



Prestbury Parish Council

REPORT ON A DISCUSSION IN PRESTBURY PARISH COUNCIL ABOUT THE SUBMISSION BY POYNTON LAP SUB-GROUP ON THE BAe WOODFORD SITE DEVELOPMENT

After a series of unfortunate factors - including the time pressure on the work of the Poynton Local Area Partnership BAe Woodford sub-group, the short consultation period associated with the recent BAe site exhibition and the fact that the Cheshire East Councillor on the sub-group was not until recently a member of Prestbury Parish Council - we regret that there has been a mixed background of responsibilities for our lack of involvement in the work of the sub-group. The Parish Council resolved at its June meeting to have greater interaction in future with the Poynton (LAP) than it has to date.

Until our meeting on 14 June, which was after the close of the consultation, we had received no feedback or presentation in relation to the work of the sub-group, although we note that the terms of reference requires this. Prestbury Parish Council has not been able, for all these reasons, to make a contribution to the work so far, other than a written response to the key issues made at a late stage of the work of the sub-group, "RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF PRESTBURY P.C. TO BAe WOODFORD AERODROME CONSULTATION".

At our meeting on 14th June, we discussed the sub-group report which had been circulated to members a few days before the meeting. We recognised the good work done by the sub-group in producing a consensus, we agree with many of the conclusions, but were unable to join in that consensus because of several differences of view on the issues involved.

We would make the following comments on our differences with the sub-group report. We hope that our response will contribute to the subsequent discussions and detailed evaluation of future planning options.

1. We are concerned that the sub-group has endorsed the need for "a Relief Road". Prestbury P.C. has never taken a view on any part of the SEMMMS 'Relief' Road scheme or any other "Relief Road" and, before doing so, would seek the opinions of its residents, many of whom have expressed concerns about potential impacts of building new roads in the past, and we would wish to see traffic surveys and forward traffic estimates. We concluded that, in our opinion, if the site were sufficiently well designed, there should be no need for additional road infrastructure outwith the site.
2. Our submission also differed from the LAP submission in that:
 - We did not support "*retention of the site in employment use as the preferred option*" (para 10.1)
 - We pointed to the Foresight review's recommendation in respect of a likely appropriate balance between employment and housing which is higher than the percentage favoured by the LAP.
 - While we concur that Option 3. offered the best basis for a scheme, we expressed concern about potential poor land use in one of the scenarios that promoted low density housing, whereas the LAP submission speaks very favourably about this proposal.
 - We mentioned the need to provide affordable housing and cater for walking and for senior citizens and called for bus services plus playing fields and a nature reserve
 - We expressed reservations about a park and ride site

Prestbury PC would like these points to be considered in the future process.

Arthur Dicken, Chairman

15 June 2011