



Stakeholder Workshop Synopsis

Woodford Garden Village
Harrow Estates
July 2013



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Workshop 1.....	5
Workshop 2.....	7
Workshop 3.....	9
Conclusions & Next Steps.....	12
Appendices.....	13



Executive Summary

Harrow Estates held three stakeholder workshops at Woodford Aerodrome on Wednesday 3rd July 2013, regarding the proposals for Woodford Garden Village.

Relevant elected representatives; stakeholder groups; and those who had participated in Stockport Council's consultation on the developing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), lived within Stockport MBC and asked to be kept updated about the developing plans for the site; were invited to attend one or all of the workshops (Invitation attached at Appendix 1).

In total over 250 invitations were distributed, resulting in each of the three workshops being fully subscribed, with all those wishing to attend one of the workshop being able to do so. However, participants felt that there was a "weight of opinion" within Woodford and that more people would have liked to attend the sessions than were able to.

All three workshops were facilitated by consultation specialists PPS Group, with other relevant consultants in attendance to provide participants with information in relation to their specialisms.

The first workshop, Landscape and Design, was led by Planit Intelligent Environments – who are responsible for developing the overall masterplan for the site.

The second workshop, Community Facilities and Phasing was led by Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners – who are responsible for ensuring that the scheme accords with all national and local planning policy requirements.

The third and final workshop, Transport and Movement, was led by Peter Brett Associates – who are responsible for assessing the likely impacts of the development upon the local road networks and other movement within and around the site.

All three workshops followed the same format (Agendas attached at Appendix 2). A brief introduction to the structure of the sessions was provided and the objectives of the workshop were explained. An overview of the topic was then provided by the lead consultant for each of the sessions. Participants in each of the workshops were split into three groups for breakout sessions where the issues were discussed in detail with each other and a member of the Harrow Estates project team. Each group was asked to present its thoughts to the rest of the workshop at the end of each session.

It was agreed that information would be recorded in the groups – but also – through feedback presented by the groups to other attendees. This was recorded in front of all attendees by PPS and 'agreed' by other participants.

The report below highlights some of the feedback and discussions and many of the highlighted points made – but in turn – in the appendices (Appendix 3 and 4) – you can find copies of all of the lists made by each of the breakout groups as well as points recorded by PPS as a synopsis of points captured.



Workshop Attendees

Workshop 1 Landscaping & Design	Workshop 2 Community Facilities & Timing	Workshop 3 Transport & Movement
Rev David Russell	Cllr Alanna Vine (Bramhall North ward)	David Withington
John Cooke	Rev David Russell	Rev David Russell
Cllr Debbie Heywood (Adlington Parish Council)	John Cooke	John Cooke
Mr Hanson	Cllr David Moss (Adlington Parish Council)	Alan Bramwell
Mrs Hanson	Mr Hanson	Cllr David Moss (Adlington Parish Council)
Robin Brammar	Mrs Hanson	Mr Hanson
Stephen Taylor	Robin Brammar	Mrs Hanson
Stephen Balfour	Stephen Taylor	Robin Brammar
David Greenwood	David Greenwood	Stephen Taylor
David Buszard (Woodford Community Council)	Paul Rodman (Woodford Community Council)	Stephen Balfour
Paul Rodman	Robin Berriman	David Greenwood
Robin Berriman	Phil Horton	Paul Rodman
Cllr Lillian Burns (Prestbury Parish Council)	Cllr Lillian Burns (Prestbury Parish Council)	Robin Berriman
Kathryn Wardle-Davies	Andrew Freeth	Cllr Lillian Burns (Prestbury Parish Council)
Edward Wardle-Davies	Cllr Lisa Walker (Bramhall North ward)	Cllr Lisa Walker (Bramhall North ward)
Roger Burton	Jane Sandover	Jane Sandover
Cllr Bryan Leck (Bramhall South ward)	Judith Craig (WWMCC)	Brenda Mercer (WWMCC)
Cllr Lisa Walker (Bramhall North ward)	Mandy Anderson (Queensgate FC)	Roger Burton
Cllr Philip Hoyland (Poynton Town Council)	Bruce Poizer (Queensgate FC)	
Jane Sandover		
John Kennedy		

Workshop 1 – Landscape & Design (12-2pm)

It is important to note that at the outset of the first workshop, time was dedicated (at the desire of the participants) to explore the structure, purpose and rationale of the workshops. Queries were raised in relation to invitations, timing of the event and clarity regarding the use of, and recording of, feedback given. Such a detailed discussion did not take place at each workshop as many of the participants were consistent throughout the day.

The main focus of the conversations during the first workshop related to how the development and its residents would integrate into Woodford and this was the most frequently raised topic when each group was asked to report their feedback to the wider workshop:

- Group 1 – *The development should integrate into Woodford and not be separate*
- Group 2 – *The development should integrate into Woodford*
- Group 3 – *How will the development draw existing Woodford residents into the site?*
- Group 3 – *The development needs to avoid ‘ghettoisation’*



Linked to the focus on the site’s integration into Woodford was how the access arrangements between the site and Chester Road would be developed. Although transport and movement was a topic for Workshop 3, participants felt that the design of the access arrangements needed to be carefully thought through:

- Group 1 – *Suggestion to divert Chester Road behind Bodycote*
- Group 2 – *The treatment of the connection onto Chester Road has to be carefully considered*

Another popular theme concerned the management of the proposed open spaces and landscaped areas within Woodford Garden Village. Participants felt that thought would need to be given to how the spaces would be maintained and who would be responsible for its management:

- Group 1 – *Clarity is required regarding the stewardship of open areas and landscaping*
- Group 2 – *The management of green spaces needs to be thought through*

There was also general agreement that the location of the proposed business units towards the south of the site should be reconsidered. It was felt that the potential for HGVs accessing the business units and travelling through the development was not desirable:



- Group 2 – *Location of the business units to the south of the site could encourage HGVs to drive through the site*
- Group 3 – *“the business units should be located in the north of the site, not the south*

Each of the three groups also provided a wide range of feedback that wasn't consistent across the board:

Group 1

- *Is a pub required on site?*
- *The newschool is supported but a concern that there isn't sufficient space for a driver drop-off*
- *Query the lack of facilities for 11 – 17 year olds*
- *Harrow Estates should consider existing residents with regards to views directly into the site. The company could hold individual meetings with those residents*
- *The total footprint of the site is larger than anticipated*

Group 2

- *The school has to be centrally located*
- *The layout of Runway Park needs to be considered*

Group 3

- *The name of the development is frustrating*
- *The blending of existing woodland to the south of the site into new landscaping needs to be considered*
- *Query the potential for renewable energy/sustainability of the development*
- *Query risk to the Vulcan from vandalism*
- *Access to the golf course should be considered*
- *The housing density in the north east of the development is too high*
- *Preference for green spaces near to Bridle Lane*
- *The housing design should be varied and reflect the designs already in Woodford*
- *Landscaping should be planted early to reduce visual impact from Poynton and Adlington*
- *Severed footpaths should be reconnected*

As can be seen from the above the workshop produced a variety of comments in relation to landscaping and design. How views into the site both from its immediate vicinity and further afield were raised as was the amount of development proposed for the site. Access through the site was a key consideration for Group 3.

Workshop 2 – Community Facilities & Timing (3-5pm)

In contrast to the first session, there was greater consistency among feedback provided by each group during the second workshop. The most frequently raised subject from all three groups related to affordable housing, with participants offering a number of suggestions about the type of affordable housing, location on the site and the amount of affordable housing that the scheme could support. The subject was such a focus of much of the discussions that it was suggested that a specific workshop was required to decide what the community's preferences were.

In addition to the physical location and type of affordable homes on the site, participants also felt that residents of the affordable housing would benefit from some of the wider community facilities discussed during the workshop, such as public transport, medical facilities and employment. The feedback included:

- Group 1 – *The development should have specific areas for starter/retirement homes*
- Group 1 – *The affordable housing should be 'pepper potted' across the scheme*
- Group 1 – *The affordable housing element should include shared equity*
- Group 2 – *Residents of affordable housing could require additional support, such as employment; public transport, extra healthcare, leisure*
- Group 2 – *The integration of affordable housing and their residents needs to be considered both in a physical sense and socially*
- Group 2 – *The 40% target for affordable housing is too high*
- Group 3 – *Affordable housing requirement should be the subject of a specific workshop*

The provision of sporting facilities as part of the development was equally important to those participating in the workshop, with all three groups raising a number of suggestions about the type of sporting facilities and how they are managed. There was a consensus that whatever sports facilities were included, they should be able to operate all year round and include adequate changing facilities:

- Group 1 – *Sports facilities should include changing facilities. Other considerations should also be given to: all-weather sports pitches; bowling green; tennis courts; toilets*
- Group 2 – *Sports facilities at the site should consider: car parking; astroturf; be located at the south of the site; management of them should be long-term and sustainable*
- Group 3 – *Sporting facilities will need changing rooms and adequate parking. They should not compete with existing provision*





- Group 3 – *Drainage to sports fields will need improving*

There was also support from participants for a new medical centre and additional community facilities on the site. However, there was disagreement amongst the three groups about whether additional community facilities should be provided as part of the scheme or could extend existing provision:

- Group 1 – *Recognition of the need for new medical/pharmacy facilities*
- Group 1 – *Extra community centre should be provided either at existing places or on site*
- Group 2 – *The doctor's surgery is a priority*
- Group 3 – *It is important that the medical facility is on the ground floor. Demand is increased due to a lack of car parking at existing facilities in the area*
- Group 3 – *A new community centre represents the best opportunity for integration of the new community and this should enhance existing facilities*
- Group 3 – *A potential land swap for enhanced communities?*
- Group 3 – *A skate park or similar for older children should be provided*

The final area of agreement amongst the groups related to access through the development and beyond:

- Group 2 – *Bridleways through the site are wanted*
- Group 3 – *Bridleways and footpaths desired*

A wide range of other comments were made in relation to community facilities and timing:

Group 1

- *A pub/café/bar should be located to the north of the site to improve integration*
- *Query on-site renewable energy such as an Anaerobic Digestion Plant*

Group 2

- *A single-form primary school should be provided*
- *ATM at the site*

Group 3

- *Public transport provision does not currently reflect need. New bus service should penetrate the depth of the development, not just service the entrance to the site*
- *Chester Road should be improved – permeability/crossings*
- *The Vulcan requires suitable care and preservation*



Workshop 3 – Transport & Movement (6-8pm)

The final workshop provoked the most discussion in relation to the issues that were important to the immediate community, with much of the conversation focussed upon the need for very detailed information to be provided about the potential traffic impacts of Woodford Garden Village, public transport provision in the area and proposed traffic calming.

Level of information

There was broad agreement amongst participants that Harrow Estates should provide detailed information about the potential impact of traffic from Woodford Garden Village during the next stage of public consultation. It was felt that to enable the local community to have a full understanding of the likely traffic impacts, an understanding of the modelling, traffic surveys and predictions should be provided alongside the results of the assessment:

- Group 1 – *Query the accuracy of the traffic flows presented at the workshop, especially towards Poynton*
- Group 1 – *Modelling of the site entrances onto Chester Road needs to be carefully considered. Particular thought should be given to the impact on current road users and on new residents trying to leave the site*
- Group 2 – *Residents require trip data for the whole day to be able to take a view on the potential impact of the scheme*
- Group 3 – *It is felt that there wasn't enough information provided during the workshop to allow an informed decision to be made*
- Group 3 – *Harrow Estates should consider the temporary traffic impacts whilst SEMMMS is developed*
- Group 3 – *The model shift to cycling presented at the workshop is overstated*

Public Transport

It was agreed by participants of the workshop that proposals for additional public transport options was positive. However, the groups raised a number of points that they felt Harrow Estates should take into consideration when any proposals for new public transport provision is made:

- Group 2 – *Harrow Estates should be aware that there is currently minimal bus services to Poynton Secondary School*
- Group 2 – *The group felt that there were pro's and con's to having any proposed bus service travel through the site rather than stop at the entrance of the development*
- Group 2 – *Would Harrow Estates subsidise new bus routes?*
- Group 2 – *Query whether an in-site shuttle bus should be considered*

- Group 3 – *Proposals to improve public transport are welcome – but the lack of joined-up decision-making between Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority and Cheshire can be problematic*
- Group 3 – *Improved car and cycle parking at Bramhall and Poynton Train Stations should be considered*
- Group 3 – *The direction of travel of new residents needs to be considered in light of the ‘step-change’ in fare increases between Bramhall and Poynton*

Traffic Calming



Another topic that generated interest was the proposed traffic calming measures, particularly along Moor Lane. Participants wanted to understand the rationale for proposing this and also offered their thoughts about the type of traffic calming measures to be introduced:

- Group 2 – *Query the impact on air quality of proposed traffic calming measures*
- Group 2 – *Query whether speed cameras should be proposed instead of traffic calming, especially along Moor Lane and Chester Road*
- Group 2 – *Question the ‘shared space’ concept and impact that this would have on traffic flows*
- Group 3 – *The rationale for proposed traffic calming along Moor Lane and changes to routes and roads should be provided to residents*
- Group 3 – *Traffic calming should be provided through speed restrictions not carriageway restrictions*

On-site Traffic

A number of participants expressed concern about traffic associated with the business units, located towards the south of the development, travelling through the site:

- Group 1 – *Concerned about the number of HGV movements to and from the business units, especially driving past the school*
- Group 3 – *Traffic travelling through the site and particularly the business units should travel around the edge of the development and not through it*

Poynton Bypass

The remaining common topic of discussion related to the proposed Poynton bypass and how this could relate to Woodford Garden Village in the future:

- Group 1 – *Query the potential for an access onto the site from the proposed Poynton bypass*



- Group 2 – *More information is requested regarding the potential impact and linkages from the proposed Poynton bypass*

Other Suggestions

Some other suggestions were made by participants regarding future transport provisions associated with Woodford Garden Village:

- Group 2 – *A roundabout should be considered for access onto Chester Road from the site*
- Group 3 – *Proposed cycle routes are positive but ‘pinch points’ on local roads could be a problem and any cycle route on Bridle Road would only be safe if it was on the footpath*
- Group 3 – *All Woodford residents should receive any travel plan information provided to new residents of the development*



Conclusions & Next Steps

The feedback received from the three workshops has provided Harrow Estates and its consultant team with valuable information that will be considered as an outline planning application is developed.

Some of the feedback challenges views that have been expressed during the previous SPD consultation and also more recent discussions with statutory authorities.

Wherever possible the suggestions made during the events will be incorporated into the final masterplan and within the next public consultation process for Woodford Garden Village.

The feedback presented within this document and the project team's response will be included as part of a Statement of Community Involvement that will be submitted to Stockport MBC as part of the outline planning application for Woodford Garden Village.



Appendix 1 – Workshop Invitation

Dear Resident

Woodford Garden Village – Invitation to Participate in Workshops

I am writing to invite you to take part in the second stage of consultation regarding the Woodford Aerodrome site, which will take the form of discussion-based workshops held at the Woodford Aerodrome on Wednesday 3rd July.

In May 2012 Harrow Estates were part of a public exhibition to understand the community's views about the potential for development and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document. Over 1000 people attended the exhibitions and many completed feedback forms. Following approval of the SPD in January of this year, the role of managing public engagement and consultation has now transferred to Harrow Estates.

At this stage we will not be presenting definitive solutions but providing information in order to inform a discussion and debate. We intend to hold public exhibitions with the details of our planning application later in the year. Each workshop will follow a similar structure and has one of three themes. These themes have been identified from the feedback received to date and are designed to encourage debate and discussion with our specialist consultants on issues of importance for the local community. Invitations to participate in these workshops have been issued to those Stockport residents who previously participated in the Council led workshops in 2010, along with stakeholder and representative interest groups.

Overleaf, you will find a list of themed workshop sessions, dates and times. Please read through the synopsis of the workshops, along with the guidelines in order to select the workshop(s) which best suit your interests. You must then notify us of your attendance, so that we can allocate you a space at the session.

We very much hope you will be able to take part in the workshops. Should you have any queries, please call us on 0800 170 1418.

Yours sincerely

Jennie Daly

Managing Director, Harrow Estates



Appendix 2 – Workshop Agendas

Workshop 1 Agenda



WORKSHOP TOPIC ONE Landscaping and Design

AGENDA

Time	Activity
1. 12pm to 12.15pm	Arrival and refreshments
2. 12.15pm to 12.30pm	Overview and workshop parameters
3. 12.30pm to 12.45pm	Project overview/ design synopsis
4. 12.45pm to 1.15pm	Group work in key areas
5. 1.15pm to 1.40pm	Feedback from groups
6. 1.40pm to 2pm	Conclusions



Workshop 2 Agenda



WORKSHOP TOPIC TWO Community Facilities and Timing

AGENDA

Time	Activity
7. 3pm to 3.15pm	Arrival and refreshments
8. 3.15pm to 3.30pm	Overview and workshop parameters
9. 3.30pm to 3.45pm	Project overview / design synopsis
10. 3.45pm to 4.15pm	Group work in key areas
11. 4.15pm to 4.40pm	Feedback from groups
12. 4.40pm to 5pm	Conclusions



Workshop 3 Agenda



WORKSHOP TOPIC THREE Transport and Movement

AGENDA

Time	Activity
13. 6pm to 6.15pm	Arrival and refreshments
14. 6.15pm to 6.30pm	Overview and workshop parameters
15. 6.30pm to 6.45pm	Project overview/ design synopsis
16. 6.45pm to 7.15pm	Group work in key areas
17. 7.15pm to 7.40pm	Feedback from groups
18. 7.40pm to 8pm	Conclusions