

## Meeting with members of SMBC to discuss Woodford Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation

23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017 from 14:00 to 16:00 pm in the Small Hall at Woodford Community Centre

### Minutes

Attending from WNF: Roger Burton (RB), John Knight (JK), Evelyn Frearson (EF), Jude Craig (JC),  
Attending from SMBC: David Johnston, Steve Johnson

	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting</b> The minutes of last meeting in this series were approved.</p>	
<p><b>SMBC Local Plan</b> WNF reps noted that it was very well written, honest about the issues, and that the consultation so early in the process was welcomed. SMBC reps informed the group that the workshops will be drops in sessions, with short presentations and no need to register. RB will be attending. <i>[Note that the sessions for Bramhall, Cheadle Hulme South and Woodford are on Saturday 16 September from 10:00 to 12:30 in St Michael's Church, St Michael's Ave, Bramhall, SK7 2 PG. The online notice has the option to book a place – deadline Mon 11 Sep]</i>  Consultation on the Local Plan will be online, using the same software as used for GMSF. SEMMMS will be included. There will in a guidance video explaining how to respond. <i>[Note consultation deadline is 20 September 2017]</i></p>	
<p><b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</b> RB reported that he has contacted Angie Jukes of SMBC who had suggested using the “assessment wheel” software package, which was designed to look at the environmental impact of proposed development. RB had looked at assessment wheel and found it difficult because the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating sites. SMBC reps noted that, in context of SEA, our proposals could have negative or positive effects, even though they maintain the status quo. It is WNFs call whether to do it or not. JK noted that he had looked at other neighbourhood plans and found that many have not done it.</p> <p><b>Action: It was agreed that JK would write a report to justify why WNF are not completing the assessment wheel.</b></p>	JK
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation document structure</b> EF and RB explained the proposed structure of the document. The content is being split into a Policy Section, containing planning policies with a brief justification for the objective, and a Village Action Plan Section, containing aspirations. Justification, evidence and references for all the policies will be placed in an Appendix Section. The structure was supported by SMBC reps.</p> <p><b>Action: WNF team to carry on in the style</b></p>	WNF
<p><b>Pre-submission consultation document design</b> JC displayed in the “flip book” version on line, the proposed design of the document. SMBC reps approved of the design.</p>	

<p><b>Action: WNF team to carry on in that style</b></p>	<p>WNF</p>
<p>Consultation on value land supply will start at the earliest in October. It will be a 3 month consultation.</p>	
<p><b>Revised policy wording</b>  EF explained that, for the policy content, the wording had been changed from “supported or resisted” to “permitted or refused” to provide greater clarity and less ambiguity for decision makers.  The WNF team took it as understood that the policies formed part of a check list, along with SMBC and national policies, and a development proposal would have to comply with all relevant policies. Therefore, this would be stated once in the introduction and not repeated in each policy.  The SMBC reps supported that wording and approach.</p>	<p>WNF</p>
<p><b>Action: WNF team to carry on in that style</b></p> <p><b>Employment policy amendments</b>  JC explained the current status of the Employment policies and the wording was discussed</p> <p><b>EMP1</b>  “Proposals shall be permitted that extend or promote existing and new small-scale employment opportunities.....”  It was suggested that “promote” should be changed to “allow”. The word “extend” was debated.  It was noted that the policy needs to refer to NPPF para 89 and SMBC policies [<i>which it does in the Justification and Evidence section</i>].</p> <p>The following criterion for this policy was discussed:  “The most suitable broadband package should be installed in order to support and assist the viability of the new businesses”  SMBC reps noted that they are on board with this and hoping to address in Local Plan. The question of whether it can enforced realistically was debated. The recommendation was to leave it in.</p> <p><b>EMP2</b>  SMBC reps suggested that the policy should be reworded to omit the section “will be generally regarded as unacceptable and most certainly wholly undesirable. Such a situation.....” should be deleted, so that the policy reads:  “Loss of existing local employment sites through change of use or redevelopment shall only be permitted where the applicant:....” followed by the criteria as written.</p> <p><b>EMP3</b>  The question of when a business becomes a planning issue was discussed. SMBC reps explained that it is a matter of fact and degree. The question of what impact it has on the community is the important aspect in the decision.</p> <p>SMBC reps noted that there were no immediate plans to assess or review the Green Belt.</p> <p>JC noted that the criterion referring to renewable energy was taken from NPPF, which very general and vague on this issue.</p>	<p>WNF</p>

<p>JC enquired whether the legal team can be consulted over the ten year timescale for change of use of agricultural buildings. Points raised in the discussion, included whether the building had been used for an agricultural purpose during that time, or whether evidence should be sought for the need for erection of a new barn.</p> <p><b>Actions: WNF team to amend wording as above</b>  <b>SMBC reps to consult legal team about the ten year timescale</b></p>	<p>WNF SMBC</p>
<p><b>Community policy amendments</b>  WNF reps explained that the team were currently discussing how to handle Heritage issues, in policies or in aspirations.</p> <p>JK noted that Woodford has some listed buildings, but there are no local listings. Historic England will have a say in approval of the Neighbourhood Plan and could object to the plan if it contains no Heritage policies.</p> <p>SMBC reps suggested making contact with Paul Hartley who is responsible for local listings in SMBC. JK agreed to talk to him.</p> <p><b>Action: JK to make contact with Paul Hartley</b>  <i>[JK has subsequently suggested that it would be better for EF, as the Hon Sec, to make the initial contact via email]</i></p>	<p>JK EF</p>
<p><b>Development policy additions</b>  RB explained amendments and additions to the Development policies</p> <p><b>Village boundary</b>  RB explained that it is not easy to define a boundary. There was discussion about the impact on development, house value and social implications of drawing a village boundary within the parish. The WNF team noted that, currently, everyone who lives in the parish considers themselves to be part of Woodford village.</p> <p><b>DEV15 Infill criteria</b>  SMBC reps expressed initial concern that because we have defined criteria we have effectively defined a boundary and it could be subjective how you define a built up frontage.</p> <p>Points made during the discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WNF team are interested in what would happen in the gaps – we could define how many and what character.</li> <li>• Criteria could allow a little more development than is possible now</li> <li>• One benefit of an NP is the detailed design code.</li> </ul> <p>SMBC supported WNF taking this approach but the cautioned that an Examiner may refuse it.</p> <p>In the eight criteria under DEV15, SMBC reps suggested changing “low density” to “lower density” because most of Woodford is low density.</p> <p><b>DEV16 Sub-division of large houses</b>  RB explained the idea behind this policy was to create more smaller dwellings in Woodford.</p>	

<p>SMBC reps supported the policy but noted that the only issue would be accessibility. It was recommended that “preventing of creating an additional curtilage” needs to change to “not extending the existing curtilage”.</p> <p><b>Action: WNF team to make the amendments suggested</b></p>	WNF
<p><b>Village Action Plan</b>  RB explained the this section included aspects that were not planning policies and were mostly focussed on safety and getting people to move around more healthily. Expert advice would be useful in order to achieve this.  JK noted that two bypass schemes may make Woodford quiet and create a genuine village once more.</p>	
<p><b>Forum approval of the document</b>  EF explained that the whole Forum would be invited to comment and approve on the policies and aspiration using a form. A majority of those voted would be required before an amendment was made.  <b>Action: EF to send the protocol and form to SMBC reps</b></p>	EF
<p><b>Timescales</b>  SMBC reps outlined Local Plan timescales:  It was noted that neighbourhood plan will have to comply with existing policies.   JK outlined Neighbourhood Plan timescales:  Reg 14 is next. Then WNF team make any changes needed. Then WNF team send full consultation statement t to SMBC. Then it is SMBC document [autumn 2017?]  Reg 15 Submission stage expected early 2018.   It is expected that revised GMSF goes out for consultation in early June.</p>	
<p><b>List of statutory consultees</b>  WNF reps requested the list of statutory consultees plus any others that should be added.   <b>Action: DJ will get us the names and addresses for Reg 14 consultation.</b></p>	SMBC
<p><b>Next steps</b>   It was agreed that when the text is completed WNF team will send it as a Word document in track changes and clean versions to the SMBC team, who will send it around various departments in SMBC for comment.   <b>Action: EF to prepare final document when text ready in Word and send to SMBC.</b></p>	WNF  EF