvantages were acknowledged, it was generally that the WNF should object and that JK and SJT would meet to produce a draft. Some of the points for constructive criticism were identified by the group as: the need for transparency; clarification of processes for ongoing funding of communal spaces, the need to safeguard the conditions; details of the traffic r.a.b.

It was agreed that WNF would make representations to the SoS that the hybrid PA is not compliant with Green Belt policy.

5. CEC Core Strategy/Local Plan update (responses from SMBC and MP)

EF reported on the CEC Local Plan consultation. Responses were being loaded on to the CEC website on a daily basis. To date there was only 1 response in favour of the North Cheshire Growth Village posted by a group in Knutsford. A small number of responses were comments, while 90% of responses were objections, including several from developers.

Responses from SMBC council officers sent to EF via email indicated that there were concerns over the plan with particular regard to sustainability, traffic issues and deliverability. A letter from Mark Hunter MP stated that he shared concerns about the impact on SMBC residents, particularly with regard to traffic congestion but as there was no planning application as yet, it was not appropriate for him to formally object.

6. SEMMMS update

The web site shows a low response rate with more objectors than supporters. PG noted that supporters should respond to the consultation as well as objectors. The WNF had sent in a response expressing support with a number of qualifications.

7. WCC update Carried forward to next meeting.

8. Next Meeting: Mon 3rd Feb 2014 at 7:30 pm, Woodford Community Centre Large Hall.

Evelyn Frearson, 1st Feb 2014