

Woodford Neighbourhood Plan – Summary of Representations made to the Examiner

All representations including attachments are available to view in full on the Council's Consultation Portal at:

<https://consultation.stockport.gov.uk/planning/woodford-neighbourhood-draft-plan/>

Some respondents have reference numbers in order to protect personal data.

Name	Organisation	Comment on Neighbourhood plan
Jane Sandover		DEV 6 Policy: I think the one metre gap (c) should be flexible as my side extension cantilevers out by 300mm and still retains the original feel of 1927 property
Response 682660445		protect the greenbelt and the environment and the ecosystems
Christopher Hayward		ENV5 Policy All new flood/security lighting should be restricted to the lowest level of brightness consummate with adequate function.
Response 932298323		Responded by multiple choice questions
John Colburn		DEV9: This could make the density of properties too dense and affect other parts of this consultation like noise and air pollution, so I oppose such development.
Response 389219465		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 1037529372		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 588688933		Responded by multiple choice questions
DAVID AUDEN		Dev9: BACKLAND/TANDEM SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED AS MOST OF THE LAND IS GREEN BELT.
John Kennedy		Responded by multiple choice questions
Chris Coppock		Responded by multiple choice questions

Response 12130860		Responded by multiple choice questions
Emily Hrycan	Historic England	Historic England welcomes the content of these policies within the Neighbourhood Plan for Woodford. It sets out an appropriate framework and manages the future of the Plan area's heritage assets in line with the requirements of the NPPF.
Response 286111738		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 430652144		<p>ENV2 Understand that new housing development necessary but existing approved plans will already 'change' the village. Further development will be catastrophic.</p> <p>EMP1 Transport is already a problem and stretched to there limit in this area, even with the new developments on the A34. Any new development has to take this into account</p> <p>EMP2 Already limited local opportunities.</p> <p>COM1 Very limited community facilities which relies heavily on local raised funding.</p> <p>COM2 The existing facilities have developed over time for the village and they attract large numbers of people from outside the village so local neighbours can enjoy them, without resorting to using cars etc.</p> <p>DEV1 Existing plans for new housing stock already will massively change the village. Enough us enough.</p> <p>DEV2 Thus will need to be in keeping with existing buildings.</p> <p>DEV3 Affordable housing for locals essential as houses have been 'over inflated' in Woodfird.</p> <p>DEV4 Essential that housing of all sizes available not just '5 bedroomed executive' houses.</p> <p>DEV6 Poor planning decisions results in poor outcomes when it comes to extensions on houses.</p>
John Chambers		Responded by multiple choice questions
Brian Bagnall		Responded by multiple choice questions

Val Shields		<p>ENV1 Preferably, I would prefer no further development in Woodford. I propose that the Woodford Garden Village has already more than contributed to loss of green belt and open space .</p> <p>ENV3 Totally agree on all counts</p> <p>ENV4 Hoping that we do not reach the point where these measures are necessary</p>
Response 32950761		<p>EMP3 Further to this I would not want to see increased traffic on any of the local roads giving access to Woodford from the Bramhall, or Cheadle Hulme directions.</p> <p>COM1,2,3 DEV 1,2,4,5,7,9 Further to this I would not want to see increased traffic on any of the local roads giving access to Woodford from the Bramhall, or Cheadle Hulme directions.</p> <p>DEV3 I don't believe that Woodford is a suitable place to develop affordable housing in general terms because there is no transport infrastructure and little in the way of suitable employment opportunities. Affordable housing should be developed near to train or tram services and within commutable distance of centres of employment, educational and medical facilities, shopping facilities using public transport. Bus services are not suitable infrastructure as they do not provide the required frequency or capacity for commuting or the school run, and therefore local car traffic would increase as a result of any housing developments. Further to this I would not want to see increased traffic on any of the local roads giving access to Woodford from the Bramhall, or Cheadle Hulme directions.</p>
Judith Craig		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 701663586	The Coal Authority	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.
Response 285431853	Richborough Estates c/o Savills	Please find a copy of our written representation to the Woodford Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Version on behalf of Richborough Estates.
Response 214318688	Wallace Land Investments	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>WOODFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN</p> <p>I am writing in response to the ongoing consultation in respect of the Woodford Neighbourhood Development Plan. Wallace Land Investments (Wallace) have</p>

		<p>previously submitted representations to the Neighbourhood Forum, including in relation to the 'PreSubmission Consultation' in June 2018. I enclose a copy of those representations as the majority of our comments remain the same, albeit the Revised 'Draft' National Planning Policy Framework is indeed now adopted. I would be grateful if the enclosed comments could be reviewed and taken into account by Stockport MBC in their consideration and assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP).</p> <p>We understand and acknowledge the uncertainty surrounding the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) and in turn the delays to the preparation of the Local Plan. However, we continue to be concerned that the NP does not look to the future, it simply looks back to the adopted and outdated Core Strategy. As per paragraph 30 of the new NPPF, once the GMSF and/or the new Local Plan are adopted, any policies relating to Woodford and specific sites will replace and overrule the NP. Much of the hard work by the NP forum will therefore be wasted.</p> <p>Overall Wallace Land Investments fully support the Woodford Neighbourhood Plan, and have sought to offer constructive comments where possible to ensure that it meets the basic conditions required for it to go to referendum and be made.</p> <p>It is our strong view that, to meet the basic conditions, the plan will need to take account of the GMSF and wider strategic needs in Stockport, rather than relying on a localised need assessment, which is out of date in any event.</p> <p>Our original representations demonstrated how more larger scale housing development (beyond the 20-25 dwellings supported in the plan) will deliver a series of economic and other benefits which will help to support the wider aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan, not least the protection and support of local businesses and community facilities.</p> <p>We trust the above and enclosed representations are clear but should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
Response 271375037		GDPR
Response 75573829		GDPR
Response 913164075		Responded by multiple choice questions

Response 985637686		ENV2a is vague. It could be argued that some development has no detrimental impact by unscrupulous developers. ENV4 Replacing trees etc. should not be accepted. Many trees were felled for the new by-pass and supposedly replaced elsewhere. This does not help the area in Bramhall where natural features and parkland have disappeared. Do not allow this in Woodford
Response 913884915		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 422929671		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 735042561		ENV1 The development will cause more road air pollution. Try reading your own tweets about traffic and pollution ENV2 Has no effect on green space. Where are all the people going to go.. ENV3 Basically your going too build it and not care. Cash counts ENV4 Your just talking nonsense now. Mass house building will effect all the environment around it EMP1 If they are shops they will need delivery from HGV EMP2 Any employer can make a business not look viable if it's in there interest EMP3 Who is going to police the no heavy vehicles and parking. Stockport Council don't do it now
Evelyn Frearson		DEV3 In practice this policy will very rarely be implemented while Woodford is in Green Belt because the threshold will rarely be reached through limited infill, barn conversions and other permitted development in Green Belt. DEV9 It is important to set criteria because consultation with residents revealed that backland development was not favoured.
Jean Barnes		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 237485138		Responded by multiple choice questions
Response 985829871		Responded by multiple choice questions
Stephen Ford		Responded by multiple choice questions
C Paul Rodman		Responded by multiple choice questions
John Ambrose Cooke		Responded via multiple choice questions
Response 29411427		EMP1 'Small scale', must mean actually small, not relatively small.

		DEV4 Claims of inability to be reused or having outlived useful life should be rigorously investigated.
Ann Wood		Responded via multiple choice questions
Response 135733281		Responded via multiple choice questions
Malcolm Evans		Responded via multiple choice questions
Mary Robinson MP		Responded via multiple choice questions
Mark Jones		COM1,2 Would expect any actions in this area to include consideration of requirements and/or impact of "Woodford Garden Village" residents
Response 111874268	GVA HOW Planning	<p>ENV1 Policy ENV1 lacks any robust justification to determine why the 'important local views' are identified for protection. The evidence base that justifies this approach is deficient, considered to be highly subjective and does not contain the justification for the specific viewpoints identified for special protection. The evidence base is the Woodford-Landscape-and-Environment-Report-Part-1-September-2018. PLSL's site is considered within this document under two separate character areas: • Central Woodford, Area 5; and • Central Woodford, Area 7 The document, produced on behalf of the WNF, does not follow a clearly stated methodology . PLSL object to an evidence base document that supports a range of environmental policies within the plan, including ENV1 which seeks to protects views and vistas, yet does not properly cross reference view point locations on plan or photographs. Having specific regard to the assessment of Area's 5 and 7. The report states that there are 'treasured' views of the distant Pennines from many locations. Such statements are highly subjective and should not form part of the NP evidence base. PLSL also note that the Greater Manchester Green Belt Assessment assesses the Woodford area as part of parcel SP-BA03 and it is judged to have a sense of urban encroachment as a result of the existing development/housing, new development and the transport infrastructure through this landscape. Furthermore, PLSL's own studies of the area, undertaken by fully qualified Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment consultants (see Appendix 1), conclude that wider views to their site are limited by the surrounding landscape, vegetation and generally flat topography. Limited long distance views are available from the surrounding landscape due to the lack of highly elevated topography. Although development would be outside of the</p>

		<p>limits to development for Woodford, it is considered that while a change in the local landscape character would be noticeable due to the change from agricultural fields to the proposed development, the predicted change would be relatively small due to the limited extent of the views and the proximity of existing housing to the eastern, southern and western boundaries. It is considered that the landscape mitigation offered would integrate the scheme into the local landscape and the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the landscape character of the area. Views of the development from the wider area are filtered and screened by the intervening buildings and surrounding mature hedgerow and tree boundaries and surrounding curtilage vegetation.</p> <p>ENV2 Policy ENV2 lacks robust justification for the countryside and green spaces identified. It identifies all of the land at Hill Top Farm, Woodford (Areas 5 and 7) in conflict with the draft allocation for housing in the emerging GMSF. The Policy defines what is effectively the whole of Woodford as Countryside and Green Space, seeking to prevent all development that might have a detrimental impact on defined areas. Areas 5 and 7 should be removed from the policy.</p> <p>DEV3 Policy DEV3, should demonstrate general conformity with the adopted development plan and emerging SLP. No justification is provided for seeking 50% affordable housing when the current adopted plan requires 40% affordable housing. Indeed, the NP evidence base document: Housing Needs Assessment recommends that there is no requirement for a specific affordable housing policy in the NP. PLSL has several fundamental concerns relating to this evidence base document. The Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) dates back to July 2015 and this is already some 3 years out of date. The HNA bases its findings on the 2008 Greater Manchester SHMA and 2010 Update and assesses the need between 2011 and 2026 (which does not align with the NP duration of 2018 to 2033). It has not been updated to consider the more recent assessments undertaken and published by Stockport Council and Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) , nor emerging government guidance on assessing housing need. Furthermore, the forthcoming revision to GMSF will be supported by a revised evidence base, which the NP cannot take into account by attempting to run ahead of the strategic plan for the area. As such PLSL consider</p>
--	--	--

		that the evidence base and methodology for the HNA is out of date and the weight that should be afforded to it is limited. Before the draft NP is finalised and submitted, an up-to-date HNA should be undertaken and the draft NP reviewed accordingly. The NP should follow, rather seek to pre-empt, emerging strategic policy. Given these fundamental concerns regarding the HNA methodology being out of date, this representation does not go into specific detailed comments on the methodology utilised other than to object to any weight being given to an out of date HNA.
Response 247648584	The Daylesford Trust c/o Emery Planning	Letter submitted by Emery planning on behalf of client, The Daylesford Trust.
Response 928376771	Mr and Mrs Petch c/o Emery Planning	Letter submitted by Emery planning on behalf of client Mr and Mrs Petch
Response 357740405	Garners Farms Limited c/o Emery planning	Letter submitted by Emery planning on behalf of client Garners Farms Limited.
Response 209971922		GDPR
Response 786438358	Manchester Airport	Letter submitted by Manchester airport

GDPR* Respondent has requested that their data be protected.