



Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

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

Email: woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com

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

Minutes of Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum Management Committee Deanwater Hotel 20th January 2023

Attendance	Present	Apologies received
Mr Robin Berriman (RBB)	√	
Mr Paul Rodman (PR)		Corresponding*
Ms Evelyn Frearson (EF)	√	
Mr John Knight (JK)	√	
Mr Paul Goodman (PG)	√	
Mr Terry Barnes (TB)	√	
Ms Jane Sandover (JS)	√	
Mrs Jude Craig (JC)		
Ms Maxine Wood (MW)		
Mrs Janet DeVeichis (JDV)	√	
Ms Zoe Jones (ZJ)		
Mr Chris Coppock (CC)		Corresponding*

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

1. Welcome

TB opened the meeting and welcomed those present.

2. Apologies

None received. JS explained that MW would be busy because she was preparing to move house.

3. Declaration of conflicts of interest

None.

4. Minutes from meeting held on 22 July 2022

Approved

5. Matters arising

EF reported that she had written to Emma Curle outlining some of the issues arising with notifications about planning applications. *[Post meeting note: A reply had been received suggesting a meeting between SMBC officers and WNF committee members, but due to members of both parties being on holiday at various times, no date had been arranged]* There had been an amicable exchange of telephone messages with Emma Curle about the officer's approach to the Bridle Road application, but the meeting was not mentioned.

It was agreed to go back to SMBC about the proposed meeting.

RBB suggested that, if a meeting with SMBC was arranged, the discussion should include notification of WNF by SMBC when applications that WNF have commented on are on the agenda for Area Committee meetings. It was a mystery why residents who have submitted objections are notified via email, but WNF is not.

JK suggested that WNF should enquire why Stockport planning officers only use the options of either refuse or approve. Other councils include the option of a list of conditions that they

recommend should be met before an application is approved.

Action: EF to draft a letter to Emma Curle copied to Jane Chase to say that we think a meeting would be a good idea and include the points raised above as the items WNF committee would like to include on the agenda.

6. Financial update

RBB reported that ZJ had donated £25 towards room hire. Members thanked ZJ for this contribution.

The balance of funds in the bank was £716.39.

7. WNF responses to planning applications

Updated tables for applications notified from 1st October 2021 to end of September 2022, and from 1st October 2022 to date had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The following were discussed:

No progress on shown on the SMBC website for the following:

DC/083867, Woodford Cricket Club, micro-brewery. *[Post meeting note: It is possible that the SMBC website had not been updated]*

DC/085607, New Hall cottage extension.

DC/085888, 40 Hall Moss Lane, 4 new dwellings.

DC/086482, Flora Cottage, 3 dwellings.

TB reported that he had heard that it had been called in to Area Committee and was to be developed by On Point Development [www.onpointdevelopments.com]. RBB noted that work was underway on the site. *[Post meeting note: EF checked the SMBC website again on 22.01.23 and the status was shown as registered but nothing about approval, so the website may not have been updated for this application, or work may have commenced on site preparation that did not need planning permission.]*

DC/087000, 34 Church Lane infill.

The committee noted that it had been expected to be withdrawn due to anomalies in the application form and EF had left it to the last minute to prepare a response. Searches on the land registry had shown that the land between 34 Church Lane and Dean Valley Farm was owned by Harry Harvey. The application raised concerns about infill in that area of the village.

DC/084051, Flag pole: application. Withdrawn.

DC/085065, 5G mast, Chester Road. Refused. Appeal rejected.

DC/086727 5G Mast, Verdon Ave. Refused. No appeal lodged according to website.

DC/084618, Bridle Road, 2 houses as infill, two rounds of amendments.

On behalf of WNF, EF had written to all councillors on Area Committee to highlight that the key point was non-compliance with DEV1 policy. Cllr Brian Bagnall made excellent contribution and identified the key point. Cllr Mark Hunter had supported refusal. The application was refused without progressing to Planning and Highways Committee. The WNF committee regarded this as a good outcome.

DC/086940, 1 Moor Lane/. Called in to Area committee 26 Jan.

The officer's report for the Area Committee, recommending approval, had been circulated before

the WNF meeting. EF noted that a neighbour had been very concerned and had made contact with WNF on the advice of Brian Bagnall. She was very grateful for the comments the committee submitted to the council. The volume increase compared with the original dwelling is very large (90%) but it has been extended previously. The officer's report notes this and presents the case for special circumstances. JS noted that amended plans were an improvement in terms of privacy for neighbours. PG noted that there were no effective grounds for objection. It was agreed that WNF committee would take no further action.

DC/085887, Redrow commercial Centre. Called in to Area Committee 26 Jan.

Documents for the Area Committee had been circulated before the WNF meeting. The discussion included noting: comments made by residents of the Woodford Garden Village; car parking for apartments is now included; the Aviator pub car park will be used for the shops as well; the layout will require shoppers leaving the premises to walk over grass, and questions over whether it will ever get built. It was agreed that WNF committee would take no further action.

DC/087514, 12 Jenny Lane extension. Deadline 24 Jan.

It was noted that neighbouring properties had been extended, and that plans for no.12 included strange backward tilting dormer window. The committee agreed that a No Comments response should be submitted.

PG enquired about the status of the applications for a new dwelling on land at back of 409 Chester Road. *[Post meeting note: This is DC/083007 which we were notified about on 8 Nov 2023. No decision is indicated on the SMBC website as of 23 Jan 2023, but it may be a little too early.]*

8. Review of process for handling planning applications

Prior to the meeting EF had circulated an email exchange with High Lane Neighbourhood Forum. They had five people in the planning team. One was responsible for circulating the notifications about the planning applications around the team. Another took responsibility for collating their responses and replying to SMBC. Their system of recording applications, status and policies cited by SMBC seemed very like ours. Extensions were generally okay and they had a "leave it to the neighbours" category. SMBC officers had asked them to assess against neighbourhood plan policies only and not NPPF or borough policies.

EF noted that we were currently in a quiet spell. There had been a very hectic spell in November last year when we submitted extensive comments on 7 applications in 3 weeks. These were not all extensions, but included two infill applications, a 5G mast, and a large extension with an elderly resident contacting us about it. EF noted that this had caused a difficult to manage workload.

There was a discussion about whether the process could be streamlined in the future. The November glut may have been a one-off, or it could happen again. The economic situation may result in a slowdown in planning applications, or alternatively more people may extend rather than move. JK noted that the High Lane category of "leave it to the neighbours" was a good idea.

EF reported that time-consuming parts of the current process included opening the documents on the SMBC website, downloading and circulating them around the team and then assessing the

application. JS and JK volunteered to continue to scrutinise applications as they do now. EF expressed gratitude for the work they do on that. Ways to reduce the load on EF were discussed.

Action: It was agreed that EF would continue to monitor the WNF inbox and circulate the notifications from SMBC to everyone on the committee. Members not in the planning applications subgroup expressed interest in continuing to receive notifications. For extensions, EF would not download and circulate the documents from the SMBC website, or assess them. This would save time. JS and JK would look at all notifications, including extensions, and highlight any that may have issues.

For applications other than extensions [*such as infill, demolition and rebuild, change of use, telecoms masts, and commercial premises*], EF would download and circulate the documents and look carefully at the applications as part of the assessment team.

EF would continue to monitor dates, prepare and submit responses to SMBC by the deadline, maintain a table of applications and their status [*and update the table on the website*].

Process to be reviewed after one year.

9. Government statements and consultations

PG and JK noted that planning was in state of flux due to changes at Government level. There was tension between departments responsible for planning and those responsible for nature and environment. This had created uncertainty, which was unlikely to be resolved until a general election. The WNF committee will not participate in the NPPF consultation.

10. Updates

10.1 Stockport Local Plan Update

PG and JK advised that it was not likely to progress before the local elections and publication of the revised NPPF. Stockport town centre work was progressing well. This was a help in the land supply equation.

10.2 Handforth Garden Village Update

PG had noted that the planning application was on the agenda for the Cheshire East Council (CEC) Strategic Planning Board on 13 January 2023.

It was a hybrid application. Outline permission had been sought for the new settlement with 1500 homes, commercial premises, village centre, and infrastructure. All detailed matters (appearance, means of access, landscaping, layout & scale) were reserved for subsequent approval. Full permission had been sought for initial works, including: ground remediation, re-profiling and preparation works; highway works; drainage works; utilities works; replacement A34 bridge works; green infrastructure works; and other associated infrastructure.

Approval had been anticipated by PG and JK. The WNF committee did not submit further representations.

[Link to the Reports Pack.](#)

Prior to the meeting EF had circulated the officers' report and a letter she had sent as a private resident to all councillors on the CEC Strategic Planning Board, requesting that they consider several key aspects, including mitigation measures for traffic congestion, biodiversity loss and carbon emissions.

EF had attended the four-hour council meeting as a spectator and reported back to WNF committee via email. Sonia Harrison (Save Danes Moss) had spoken in opposition. A Wilmslow councillor had made a speech raising concerns, including new residents travelling by car to Wilmslow station and schools. Two representatives of Engine of the North had spoken in support, listing the benefits of the development. Some of the councillors had asked very appropriate questions in the council meeting. It was noted that Engine of the North would be responsible for enlisting house builders. James Baggaley (Cheshire East Principal Nature Conservation Officer) had been called to the table to answer questions about biodiversity and mitigation measures. All councillors, except one who abstained, had voted in favour of granting permission and the application was approved.

The WNF committee discussed the implications. JK noted that he knew James Baggaley and believed him to be a very competent officer. It was noted that the request by councillors to bring forward the trigger points for several of the section 106 funds could pose a problem by front loading costs. There was speculation over whether the land had any value because of the section 106 costs. The issue of potential contamination from landfill and MOD activities was raised. The very curious situation arising because the developer was Engine of the North, which is part of Cheshire East Council, was noted, as was the issue of who would be the developer in respect of section 106 costs. Cheshire East Council did not own all of the land. Other land owners include MOD and Threeways Farm. EF noted that Gordon Yoxhall of Threeways Farm had reported that several developers had been pressurising him to sell his land that fell within the planning application site boundary. He had been resisting. It was believed that all the land involved in the works granted full permission was owned by Cheshire East Council, so work could commence soon.

10.3 Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document

JK reported that all previous policies were now superseded by policies in this plan.

10.4 Poynton Relief Road Update

TB reported that the opening day for the road, now called the Roy Chadwick Way, would be 3rd March, provided that the weather did not cause delay. BBC and Granada would be there. The event would include classic cars and Anson flyover. VIPs had been invited. It would be televised. The TV crews may be interested in the Roy Chadwick story. In common with other road openings, there would be events for walkers and runners before it was open to traffic. The company, Graham, had been good and like to leave a legacy. They had paid for the plaque commemorating Roy Chadwick. There are funds to compensate residents for noise from the road. PG noted that the junction with the A555 has 6 lanes. PG noted that Poynton town centre roads were in great need of repair. The new road may reduce through traffic.

10.5 Woodford Summer Fair 2023

EF and JS reported that the date is June 10th 2023. A sub-committee comprising Avril Furness, JC, JS, MW and EF were organising it. PR and his wife, Jo Rodman, had agreed to supply the ice cream via their organisation [Just Ice](#) based in Poynton. They have an ice cream trike for events.

TB noted that two Stockport Blue Plaques were to be sited in Woodford. One was to be fitted at the former home in Chester Road of champion [speedway rider Ivan Mauger](#). The other would commemorate the contribution of Woodford to world aviation (site to be decided). To mark the installation of these plaques, there would be a flyover on 10th June, which would be an added attraction at the Woodford Summer Fair.

10.6 Orchard on Woodford Recreation Ground

EF reported first noticing the community orchard in April 2022. There were fruit trees planted along the tarmac path and the tall fence on the A555 side of the ground. Notices stated that they had been planted by a group called Sustainable Bramhall, which has a presence on Facebook and Twitter. They described themselves as “A group for people living around Bramhall who are trying to reduce their impact on our world and live more sustainably”. No Woodford organisations were consulted about the orchard, which was a pity, but it was agreed that it was a good initiative nevertheless. Sustainable Bramhall had requested a stall at the Woodford Summer Fair via Peter Crossen (WCC committee member).

10.7 Places for Everyone Examination and SGMGB

The examination had started in November with the legal aspects and then moved on to consider the general [*thematic*] policies in the plan. It had resumed in January to consider the allocations, and would continue into March. EF had watched some of the hearing sessions and had been interested to watch the GMCA’s barrister, Christopher Katkowski (known as Kit Kat) in action. He had frequently stated in response to points raised by attendees that the examination was to test whether the plan was sound, not whether it could be made better.

PG noted that Kit Kat had put forward a request to remove sites at the beginning of process, but had been told by Inspectors that they would make that decision.

SGMGB had a representative in every hearing session. Marj Powner had been making good contributions on behalf of SGMGB [and/or *Save Carrington Moss*] as had Jackie Copley on behalf of CPRE. One of the Inspectors had become irritated with an objector who was an ecologist because he overran his time with a long list of inadequacies in ecology reports used to support the plan. [*Post meeting note: The Inspector had asked whether, despite this issue, thematic environmental policies in the plan would ensure that the allocation was sound if followed properly.*]

10.8 WCC

JS reported that the AGM minutes were in progress. TB to send his notes for Chairman’s Report. to JS.

JS noted that MW was about to move house, so needed TB to collect the WCC notice board which was stored in her barn.

10.9 Redrow/Harrow development

TB reported that he had heard that demand for houses has slowed. There had been issues with drains and electricity supply. The aim was to reduce from the 920 dwelling with planning permission to 850 plus an extra 500 at Avro Golf Club end of the site.

10.10 Avro Heritage Museum

TB reported that architect drawings for their new facility, which will house five aircraft, had produced a solution that Harrow and Redrow were happy with. The next step would be planning discussions with SMBC. Numbers of visitors to the museum were very high.

11 AOB

JdV reported that Roger Burton had said farewell because he had sold his house in Woodford and was moving further South.

12 Next meeting

Aim for April.

Evelyn Frearson 22 January 2023