

# Woodford United Exhibition

## Introduction to Woodford United

Woodford United is the working group set up by Woodford Community Council to harness the expertise, skills and energy of local residents to represent the community in its resistance to the current proposals of SMBC and Harrow Estates/Redrow to build 950 houses on the ex-BAE Woodford Aerodrome site.

Web site: [www.woodfordcommunity.co.uk](http://www.woodfordcommunity.co.uk) e-mail: [info@woodfordcommunity.co.uk](mailto:info@woodfordcommunity.co.uk)

Woodford United members include two ex-Chief Town Planners, four practising architects, legal support and a range of other professionals. It is working closely with local MP, Mark Hunter and local ward councillors, Bryan Leck, Brian Bagnall and Paul Bellis, as well as with representatives of the other local councils bordering onto the Aerodrome site.

Woodford United has recently conducted a survey of all local residents within the Woodford Parish to determine their opinions on this development proposal. The results of this survey are available here today. If you are a Woodford resident and didn't complete and return the survey, then please consider completing the brief questionnaire now.



*Woodford United Team Meeting*

If you wish to be kept informed on progress, then please complete a contact form available at this exhibition.

**We strongly recommend that you make your comments on the draft SPD within the Consultation Process as soon as possible (see back page).**

## Woodford United Recommendations

### Employment opportunities

The SPD should be based on Core Policies and guide development to ensure that a balanced approach is taken; inclusion of both residential and employment uses being made a requirement for the site. There should be provision of space for employment units to allow local people to develop their businesses and allocation of space for future business growth to support sustainable, local economic development. This will contribute to minimising traffic movements. The SEMMMS extension will make Woodford more accessible to the potential workforce and markets.

### Number of houses

The residential component of the redevelopment of the site should be more than halved to align with the Core Strategy. This is fully supported by Woodford residents.

### Transportation and sustainability

The size of the development should be smaller to reduce the inevitable traffic congestion and increased pollution caused by tripling the number of houses and where 950 of those would be on one estate with a single point of access/egress. The A555 relief road should be delivered together with the associated improvements in cycle-ways and bus routes, which should be a prerequisite to the re-development of the BAe site.

### Greenbelt preservation

We recommend the protection of the Green Belt and the preservation of its openness, the continued separation of the MEDS areas and an appropriate limit on the development area, which should not exceed the area of the two MEDS.

### Preservation of village character

The approach to any development on the site should respond effectively and sympathetically to the existing village in terms of scale and layout.

## Infrastructure improvements

The SPD states that there should be improvements to roads and public transport and that a primary school, a day nursery etc may be built. It does not state at which point these improvements and facilities will be provided, instead relying on developers to suggest phasing strategy in their planning application.

**Woodford United recommends** that more controls are incorporated into the SPD to ensure that:

- Boundaries are better defined and restrictions put in place to prevent any future encroachment into other areas to avoid development spread. For the avoidance of doubt, the SPD should clearly state that the proposed developable area on the SMBC side of the site will not exceed the currently developed area of MEDS A and B.
- A primary school is provided at a predetermined scale of development. Further discussion and agreement with existing primaries in the area are carried out to set these appropriate limits.
- Additional negotiation with the Local Health Trust results in accessible and local, additional medical provision and facilities.
- The developer must support a public transport service and assist negotiations with transport providers before development. Bus stops must be included in the development, and service to and from them guaranteed.
- The SPD should clearly state the maximum number of houses which can be built in advance of SEMMMS completion. Any additional development after that will accommodate additional access and egress points to the site.
- Any housing development must be balanced to include a suitable mix of property types, all of consistent high quality, throughout all stages of construction Not least this must take into consideration current local residents existing and potential requirements.
- Evidence must be available to demonstrate a concerted approach to attract the business community both locally and nationally.
- A formal agreement with any developer is reached concerning the upkeep and maintenance of public spaces and facilities, both now and in the future.
- All recreational facilities are identified and included as a pre-requisite in advance of other construction.
- Defined practices such as environmental matters and the minimising of impact on existing residents are defined and subsequently enforced during any site preparation or development, including but not be restricted to working times and access routes.
- The SPD clearly sets out developer liabilities and any future planning applications are compliant with these, and deviation is not permitted, if at the expense of public benefit.
- It is inappropriate for the SPD to quantify housing numbers without a formal infrastructure plan and inclusion of a directive which addresses the above issues.



## Jargon explained

### CORE STRATEGY DOCUMENT

SMBC's "Bible" for the development of the aerodrome. This is the result of a lengthy consultation process, it is approved by an independent inspector and it is the document upon which all planning applications are considered.

### MEDS

Major Existing Developed Site. The Core Strategy requires that any new development should not occupy a larger area of the site than existing buildings.

### SPD

Supplementary Planning Document. This offers guidance and direction to anyone with an interest in developing a site and should draw on established policies, such as those in the Core Strategy, and set out the aspirations for Stockport to reflect local and Borough wide needs over the forthcoming years.

### NPPF

The recently introduced National Planning Policy Framework has overarching requirements for any development.

### GREEN BELT

The NPPF defines the Green Belt as having the principle purpose of preventing urban sprawl. In preparing the Core Strategy the Council has found no evidence that a strategic review of the Green Belt is necessary to meet development requirements up to 2026.

### SEMMS

The South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (A6 to Manchester Airport Link Road.)

### UDP

The Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (adopted 31st May 2006) forms part of the current statutory development plan for the Borough. From 1st April 2011, following adoption of the Stockport Core Strategy, certain policies, particularly those applying to development in the Green Belt or the MEDS, will still be those of the UDP.



## What you can do to help change this situation

### Respond to the consultation

You can do this online on the SMBC web site: [www.stockport.gov.uk/woodfordspd](http://www.stockport.gov.uk/woodfordspd) (click on consultation portal).

Or you can send your response by email or post to:

**The Planning Policy Team  
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
Place Directorate  
Stopford House  
Stockport  
SK1 3XE**

**Email: [planning.policy@stockport.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@stockport.gov.uk)**

**Fax: 0161 474 2610**

**Please don't just assume that someone else will write. It is vitally important that as many people as possible put pen to paper! Your opinion counts, please let it be heard!**

### Copy your response to:

- our local councillors
- our MP, Mark Hunter
- the press
- Woodford United

**Our local councillors:** Paul Bellis, Brian Bagnall and Bryan Leck

[cllr.paul.bellis@stockport.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.paul.bellis@stockport.gov.uk) 12 Penrhyn Cres., Hazel Grove, Stockport. SK7 5NF T. 07851 120795

[cllr.brian.bagnall@stockport.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.brian.bagnall@stockport.gov.uk) 4 Bramhall Park Road, Bramhall, Stockport. SK7 3DQ T.0161 439 1569

[cllr.bryan.leck@stockport.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.bryan.leck@stockport.gov.uk) 236 Church Lane, Woodford, Stockport. SK7 1PQ T. 0161 439 3137

**Our MP:** Mark Hunter. [mark.hunter.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:mark.hunter.mp@parliament.uk) Hillson House, 3 Gillbent Road, Cheadle Hulme, SK8 7LE

**Woodford United:** web site: [www.woodfordcommunity.co.uk](http://www.woodfordcommunity.co.uk) email: [info@woodfordcommunity.co.uk](mailto:info@woodfordcommunity.co.uk)

Post: Woodford United, c/o Woodford Community Centre, Chester Rd., Woodford, Stockport. SK7 1PS

**MEN News editor:** Sarah Lester Email: [newsdesk@men-news.co.uk](mailto:newsdesk@men-news.co.uk)

### Examples of points which are legitimate objections

- Failure of SMBC to comply with their own policy
- Loss of Green Belt
- Lack of employment opportunities
- Impact on local services and facilities
- Impact on infrastructure
- Impact on village character

**Note:** Loss of a view from your property, impact on the value of your house or local business, criticism of Harrow as a company and personal opinions or comments about Harrow staff or SMBC staff are not legitimate objections to the proposals.