



<b>DATE:</b>	Tuesday, 19 <sup>th</sup> April 2016
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Room 133 – Civic Centre
<b>TIME:</b>	17:30 – 20:00
<b>CHAIR:</b>	Councillor Ian Potter
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Borough of Poole: Stephen Thorne (ST), Richard Genge (RTG), Nick Perrins (NP), Clare Taylor (CPT) Bob Lister (BL) – Poole Beach Huts Association, Brian Finch (BF) – Friends of Harbour Reach, Clive Bartlett (CB) – Poole Old Town Conservation Group, Gerald Rigler (GR) – Society of Poole Men, Graham Whitehall (GW) – Lilliput and Neighbourhood Association, Terry Stewart (TS) – Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, Wayne Hancock (WH) – Branksome Park, Canford Cliffs & District Residents Association, Chris Allenby (CA) Poole Quays Forum, Ken Bearcroft (KB)
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Sue Ludwig (SPL)
<b>GUEST SPEAKERS:</b>	Councillor Michael Brooke (MB), Bill Constance (BC)

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
1.	Arrival and Refreshments	
2.	<p><b><u>Introductions</u></b></p> <p>ST welcomed all to the meeting, introduced Councillor Ian Potter as the Portfolio Holder for Planning &amp; Regeneration and requested around the table introductions.</p> <p>ST advised that two speakers, Councillor Michael Brooke and Bill Constance, had been invited to give an overview on the Neighbourhood Planning Forums and the importance of having these.</p>	
3.	<p><b><u>Broadstone Neighbourhood Plan Update – Councillor Michael Brooke</u></b></p> <p>MB circulated the Neighbourhood Plan at the meeting and explained regarding the Regulation 14 Consultation and Supplementary Guidance Document. The six week consultation has commenced and MB gave an overview of other documents, which accompany this such as the consultation statement and evidence based document. MB advised that a housing needs assessment had been carried out, as there are Natural England protection areas. The number of housing supply in Poole's plan is 730 – 780 housing units. There are considerably less restraints with a 5 year supply document, which goes with the plan.</p> <p>MB explained in full the method in which the forum arrived at this stage. The process commenced four years ago. In 2011 the decision to implement a Neighbourhood Forum was made. A team was formed after a year. MB explained regarding Ward Boundaries and the problems that were experienced. Government legislation changes made it difficult in pushing the plan forward. The pitfalls of being the first Neighbourhood Forum with differences of opinions with the Council were felt. Options were</p>	

**Item 3 contd...**

opposed, which would cause problems further down the line. MB expressed that Rebecca Landman (Policy – BoP) has been extremely helpful and requested that ST pass on the forums' gratitude. MB advised regarding Broadstone and the options for the town.

It was noted that, previously, they did not have the regulations documents but now have these to push things forward. The Neighbourhood Forum Plan has been worked on since February 2013, monthly meetings have been held, together with drop in sessions and the AGM. It has been a long process to set up the Neighbourhood Forum. However, MB stated that this has been a worthwhile exercise.

When the Super Unitary comes into effect, there will be no Parish and Town Councils and, therefore, we have to move fast if a Forum is to be formed.

Health and Basic Needs Assessment have to be carried out by an independent consultant and this is still required.

The timings are dependent on Council and response from consultation. An analysis will need to be carried out once the data from the consultation has been received. It could be that timings will need to be adjusted. The consultation ends on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016 and will then be submitted to the Council, who may need to then carry out their own Consultation. It is anticipated that the process will be complete by the end of the year.

It was noted that the forum meeting dates can be found on the Local Link Magazine, Website, advertised on Public Notice Boards, Family Fun Days etc.

Area Committees were discussed, MB advised that there is a database held and stated that this is not a large database.

Beach Development was discussed; it was felt that this is not making any headway. MB advised that this is unknown, as this has so many issues surrounding it.

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
	<p>MB stressed that if anyone has their own forum they have to fit in with the Councils National Planning Policy and Strategy.</p> <p>ST advised that the Neighbourhood Plan has been through the process in accordance with the Core Strategy in order to shape Poole's own environment. ST gave an overview of how to get supported depending on residents and area.</p> <p>MB explained regarding the Local Plan and expressed that this is a very good plan. MB advised that a forum has to have a core team, the minimum requirement is 21 people, MB has 31 people in the team. However, people do drop out whilst others join. 18 of the team members meet regularly. The team selection comes from representatives of organisations, e.g., Neighbourhood Watch amongst others. These are selected from each District of the Wards.</p> <p>Community Activity working in partnership with the Council.</p> <p>MB advised that the website address is: <a href="http://broadstoneneighbourhood.uk/">http://broadstoneneighbourhood.uk/</a>            (click here for ease of access)</p>	

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
4.	<p><b><u>Poole Neighbourhood Plan Update</u></b></p> <p>BC gave a presentation on Poole Quays Forum Neighbourhood Plan, which is a Regulation 15 submission in March 15. BC distributed a copy at the meeting. Please click here to view:  <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B80X9nid5K8Wc214bVFka1hqQ2c/view?pref=2&amp;pli=1">https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B80X9nid5K8Wc214bVFka1hqQ2c/view?pref=2&amp;pli=1</a></p> <p>BC explained that the consultation is being extended due to issues being experienced, this is in hand.</p> <p>BC gave an overview of the Urban Design Artist who has been employed in respect of a possible Maypole and the design of the Guildhall.</p> <p>The plan is aimed at Poole people working in partnership with Borough of Poole.</p> <p>The next Poole Quay's Forum meeting is scheduled for 24<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and will be held at the RNLI. The invitation is sent out to numerous people.</p> <p>The issue of parking charges in Poole Town Centre was raised. It was felt that two hours free parking should be introduced in a bid to encourage visitors to Poole to boost the traffic. MB agreed with this and advised that this is being discussed with the Town Centre Management Group and explained in detail.</p> <p>ST enquired regarding the Boundaries between the Broadstone and Poole Forums, how do we draw the boundaries? MB explained regarding the Conservation Group and Hamworthy Group working together. It was noted that the surrounding areas are major Regeneration sites.</p> <p>BC expressed concerns regarding the size of the area and complexity plus the number of people in the area.</p> <p>BF felt that Poole Quays Forum has flaws and that there is a lack of consultation. There are issues with the areas being missed out of consultations. It appears to be Poole Quays specific and does not feed the rest of the community.</p> <p>ST advised regarding defining the community, we need to draw the line somewhere. The community is bigger than the ward boundary. It was noted that the Council has concentrated efforts into ensuring wards are sensible.</p> <p>ST enquired regarding the process, sharing between the forums and overcoming issues. Both forums are talking to each other. BC added that MB has been on the mailing list for years, since day one, and attends all of their meetings. It was noted that this works very well.</p> <p>ST enquired if there was an appetite for another Neighbourhood Forum. It was felt that the process is so complicated and time consuming with a lot of voluntary work involved that the general feeling is no but there is a lot of respect for the ones that are progressing.</p>	

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
	<p>ST thanked BC and MB for the insight and congratulated them for the progress so far. BF enquired regarding Government legislation and advised that he had heard that the open space was going to be sold. ST stated that he is not aware of this legislation and that it would be the Brownfield sites that would be encouraged to be utilised.</p> <p>BF asked that with the way Planning is going, is there any point to Localism? ST responded with information on the consultation that has been carried out on behalf of the Unit by NP. The process is being streamlined. The Government will continue to support the Neighbourhood Forums. ST also explained regarding the provision of housing and releasing land quickly.</p> <p>BF asked as to which takes precedence. ST responded that both future plans for the Neighbourhood Forums will be taken into consideration.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Planning Policy Update</u></b></p> <p>NP gave an overview of the Planning Policy updates. In 2015, there were various SPD's, which were adopted and are now up and running. The Poole Development Plan, which is in connection with the Poole Core Strategy, is now in progress.</p> <p>NP outlined the Evidence Base, which is 710 homes per year up to 2033. There are plans to accommodate additional homes by using various options surrounding the capacity to build more homes. The summer consultation will look at key sites and growth options/strategy. How we should be developing Poole and developing character. This consultation will be run in the summer, date to be confirmed but it is anticipated that this will be June/July before the start of the summer holidays.</p> <p>GR felt that the number of houses is ridiculous for the Poole area. The timetable for the consultation would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Summer Consultation.</b></li> <li>• <b>Plan preparation – draft format</b></li> <li>• <b>Public Examination.</b></li> <li>• <b>Adoption in 2018</b></li> </ul> <p>GR enquired as to whether the Core Strategy has overtaken the one adopted in 2015. NP responded that this is correct.</p> <p>The merging of the Councils and the possibility of prejudging ahead of this was discussed.</p> <p>RTG advised that from the planning application point of view there is a high risk if work stopped on the Local Plan Review prior to the Super Unitary. The query of whether we would need to re-do all of the work following the Super Unitary was raised. ST advised that a conversation would need to be held to review this. A refresh of the evidence base would need to be carried out. ST gave an overview of the 5 year land supply. It is imperative that this is in place to prevent spurious planning applications from developers being given permission by the Planning Inspector.</p>	

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
	<p>It was noted that the Core Strategy is essential.</p> <p>The matter of employment was raised. It was felt that, with 710 homes per year being required, there would be issues such as a lack of employment for the number of people in the new homes. NP responded by advising that all development needs are looked at and employment needs are all part of the plan. It was noted that with the current situation with the EU, we would have to wait to see what happens.</p> <p>The matter of pressure on developers to develop available land/sites was discussed. NP state that we cannot push too far at this stage.</p> <p>The evidence base has to be sound and understood. Calculations to get to the 710 per year document showing the figures will be circulated by NP.</p> <p>The Newsletter was queried; ST/NP stated that the next one is due to be released imminently. A link to the website, where people can register to receive this is here: <a href="https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/UKPOOLE/subscriber/new">https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/UKPOOLE/subscriber/new</a></p> <p>ST outlined in full the SHMA, which is in respect of Open Space) and explained that the evidence base has been accepted.</p> <p>BC raised that subject of the impact of the Local Plan on the Neighbourhood Plans. NP responded that their plan works in with the new plan. NP advised that we will need to ensure that this works. It could have an impact. There could be some necessary changes around the town centre.</p> <p>ST added that the two plans would be integrated as we go forward. It's about a partnership between the Forums and Borough of Poole; we have to work together on this. The timescale for the revised Local Plan is anticipated for Spring (March/April) 2018.</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>Community Working Group Summary of 2015 – 2016</u></b></p> <p>ST enquired around the table for any input in respect of the Community Working Group Summary for 2015 – 2016. No volunteers came forward.</p> <p>ST advised that approximately 100 invitations were sent encouraging people to this meeting. However, only 10 people accepted. ST enquired if residents still want to continue with the Community Working Group. BF stated that the major representatives are around the table and that the information gets communicated out to other groups. The representatives of the groups are happy with the engagement of Borough of Poole and would like to continue with these groups.</p> <p>GR stressed that he wished there was a link to Transportation and feels that improvements need to be made in that area of communication. It was generally felt that Area Meetings should be restored. Numerous people feel that further groups for other areas of Borough of Poole, such as Transportation, should be implemented.</p>	

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
	<p><b>Item 6 contd...</b></p> <p>The issue with the Beaches Plan was raised; it was felt that this is the same as three years ago and that residents' objections are being ignored. It was thought that a planning application had been received on one area of the Beaches. IP stressed that there had only been one planning application, as far as he is aware, and that just because an application is received does not mean that it will get permission.</p> <p>GR advised that a complaint had been put into the Borough of Poole and no response had been received. The subject of Community involvement to replace Area Meetings was discussed. Residents have not been consulted on. ST stressed that this matter is not for this meeting, it deals with the bigger picture.</p> <p>It was noted that there are a lot of positives with this meeting; the Forums have come a long way. CA made it clear that these meetings are for asking questions, not to complain about administration matters.</p> <p>It was noted that, from a Political point of view, Councillor Drew Mellor is the contact for Transportation. It was unanimously agreed the Community Working Groups would be kept.</p>	
7.	<p><b><u>Community Working Group Membership Refresh</u></b></p> <p>The Community Working Group Membership Refresh was outlined by RTG and this was discussed, all members who are currently on the list are happy to continue and Ken Bearcroft will be added.</p>	
8.	<p><b><u>Questions and Answers</u></b></p> <p>ST gave an update regarding the Poole Power Station site. ST stressed that frustration has run high to make something happen on this site. Met last year with Gallaghers, who were delaying progress. ST gave them six months to sort this out. In October 2015 ST pushed for information and stated to Gallaghers that he would recommend a refusal. Gallaghers withdrew their application in November 2015. Since then, no contact has been received.</p> <p>ST/RTG met with a company called Atlas (acknowledged planning service) who looked at the site. After a 6 hour meeting, Atlas went out of their way to get the development on the Homes and Communities radar and put on the Housing Zone. This development is now 20 on the list. This means that it will be on the Ministers radar, they have acknowledged the site. With the Housing Zone, there is an opportunity for funding for the developer but it is a loan not a grant.</p> <p>Homes and Communities granted a £50k Consultant Budget. Three Consultants in partnership won the tender. The development is now under viability testing and options are being investigated. KB enquired if we can demand properties on that site. ST responded that this is correct – 1,100 plus. All sites up to 2026 are already planned for and have to come out of the 710 per year figures.</p>	

ITEM	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
	<p>BF enquired regarding the Compulsory Purchase Order. Is there feasibility for this? ST stressed that this is an option but it is complicated and we would have to find a development partner and the money.</p> <p>ST stated that Borough of Poole does not own the site, Gallaghers / LIH do.</p> <p>Why can nothing be done to force this? RTG advised that we need a viable scheme, we cannot just force them.</p> <p>TS stated that the Neighbourhood Forums are involved with numerous developments in connection with the Core Strategy. In particular, Richard Carr who appears to be in breach of the density rule in the Core Strategy. An application went through and concerns have been raised regarding the Salterns site.</p> <p>ST advised that in accordance with the Development Plan system, all applications should be approved unless there are substantive reasons for refusal. Furthermore, applications go to Committee where members exercise their “red card” rights.</p> <p>TS enquired about the height. ST advised that developments may be slightly higher and that discretion would be shown.</p> <p>TS raised the matter of the Nikal site. RTG advised that this is not a debate for the Community Working Group as it is a current application as a whole.</p> <p>RTG stressed that the Core Strategy should be interpreted. NP explained in more detail.</p> <p>The 5 year land supply and the advantages of having this in place was discussed further. The disadvantages of not having a 5 year land supply were also discussed.</p> <p>BF raised the matter of some developers such as Harbour Reach using cheap materials to carry out works. This leads to chipping paint and inferior looking workmanship. There are other developers, such as McCarthy and Stone who carry out good quality work. The differences between the two are very obvious. ST stated that this is down to the builder and has nothing to do with building regulations or planning law.</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting ended at 20:00</p>	