



## Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

c/o Woodford Community Centre, Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1PS

Email: [woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com](mailto:woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com)

Web: <http://woodfordnf.co.uk>

### Minutes of Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum Management Committee

Woodford Community Centre, 7:30 pm, 27th November 2019

Attendance	Present	Apologies received
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)	√	
Mrs Dorothy Chesterman (DC)		√
Ms Jane Sandover (JS)	√	
Mrs Jude Craig (JC)	√	
Ms Maxine Wood (MW)		√
Mrs Janet DeVeichis (JDV)		√
Mrs Doreen Neil (DN)		Corresponding*
Ms Zoe Jones (ZJ)		
Mr Chris Coppock (CC)		Corresponding*

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

<b>1. Welcome</b> TB opened the meeting and welcomed those present.
<b>2. Apologies</b> JDV, MW
<b>3. Declaration of conflicts of interest</b> None.
<b>4. Minutes from previous meeting on 22 July 2019</b> Approved.
<b>5. Matters arising</b> JK noted that JW Lees is progressing with the pub on the Redrow site.
<b>6. Financial update</b> RBB reported that the balance stood at £1102 at the financial year end and was £932.31 at the time of the meeting, following payment of expenses for flyers and AGM refreshments. JK raised the issue of future funding of WNF. The potential for matched funding was discussed. <b>Action:</b> All to think about future funding opportunities.
<b>7. AGM review</b> It was agreed that the AGM had gone well and was well attended.

## 8. WNF responses to planning applications

Some of the more controversial applications were reviewed:

- Development adjacent to **Windy Ridge on Bridle Road** refused. This concurs with WNF opinion. An appeal was expected.
- Development in garden at **10 Jenny Lane** permitted. This is contrary to WNF opinion.  
**Action:** EF to try to ascertain the reasons. [See post meeting notes 1]
- Replacement of large house at **124 Woodford Road**. We misinterpreted the Green Belt boundary. We took up the opportunity given by Jane Chase to revise our response accordingly.
- Change of use of **Oliver's restaurant** into two dwellings. WNF response to raise a number of issues of concern. RBU noted that the developer is the owner, the credentials of the applicant are not our concern and the team should focus on the planning policy issues.
- Change of use of outbuildings into dwellings at **Flora Cottage**. It was agreed that this is a brownfield site. WNF response should mention issues around access for vehicles and need for highways assessment, and that the application does not mention WNP. It was noted that the dwellings are described as bungalows. [See post meeting notes 2]
- It was agreed that we should monitor SMBC decisions and comments on those applications where we have submitted a response.

**Action:** EF to draft WNF responses and track down SMBC comments on PAs.

## 9. Monitoring

PG and JK explained that WNF is required to produce an annual report in relation to policies in the WNP. This could include:

- WNF responses to Planning Applications.
- Any relevant changes in government policies.
- Progress on implementation of Village Aspirations.

JK suggested that we could review one WNP policy and present it at the AGM in 2020.

**Action:** EF to continue to update the spreadsheet of responses to planning applications.

## 10. Implementing WNP policies and Village Aspirations

RBU reported back on follow up on interaction with Sustrans and SMBC Walking and Cycling officer. After an initial conversation in 2018, Sustrans produced a report and suggestions for promoting cycling in the village. This was less locally focussed than had been expected and included a proposal to close Hall Moss Lane in order to take through traffic out of the village. It was agreed not to pursue their ideas further.

EF reported on a presentation on the [Stockport Local Fund](#), which Cllr Brian Bagnall had alerted us to, and which was attended by TB, JS and EF. Funding is available to support local initiatives to help communities. Two ideas were explored at the meeting which are relevant to our aspirations:

- An event at the Community Centre for local community organisation to exhibit their roles (an idea that arose at a WCC meeting).
- Improving accessibility of the country footpaths through Woodford in conjunction with

Crazy Legs, a private organisation who organise chip-timed events.

The council officer thought that both these ideas were suitable for an application for funding.

**Action:** Committee to follow up on these ideas.

## **11. Updates**

### **10.1. WCC**

JS reported that the constitution had been revised and updated to be more inclusive, and was to be submitted for approval at the AGM on 28 Nov 2019 (the following day). The website was to be updated next year.

### **10.2. WWMCC**

JC reported that the bonfire had achieved record attendance and record profits, but had also produced a number of problems, including traffic jams, long queues at the entrance gates, over-crowding on site and flying embers from the bonfire. A review meeting was planned for the committee and key residents who help on the night.

### **10.3. GMSF**

PG noted that the strategic plan may be a broken model. There was an update on 17<sup>th</sup> November giving priority to two pieces evidence on viability and transport, respectively. New ONS projections were expected to be published in February.

### **10.4. CEC**

PG and JK noted that:

- Planning permission on development on land near Hazelbadge Road had progressed, but the section 106 agreement had not been signed. There are costs relating to retention tags, engineering on site and the carpark for school.
- The new CEC team would like to review the development plan. There is opposition to some of the supplementary sites in Green Belt, especially in Bollington.
- The contract had been signed for the Poynton Bypass and preliminary works was expected to start in 2020.
- The NCGV may be deferred. There is little interest from developers.

### **10.5. SGMGB**

EF reported that the organisation had grown since GMSF2, which had reduced total Green Belt loss, but had spread the losses around more small sites. This had resulted in an increased number of communities affected and new Save the Green Belt groups had joined Save Greater Manchester's Greenbelt group, bringing the total number of member groups to around 50.

Particularly active groups include:

- Royton who had taken on a statistician to analyse the way the housing numbers had been calculated. He concluded that, because GMSF covered 19 years and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) covered only 15 years, this inevitably produced a short fall in sites before the end of the plan period. GMCA had also omitted to take account of large windfall sites. Members of the Royton team had been invited to present

their analysis to the Mayor and members of the GMCA team.

- Friends of Carrington Moss have been focussing housing, climate and air quality and on pushing for greater Government and local authority knowledge of what the housing need is, especially with regard to social housing. They could find no national policy for Homes England. They achieved a meeting with Esther McVey, who was Minister of State at the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government at the time.

### 10.6. Avro Heritage Museum

TB reported that a Shackleton would be arriving at the museum in May 2020. It would be housed eventually in a glass building. Meanwhile, they had the use of the CAE (aviation training) building.

**Next meeting:** February 2020

Evelyn Frearson 21 February 2020

### Post meeting notes

#### 1. Nanny annex at 10 Jenny Lane

We learned from Steve Johnson after the Stockport Forums meeting that the nanny flat was considered to be associated with the existing dwelling and not a stand-alone dwelling that could be used separately. He thought this would be the reason that it was granted permission.

#### 2. Definition of bungalow

From RICS: <https://www.ricsfirms.com/glossary/residential-property-types-definitions/>

“Originates from India and Bengal. Described simply as a low house having one storey.

Ward v Paterson [1929] 2 Ch 396 defines a bungalow is a building of which the walls, with the exception of any gables, are no higher than the ground floor, and of which the roof starts at a point substantially not higher than the top of the wall of the ground floor, and it does not matter in what way the space in the roof of a building so constructed is used (per Romer J.,

Chalet bungalow used to describe bungalows with upper rooms set in the roof usually with dormer windows.”

#### 3. Definition of sui generis use

From: [https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Sui\\_generis\\_use\\_class\\_in\\_planning](https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Sui_generis_use_class_in_planning) The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order categorises uses of land and buildings. Developments may not be used for purposes that are not within the use class for which they received planning permission. Changing the use of a development from one class to another may require planning permission, although changes of use may be permitted without the need for a planning application for certain allowable uses (for example changing a restaurant into a shop - see permitted development). ‘Sui generis’ buildings are those that do not fall within any particular use class. The Latin term 'sui generis' means 'of its own kind'.

Sui generis buildings include:

- Theatres.
- Houses in multiple paying occupation.
- Hostels providing no significant element of care.
- Scrap yards.
- Petrol filling stations and shops selling and / or displaying motor vehicles.

- Retail warehouse clubs.
- Nightclubs.
- Launderettes.
- Dry cleaners.
- Taxi businesses.
- Amusement centres.
- Casinos.
- Data Centres