

**Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum**  
held at Woodford Community Centre on 3 Jul 2017 7:30pm

<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Apologies received</b>
Mr Robin Berriman (RBB)	√	
Mr David Buszard (DB)		√
Mr Paul Rodman (PR)		Corresponding
Ms Evelyn Frearson (EF)	√	
Mr John Knight (JK)	√	
Mr Paul Goodman (PG)	√	
Mr Terry Barnes (TB)	√	
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)	√	
Ms Zoe Jones (ZJ)		
Mr Chris Coppock (CC)		√

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

<p><b>1. Welcome</b> TB opened the meeting and welcomed those present.</p>
<p><b>2. Apologies</b> DB, JS, CC</p>
<p><b>3. Declaration of conflicts of interest</b> None.</p>
<p><b>4. Minutes from previous meeting on 3 Apr</b> Inaccuracies in item 6.1 were noted.</p>
<p><b>5. Neighbourhood Plan update</b>  RBU presented the update.</p> <p><b>Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There had been two meetings with SMBC to discuss draft policies.</li> <li>• There are policies under the topics of ENV, EMP, COM, DEV* see post-meeting notes 1.</li> <li>• MOV and INT contain aspirations which are not planning policies.</li> <li>• SUS had been dropped as a separate section.</li> <li>• One of the key things coming out of discussion with SMBC had been where to put development, which is restricted by the NPPF to limited infilling in villages as an exception to Green Belt policy.</li> </ul>

- Other policies are about how we can protect the Green Belt.
- A key part of the conversation with SMBC had been putting into words what can be permissible in Green Belt.
- Whether Woodford is a village was discussed with SMBC.
- If WNF defines a boundary within the parish, it could cause arguments.
- SMBC said they would look at it and David Johnston had begun to draw a boundary, which included the already developed areas in the Neighbourhood Area but not the Aerodrome site.
- Plan group had started to look at defining limited infilling in the village, to allow limited development.
- Also looking at sub-division of larger houses in order to create smaller homes.

JK noted that:

- SMBC are working on their Local Plan. They propose to consult in the autumn, although the timescale seems unlikely.
- They are looking at village boundaries. Some places are already defined. There are about three places where they see a need to define village boundary.
- WNF policies had been written to reduce risk of development which filled in all the gaps.
- In response to a question about whether there are any rules about infill, JK replied that national policy allows limited infill in villages. SMBC policy (2011 and 2006) is not up to date with national policy. Each case is determined on its own merits as they are treated as exceptions rather than being in accord with policy.
- It was agreed that it would be useful to make contact with Adrian Fisher, who will be providing cover for Emma Curle while she is on maternity leave, with a view to arranging a meeting.

PG noted that:

- WNF has a choice between either policies which define the roads where infilling will be allowed,
- Or policies which define the criteria for the type of infilling that will be allowed.
- The latter carries a risk of effectively allocating gaps between existing properties for development.
- Policies should be written so that they clearly allow acceptance or approval (see below.)

#### **Actions:**

**Plan group to continue to refine DEV policies**

**Plan group to rewrite policies**

**Make contact with SMBC**

#### **Evidence**

- The potential need to update the housing needs assessment was discussed. RBU had established that a new grant for a new piece of work would be needed. It was agreed that this should not be pursued.
- JK noted that Kris Hayward had delved into data on housing development over the last 3

years and sales over the last year in and around Woodford Neighbourhood Area, which provided an update for the Plan.

### **Policy wording**

- PG pointed that wording could be changed in order to provide clearer direction and less ambiguity for SMBC when determining planning applications, as follows:  
New development will be permitted providing that.....  
Any development proposals which would reduce.....will be refused.
- After a discussion, it was agreed to rewrite policies along those lines for the Pre-submission Consultation.

### **Action**

**All policies to be rewritten in this style**

### **Village action plan**

- Will include MOV, INT. Sustainability will not be included because it is not supported by consultation and it is covered by SMBC policy.
- RBu is liaising with Nick Whelan of SMBC about any funding available for traffic improvements in the MOV Aspirations wish list\* See post-meeting notes 2.
- It was noted that anticipated changes to traffic resulting from new roads reported in the Peter Brett study.

### **Pre-submission consultation**

- Plan group is working towards consultation in the autumn.
- Need to look at whether we need a Strategic Environmental Assessment because we are not proposing significant development. It was agreed that RBu will go to talk to Angie Jukes.

### **Action**

**RBu to liaise with Angie Jukes of SMBC about SEA**

### **Policies**

#### **Community Policies**

- It was agreed to delete COM3 because listed buildings are adequately protected by SMBC (and national) policy.
- For COM4, it was agreed to develop the ideas presented by JK in option 3 (see appendix) and to generate two lists as follows:
  1. Assets of Local Community Value – about buildings which form a useful function
  2. Local Heritage Assets – about the form of the building\* see post-meeting notes 3. It was noted that some buildings might be on both lists.

#### **Environment Policies**

- **PG noted that ENV7 on garden fires is not a planning issue. After discussion it was agreed that it was useful to highlight in the plan and it would be moved to Village Action Plan.**

## **Actions**

**COM4 to be rewritten accordingly**

**Plan group to come up with lists**

**ENV7 to be moved to Village Action Plan**

### **6. GMSF update**

- JK reported that the GMSF Planning policy lead Councillor had been from Rochdale, but has been replaced by Paul Dennett the City Mayor of Salford. Salford's head of planning was continuing in leading GMSF revision at officer level. As Salford is a local authority with a high number of high rise buildings, along with Manchester City, this is a primary focus of effort.
- There will be elections in most boroughs next year, which will affect GMSF progress after Feb 2018.
- EF reported that SGMGB had held a Neighbourhood Planning conference on 1<sup>st</sup> July which had gone well.
- There had been an SGMGB meeting afterwards at which it was reported that emails had been exchanged with Eamonn Boylan and with Andy Burnham's assistants. It was hoped that a meeting with AB would be set up. Documents and numbers were being analysed.

### **7. WCC update**

RBB provided an update.

#### **7.1. Redrow liaison**

- Redrow have no information about Bodycote or the care home.
- There were 29 houses occupied and a further 31 in various stages of build and sale.
- Phase 2a for 55 dwellings has planning approval.
- The compound will be moved in July.
- Dust problems were reported.

#### **7.2. Church Lane/ Blossoms Lane/Moor Lane**

- Brian Bagnall had reported that the police are no longer resisting a 20 mph limit in Church Lane and Blossoms Lane.
- Jenny Lane has been included for traffic cushions.
- Public consultation will happen at some point.

### **8. CEC Local Plan update**

- Will be adopted on 27<sup>th</sup> July.
- It fires the starting gun for NCGV, but a written agreement with SMBC over the transport will be needed.
- Not currently clear who will fund the infrastructure.

### **9. AOB**

- TB reported that Steve Morgan and someone from Harrow had said that they are not

progressing development of the Bodycote at present.

- The route to the museum has been stripped, including grassland.
- Avro Museum are building a garage and having to do a geology survey down to 6 metres.
- Persimmon have a consultation about the adjacent Poynton site on Hazelbadge Road.
- Storage of classic cars on Aerodrome site has been broken in to and some stolen.
- The white line has been repainted at the junction of Bridle Road and Chester Road.
- DN and MWh reported heavy traffic on Moor Lane and Chester Road, respectively.
- Avro Heritage Museum have an event on 6<sup>th</sup> August with a Lancaster flying.

#### **10. Next meetings**

WNF meeting: 4<sup>th</sup> Sep 7:30 pm Community Centre bar area

WNF AGM: 14<sup>th</sup> Sep AGM 8.00 pm Community Centre small hall

Evelyn Frearson 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017

**Post meeting notes: Please review the lists under items 2 and 3 and provide any comments, additions or deletions.**

#### **1. Amendments to policies**

Final versions of policies and their justification and evidence will need to be reviewed and approved by the main committee before inclusion in the Pre-submission Consultation plan.

#### **2. Movement Aspirations wish list**

Movement Aspiration 5 currently contains the following wish-list. There was support from the committee for pursuing funding for traffic improvements. A shorter wish-list was circulated around residents for comments and sent to SMBC in September last year. The detail in the current wish-list in the current Movement Aspirations needs to be reviewed and approved by the committee before inclusion in the Plan. Please review. Any additions/deletions/amendments?

1. Traffic calming in Moor Lane.
2. Traffic calming in Church Lane – associated with Green Lane status.
3. Traffic calming in Blossoms Lane – associated with Green Lane status.
4. Improvements to existing pedestrian crossing points on Woodford Road incorporating tactile paving.
5. Improved pedestrian crossing facilities in Chester Road (Moor lane to Church Lane) including additional pedestrian refuges, particularly related to bus stopping points.
6. Junction improvements at Chester Road/Woodford Road roundabout including enhanced pedestrian crossing points.
7. Junction improvements at Chester Road/Church Lane (bus turn-round) forming a roundabout to provide traffic calming and a 'gateway' to the village.
8. Village 'entrance feature' at village boundaries on Wilmslow Road, Chester Road, Woodford Road and Hall Moss Lane.
9. Speed limit reduction on Chester Road from 40 mph to 30 mph from Deanwater Hotel to Moor Lane, potentially associated with the introduction of central refuges (as 5) and cycle lanes (as 10).
10. Introduction of cycle lanes to Chester Road between Old Hall lane and Moor Lane.

11. Where possible extend the existing road restrictions on heavy vehicles

### **3. Community Heritage Assets**

The committee will need to generate and approve two lists. These ideas have been put forward so far. Please review. Any additions/deletions/amendments?

#### **Buildings/ structures (to be protected due to their heritage structure of value to the community )**

- The Old Vicarage, Wilmslow Road
- The Davenport Arms, Chester Road
- White Rose Cottage now called Moor cottage, 454 Chester Road
- School House Farm, 456 Chester Road
- 195 Moor Lane
- Former Woodford Primary School

#### **Features of value to the community (to be protected due to their functional value to the community)**

- Woodford War Memorial Community Centre and field
- The Davenport Arms known locally as the Thief's Neck
- Woodford Cricket Club and field
- Bramhall Cricket Club and field
- The Royal British Legion Club House and allotments
- The Scout Hut
- Woodford Recreation Ground
- Grass verges
- Trees in grass verges and pavements
- Public footpath network
- Listed Buildings

#### **Appendix (see item 5 Community Policies)**

Draft ideas from JK, which form the starting point for COM4 policies on Protection of Community Heritage Assets:

1. The sites, structures and buildings shown in Table XX are identified as Community heritage assets.

2. Any development at or adjoining these community heritage assets should:

2.1 recognise the significance of the heritage asset as a central part of the design and layout; and

2.2 have special regard to the desirability of preserving the asset and its setting and any local features of special architectural or historic interest; and

2.3 accord with any relevant site specific development briefs or guidance approved by Stockport Borough Council as local planning authority; and

d) remove, mitigate or seek to remove any potential risk to the heritage asset.

3. Proposals that require a change of use of a community heritage asset at risk will be considered favourably where all of the following can be demonstrated;

- a) there is no reasonable prospect of the original use being retained or reinstated; and
- b) the proposed development would represent a viable use that would secure the future of the heritage asset; and
- c) where the proposed use is not for residential purposes, the proposed use will help to support the local economy; and
- d) the change of use would not be detrimental to the significance of the community heritage asset and its setting.