



Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

c/o Woodford Community Centre, Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1PS
Email: woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com Web: www.woodfordneighbourhoodforum.co.uk

Meeting between Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) and Woodford Neighbourhood Forum (WNF) to discuss Draft Policy issues in Woodford's proposed Neighbourhood Plan

Thursday 6th April 2017 at Woodford Community Centre Small Hall, 2.30pm

NOTES

	Action
<p>Attendance WNF: Roger Burton (RB), John Knight (JK), Evelyn Frearson (EF), Jude Craig (JC), Robin Berriman (RBB) SMBC: Emma Curle (EC), David Johnston (DJ), Steve Johnson (SJ)</p>	
<p>Woodford Neighbourhood Forum RB provided a brief background to WNF, its formation and progress to date. He explained that representatives of the plan preparation sub-group were present.</p>	
<p>SMBC Local Development Plan EC reported that SMBC is currently updating its Local Development Plan (LDF), preparing Part 1 and Part 2 simultaneously. Site allocations for the existing LDP had been parked. The aim is to prepare a top-line level of detail, initially, and to go to public consultation in the autumn 2017.</p> <p>SJ explained that he is leading the LDF working party. The aim is for a bottom-up process with a concise consultation document, which will be written in language understandable to the public. The aim is to engage the public in the process and obtain people's opinions via open rather than closed questions.</p> <p>EC noted that SMBC had taken on two additional members of staff with a third member due to start soon, in order to produce the LDP in the proposed timescale.</p> <p>DJ noted that the NPPF is due to be amended and DCLG have predicted that this may be achieved by the summer 2017. The SMBC team felt it unlikely that there would be any changes to Green Belt regulations, other than to strengthen and clarify current policy.</p> <p>DJ requested clarification of the "Woodford Action Plan". WNF explained that this was a working term for issues that were not policies, but which could be carried forward by Woodford Community Council to seek implementation.</p>	

<p>EC confirmed that Woodford's Neighbourhood Plan (NP) will be appraised against existing SMBC Core Strategy and UDP, because the LDP will not be finalised for a while.</p>	
<p>Woodford Neighbourhood Plan RB outlined WNF's consultation process with the residents, which led to identification of key areas and commissioning of studies, including, movement, housing, and wildlife. It has taken longer than originally envisaged.</p> <p>EF explained that the Norley NP had been used as the primary example because Norley is a small village in Green Belt with similar issues to Woodford. In addition, the NP has been approved by the council and an inspector and is now adopted. Other examples of NPs, which are approved and adopted, were also used as examples (Ardingly, Little Ashton, Chaddersley).</p> <p>SMBC commented that it appeared that WNF had tried "to be all things to all people" in the wording of the draft policies. Some of the policies appeared to try to go beyond what is allowable in Green Belt.</p>	
<p>Woodford NP Policy Review</p>	
<p>Environment EF explained that the Environment policies were being addressed first because they had been used as a model for the justification, evidence and referencing section.</p> <p>EF explained that the aim for the NP document is to have policies in one section and the justification and evidence in separate section. The general style and types of national and local policies referenced were reviewed and agreed by all to be appropriate. EF to check for any relevant European policies.</p> <p>The need for evidence and referencing had been referred to in SMBC comments. The WNF team felt that they had assembled a substantial amount of evidence to support the policies, but this had not been formally presented to SMBC with the policies.</p> <p>EF noted that there were three Environment policies with comments from SMBC. These were reviewed and amendments agreed (see below and Appendix).</p> <p>General discussion and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the policies are covered by national and SMBC policies. • In the policy section the referencing could appear as footnotes. • Proposed amendments to policies would be best presented to SMBC in track changes version. • The use of the terms supported/resisted may be better replaced with encouraged/discouraged. 	

<p>Specific policy amendments</p> <p>ENV1: WNF agreed to change the wording to include mention of Green Belt (see Appendix). SMBC UDP policy LCR1.1 has been referred to in the justification and evidence section.</p> <p>ENV2: WNF agreed to amend the wording to refer to the table of specific spaces rather the map (which is too non-specific). WNF needs to define the value of the open spaces listed. The word “around” will be removed from (b) because this would be land outside of our neighbourhood area.</p> <p>ENV3: Compliant. No changes needed</p>	<p>EF</p> <p>EF</p>
<p>Employment</p> <p>JC explained that she would lead the discussion, although the policies had been written by another member. There are few large employers creating opportunities in Woodford, but there is a very high level of working from home and small business enterprises.</p> <p>EMP1: SMBC expressed concerns that it might advocate new build in Green Belt and that employment is not one of the exceptional circumstances. WNF suggested that it could be reworded to restrict it to use of existing buildings.</p> <p>EMP2: SMBC suggested that the policy should cross reference SMBC policy AED 4 and be reworded to note that the applicant for any change of use should provide evidence that the employment use is no longer being viable.</p> <p>EMP3: SMBC explained that change of use is blind. WNF to consult NPPF paras 89 and 91. WNF might wish to think about renewable energy in reuse of buildings. For (d) 10 years might be a more appropriate timescale. Will consult legal people.</p> <p>EMP4: SMBC suggested the word “development” is removed. The policy is covered by existing policy which requires high design standards. (d) to be removed.</p>	<p>WNF</p> <p>WNF</p> <p>WNF</p> <p>WNF</p>
<p>Community</p> <p>JC explained that she would lead the discussion, although the policies had been written by another member.</p> <p>COM1: WNF to consider whether to make this site specific to the Community Centre, which would also introduce restrictions, or whether to delete the policy.</p> <p>COM 2: Title to be changed to “Protection of community facilities”, as only certain types of development allowed in Green Belt. WNF to provide the evidence to support the policy. Reword the last paragraph. Reference NPPF para 89.</p> <p>COM3: SMBC explained that DCLG have undertaken consultation, which will be reported on alongside the Housing White paper. Report expected in the autumn 2017. It is likely to allow communities to decide how funds are spent, including highways and affordable housing.</p>	<p>WNF</p> <p>WNF</p> <p>Deferred</p>

This policy should be parked pending the autumn statement.	
<p>Movement Time for detailed review had elapsed but there was a very brief review of movement and development policies. RB explained that WNF had identified that traffic safety was a major concern to residents and had produced a wish list of traffic improvements, which could potential improve the situation. Potential sources of funding had been mentioned at a liaison meeting, which included SMBC traffic personnel. EC explained that Sue Stevenson is very busy, but she will endeavour to find out with whom WNF should liaise to progress this while funds are available.</p>	EC
<p>Development Village boundary: WNF explained that they had not pursued the idea of drawing a village boundary to avoid ill feeling within the village from those within it who wished to be outside and vice versa. SMBC suggested that they will draw a suggested boundary. SMBC have criteria for what is a village.</p> <p>DEV1: WNF to provide referencing</p> <p>DEV2: to be deleted because it is outside the area</p> <p>DEV3: ? repeats NPPF?</p> <p>DEV4: is covered by NPPF under openness. Provide evidence.</p> <p>DEV5 and DEV6: appear to advocate significantly larger buildings. Should be reworded to follow NPPF make more compliant</p> <p>DEV8: this is already controlled under SPD and openness test. Policy needs to refer to front boundary. The justification is the character of area.</p> <p>DEV9: An enquiry is underway and aerial photography will be used.</p>	SJ
<p>Next Steps SMBC to let WNF know what we need to do to be ready to go to pre-submission stage, before Easter. WNF to specify what has been done and what still needs to be done. SMBC suggest that from a practical point of view, the NP consultation should not be at the same time as LAP or GMSF consultations. The NP would be better after these in order to avoid rewriting to comply.</p>	DJ WNF
<p>Housing White Paper SMBC will be providing a response. Open to suggestions from LAs</p>	
<p>Next meeting Thu 11th May 2017, 14:30 -16:30 in Small Hall at Woodford Community Centre</p>	