



Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

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

Email: woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com

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

Annual General Meeting

**25th October 2021, 8 pm, Small Hall Woodford Community Centre, Woodford, Stockport,
SK7 1PS**

Minutes

Attendees	Terry Barnes, Evelyn Frearson, Jane Sandover, Geoff Law, Mary Law, David Buszard, Helen Buszard, Kris Hayward, Robin Berriman, Judith Craig, John Knight, Paul Goodman, Paula Mott, David Mott, Maxine Wood, Valerie Shields, Kate Wardle-Davis, Jeremey Shaw, Jan de Vecchis, Cllr Brian Bagnall, John McGahan
Welcome	Terry Barnes (TB) opened the meeting and thanked everybody for attending.
Chairman's report	TB welcomed everybody to the meeting. He explained that AGM would be a short, formal meeting. It would be followed by presentations, including the Monitoring Report, local planning applications and updates on Local Plans. The main concern for the forum committee had been planning applications in the Neighbourhood Area. We had been consulted on approx. 50 applications during the last year, most of which we had supported. There had been a few where we disagreed with the SMBC decision. More details were covered in the Monitoring Report. We had continued to keep an eye on messages

	from Government. TB expressed his thanks to Evelyn Frearson and the management committee.																																													
Apologies	John Schulz, Jane Yates																																													
Approval of minutes of 2020 AGM	The draft minutes had been circulated to members via email. Approval was proposed by Kris Hayward and seconded by Jane Sandover																																													
Treasurer's report	<p>The accounts were presented by Robin Berriman and shown on the screen. There had been just one transaction, which was payment for the website.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p>WOODFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR TO 30 JUNE 2021</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">2021</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">2020</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">£</th> <th style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">£</th> <th style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">£</th> <th style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">£</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bank</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Balance 1 July 2020</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">914</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">1460</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Website renewal</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Referendum printing, banners, refreshments</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">488</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>AGM refreshments</td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">0</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">18</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">546</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Balance 30 June 2021</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 3px double black;">896</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 3px double black;">914</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">R B Berriman FCA 31 August 2021</p> </div> <p>Approval of the draft accounts was proposed Janet de Vecchis and seconded David Buszard.</p>		2021		2020			£	£	£	£	Bank					Balance 1 July 2020		914		1460	Website renewal	18		18		Referendum printing, banners, refreshments	0		488		AGM refreshments	0		40				18		546	Balance 30 June 2021		896		914
	2021		2020																																											
	£	£	£	£																																										
Bank																																														
Balance 1 July 2020		914		1460																																										
Website renewal	18		18																																											
Referendum printing, banners, refreshments	0		488																																											
AGM refreshments	0		40																																											
		18		546																																										
Balance 30 June 2021		896		914																																										

<p>Election of members of Management Committee</p>	<p>The nominations for membership were shown on screen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terry Barnes 2. Evelyn Frearson 3. Robin Berriman 4. Jane Sandover 5. Jude Craig 6. Janet De Vecchis 7. Zoe Jones 8. Maxine Wood Co-opted former resident 9. John Knight Co-opted Expert 10. Paul Goodman Co-opted Expert <p>Paul Rodman Corresponding</p> <p>Chris Coppock Corresponding</p> <p>TB explained that David Buszard and Roger Burton were retiring from the committee this time. TB expressed thanks to them on behalf of the committee. David Buszard had been part of the group who initiated the neighbourhood forum in 2013, both had served on the committee for eight years and played a big part in the development of the neighbourhood plan and Roger Burton had chaired the plan sub-group. <i>[Cards and gifts were presented to David and Roger at a later date]</i></p> <p>Nominations for the committee were proposed by Helen Buszard and seconded by Kris Hayward. No further volunteers came forward, so the committee membership was approved.</p>
<p>Close of AGM</p>	<p>8.30pm.</p>

Update meeting

Commenced following close of AGM.

Monitoring Report	<p>Evelyn Frearson (EF) gave a presentation on the Monitoring Report for the last year. She explained that we produced our first Monitoring Report last year. This year's report had followed a similar template. See slides 10-15 in the presentation, which can be found on the link at the end of these minutes.</p> <p>Review of planning applications and Implementation of WNP Policies</p> <p>There had been 50 applications in the neighbourhood area since the last report. We had looked at planning officers' reports to see how our plan was implemented. We had noted that WNP was not always acknowledged by applicants. The forum and the committee generally concurred on their view of planning applications with just a few where the forum objected but the applications were permitted. In some cases applications had been changed with the result that the forum's concerns were addressed. Limited infilling had been quite contentious. Good design is subjective and we may need to think about introducing design codes when we review the plan. The committee was generally happy with the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Implementation of Aspirations</p> <p>EF explained that we had looked at implementation of village aspirations, such as opportunities for walking and cycling and checked whether they were still relevant. There had been a huge increase in walkers during lockdown, which emphasised the importance of access to our lanes and footpaths and the increased safety for vulnerable users due to the Quiet Lane status of Church Lane and Blossoms Lane.</p> <p>Future tasks</p> <p>We would continue to look at the planning applications and keep an eye on changes in local and national policies. The plan has to be reviewed after 5 years, which will be 2024, or when the Stockport Local Plan is</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>adopted, whichever is the sooner. The neighbourhood plan will have to comply with new version of the Stockport Local Plan.</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>PG pointed out that we cannot control what planning applications are submitted but the policies in the neighbourhood plan will have an effect on what applications are submitted for those who are aware of it.</p> <p>Councillor Brian Bagnall acknowledged the large volume of work that had been undertaken and thanked Evelyn Frearson and the rest of the team for their hard work.</p>
<p>Local Plans Update</p>	<p>John Knight (JK) introduced himself as one of the forum’s planning advisors and former Chief Planning Officer for Cheshire East Council. He presented the update on Local Plans, Handforth Garden Village, Poynton Relief Road and Government Guidelines using the slides shown in the link at the end of these minutes.</p> <p>Stockport Local Plan (Slides 16-21)</p> <p>The Stockport Local Plan will be very important because Stockport Council opted out of GMSF. The SMBC website was giving residents a flavour of how the Plan will shape and setting out critical points. Many steps are involved, which can take years. The housing requirement figures of approx. 18.5 K were set by Government methodology. They were target figures and could easily change.</p> <p>SMBC had said they will apply a Brownfield First policy. SMBC had made concerted efforts to engage the more deprived areas of the Borough. They were aiming for a high quality of design and a contribution on all levels to climate resilience. Infrastructure was also very important, particularly in semi-rural areas like Woodford</p> <p>The Council had prepared a Stockport Borough Plan, which had more general topics than a Local Plan. Various meetings had been held with residents groups. On behalf of WNF, Evelyn and Jude had attended a</p>

	<p>meeting for representatives of neighbourhood forums outlining the core principles of the Stockport Local Plan. These core principles were very general, aspirational themes, rather than detail. SMBC had been awarded £90K through the property Tech Fund, which aims to make it easier for residents to engage with the planning process.</p> <p>Cheshire East Council Local Plan (Slide 22) Cheshire East Council had produced their Local Plan in two parts, part 1 was completed in 2017 and part 2 was currently being drafted. The part 2 document was the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD). A hearing for the SADPD was opened by the Planning Inspector on 12th October 2021. The Examination and remaining aspects of the hearing would follow into the New Year and 2022.</p> <p>Poynton Town Council had completed the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan some years ago, but some boundaries for Poynton set out in the SADPD may be different from those in the Neighbourhood Plan. If there were differences between the SADPD and the Neighbourhood Plan, then the SADPD would take priority for planning decisions in that area.</p>
<p>Handforth Garden Village</p>	<p>See slides 23-26. Handforth is one of four Garden Villages in the NW of England. The Planning Application had been submitted to Cheshire East Council over two years ago at the time of this meeting. A lot of new docs had been submitted to the website recently. It was still a live project. The applicant is also Cheshire East Council as it owns some of the land. The proposal includes around about 1500 houses plus retail. It would have a huge impact on the local transport system. Cllr John McGahan pointed out that the transport issues arising from new development emptying out on to the A34 would be enormous.</p>
<p>Poynton Relief</p>	<p>See slide 27 and 28. It was a joint project between Stockport and Cheshire East Councils. Graham was awarded the £26.5m contract. The road will be 3.5km long. The project would include upgrading two</p>

Road	junctions at Adlington Crossroads and Bonis Hall Lane, footway and cycleway facilities, two new bridges, and ponds for drainage. Graham had made good progress and was ahead of schedule. The aim was to finish in October 2022.
Changes to planning Regulations.	See slide 29. Planning Legislation had been changing frequently. The NPPF was revised in 2021 with a key emphasis on “beautiful”. Michael Gove had replaced Robert Jenrick as Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. There had been 45K objections submitted to the consultation on the revision of the planning system last year.
Places for Everyone	<p>EF presented the items on Place for Everyone, Save Greater Manchester’s Green Belt group and the Community Planning Alliance.</p> <p>See slide 30. Places for Everyone (PfE) was the new name for the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF)</p> <p>Stockport withdrew from GMSF in Dec 2020. The other nine councils had carried on to prepare a Joint Development Plan (PfE). An 8 week consultation ended in early October 2021. If it passes Examination in Public by a panel of Planning Inspectors, it will be adopted.</p>
Save Greater Manchester’s Green Belt group (SGMGB)	<p>See slides 31 and 32. SGMGB arose because of objections from residents all around Greater Manchester to GMSF. PfE still involves loss of Green Belt. SGMGB engaged Leith Planning to formulate a response to the proposed PfE as the response needed to be forensic in its approach and concentrate on the soundness of the proposed plan rather than “we don’t want any building on that piece of Green Belt”.</p> <p>SMGB objections to PfE:</p> <p>While some of the aims of PfE were supported by SGMGB, many of the policies seemed in conflict with the aims, Green Belt allocations remained, housing calculations were challenged, brownfield sites were overlooked, ability to fulfil affordable housing aims were challenged, long-term impacts of pandemic not acknowledge and ability to meet climate change targets was challenged.</p>

	Site specific challenges included flood risk, ecological harm, over development, inadequate infrastructure.
WNF response to PfE	See slide 33. WNF submitted a response to the Regulation 19 consultation on PfE which included the following points: another round of consultation was needed, it fails in Duty to Cooperate with Stockport Council, early stages of public consultation were inadequate, fails to address the needs of the rural economy and rural communities, development on the Green Belt sites is not sustainable development, plans for expansion of commercial and housing development around Manchester airport and to increase number of flights not sustainable or compatible with climate change objectives, the Bus Rapid Transit around Woodford should not be on a busway through fields. WNF supported positive aspects about environment and landscape.
Community Planning Alliance	See slide 34. This group aimed to bring together and support grassroots campaigns. Four hundred groups had joined to date. They represent a very disparate set of problems and campaign groups around the country. Members were lobbying to improve the situation.
Discussion and questions	David Buszard reported that he had attended the Poynton bypass consultation event and noted that it was apparently not known at that stage precisely how it would join existing road. Meeting closed at 9.20pm.

Evelyn Frearson, 25th September 2022. Many thanks to Jude Craig for notes taken during the meeting.

Further information can be found in the slides presented at the meeting, which can be viewed here: [WNF AGM and Local Plans Update Meeting](#) .