



## **Woodford Community Council**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 JUNE 2012 AT THE VICARAGE, CHESTER ROAD, WOODFORD**

#### **PRESENT**

Mr P Rodman	Chairman
Mrs H Buszard	Secretary
Mr R Berriman	Treasurer

Mr R Beatham, Mr R Brammar, Dr D Buszard, Revd J Knowles, Cllr B Leck, Mr S Taylor and Mrs M Wood.

By Invitation: Mr K Coxey, Mr P Goodman and Mrs S Shierson.

#### **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr P Crompton and Mrs M White.

#### **1. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES**

The Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 2 May 2012, were approved.

#### **2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

##### **Minute 4 Woodford Litter Day**

The Chairman reminded members that the Litter Day was being held on the following Saturday – 9 June 2012 – and hoped that they would be there in support.

#### **3 FINANCIAL UPDATE**

The Treasurer reported that the paperwork had been completed for the closure of the NatWest bank account and that the balance of £1020 would be paid into the new Barclays account.

#### **4. SUB-GROUP REPORTS**

##### **(a) Development of Woodford Aerodrome**

Consideration was given to the development plans put forward at the two Public events on 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> May. Cllr Leck pointed out that these were entirely Harrow/Redrow proposals, despite the fact that the invitations had been sent out on behalf of Stockport and Cheshire East Councils and their

logos appeared on all the exhibition boards. This was a matter of concern to Stockport Councillors, who had not been kept informed about the proposals by the Council officers. There was a worry that some officials were too close to the Harrow/Redrow team and questions would be raised.

It was noted that there had been general public opposition to the proposals, as evidenced by comments made at and after the events and in subsequent emails and letters sent/copied to the WCC. The main complaints related to the excessive number of houses proposed, with the knock-on effects on local roads and services, to the detriment of the character of Woodford. There were objections to the assumption that the two MEDS would be joined together (particularly since this plan appeared to include 25% more land than the two separate MEDS). There was also a feeling of anger and betrayal that the original proposals suggested by Avro Heritage – which had been generally been welcomed and approved – had been completely ignored and that Woodford would simply end up with a huge housing estate with little in the way of amenities for the community. Another emerging concern was the knowledge that Harrow/Redrow had been communicating with Cheshire East about the possibility of building up to 1000 houses at the Poynton end of the site in return for providing help to build the Poynton relief road. This would of course mean that Cheshire East would have to relinquish Greenbelt land, although it was still running a couple of years behind SMBC in producing its Core Strategy.

Mr Goodman reviewed the overall structure of planning law and expressed concern that whilst SPDs were intended as design guides, the purpose of which was to supplement policies laid down in the Core Strategy, there were no policies about the former BAE site at Woodford in Stockport's Core Strategy. He also noted that the Allocations Development Plan, the document that could allocate the former BAE site for housing, was not going to be produced by Stockport MBC to the timetable already announced. In addition, SMBC would have to introduce a Community Infra-structure Levy in line with the new Government policy. This would require builders of individual houses to pay a levy on each new house built to be spent for community benefit. It was not known when the Council would introduce the Levy. It was agreed that these points could be raised by the local Councillors and also queried by the WCC.

**ACTION:** Secretary

There were indications that the SPD was to be issued very shortly, which would mean that the six-week consultation period would take place over the summer holiday period. It was agreed that this would not be appropriate, since it would be a very long and detailed document, requiring in-depth study to understand all its ramifications. Local councillors had already suggested to SMBC that the document be put before the Area Committee at its meetings in both July and August and considered by the Planning/Highways Committee on 13 September and only then released for public consultation. It was agreed that WCC should also write to the Chief Executive of SMBC seeking clarification of the timescale.

**ACTION:** Secretary

A more general discussion then took place regarding the proposals and the various scenarios that could result. It was recognised that there would inevitably be housing on the site, but the main concern was to ensure that the site was not over-developed and reflected existing housing within Woodford.

Following these discussions, it was agreed that the WCC should take the lead in representing the views of Woodford residents and working towards an outcome that would be best for the community. It was suggested that the existing Sub Group could be expanded and strengthened by harnessing the enthusiasm, skills and expertise of members of the local community, so that it could speak with one voice for Woodford. Members of the WWMCC had already offered their services and an e-Newsletter would be sent out as soon as possible to explain the current position and invite volunteers willing to make a positive contribution to join the Working Group.

**ACTION:** D Buszard

The possibility of holding a community meeting to allow residents to air their views was suggested and it was felt that this could be very helpful in agreeing a cohesive strategy, which would be supported by residents. However, it would need to be carefully managed, so that a positive outcome would be achieved.

In addition, it was noted that once the SPD had been circulated for public consultation, Paul Lawrence (SMBC) had agreed to attend a public meeting in Woodford to explain the content and significance of the document and answer questions. The timing of this meeting, which would be arranged by SMBC, would obviously depend on the issue date of the SPD.

Mr Taylor suggested that it might be helpful to prepare an online pro forma type of response, which people could use to submit their views to the MP, local councillors and SMBC officials. He also felt that a type of blog could be added to the website to provide the latest information, e.g. on actions taken by WCC or the Working Group or outcomes thereof, as expeditiously as possible. He offered to follow up the practicality of these suggestions, which could then be taken on board by the Working Group.

**ACTION:** S Taylor

Finally, it was noted that the Poynton LAP (Local Area Partnership) BAE Woodford Working Group was likely to be reconvened shortly and it was agreed that WCC representatives should attend.

**(b) SEMMMS**

The Secretary referred to an email received from Shafaq Hussain, SMBC officer, regarding his request to attend a WCC meeting to present aspects of the design scheme for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. He had also commented that public consultations were being planned in various locations, including Woodford, later in the year and that these would enable residents to provide comments and feedback on the proposals.

**5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was proposed and agreed unanimously that Mr Coxey should become a co-opted member of the WCC.

**6. DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS**

The next three meeting were scheduled as follows.

- Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> July
- Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> August
- Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> October

The venues would be confirmed later.

Thursday, 29<sup>th</sup> November was confirmed as the date for the 2012 AGM.

*Approved* ..... *Date*.....