



**COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES**  
**Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy**  
**Wednesday, 25<sup>th</sup> November 2015 2.00pm – 4.45 p.m. Room 134**

Item	Description	Action
<p><b>ATTENDEES:</b></p> <p><b><u>Borough of Poole Attendees:</u></b>            Stephen Thorne (ST) Head of Planning &amp; Regeneration inc Building Consultancy (Chair)            Richard Genge (RTG) Planning and Regeneration Manager            Sue Ludwig (SPL) Business Manager            Clare Taylor (CPT) PA to Stephen Thorne</p> <p><b><u>Community Groups / Resident Associations Attendees:</u></b>            Graham Whitehall (GW) The Lilliput and Neighbourhood Association (LANA)            Ann Wood (AW) Hamside Residents Association            Chris Allenby (CA) Poole Quays Forum            Brian Finch (BF) Friends of Harbour Reach            Pat Bullock (PB) Friends of Hamworthy Park            Malcolm Tyler (MT) Lake Residents Association            Terence Stewart (TS) Branksome Park, Canford Cliffs and District Residents Association            Gerald Rigler (GR) Society of Poole Men &amp; Broadstone N Forum</p> <p><b><u>Apologies External:-</u></b>            Ken Bearcroft (KB) Parkstone Bay Association            Tony Hamilton (TH) Poole Agenda 21</p> <p>Tim Cundey (TC) Watch this Space            Wayne Hancock (WH) Branksome Park, Canford Cliffs and District Residents Association            Candice McMahon (CM) Lake Residents Association</p> <p><b><u>Apologies Borough of Poole:-</u></b>            Keith Pegram (KDP) Change and Performance Manager            Steve Dring (SD) Senior Planning Officer</p>		
1.	<p><b><u>Around the Table Introductions</u></b></p> <p>ST welcomed all to the meeting.</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising – last regular CWG meeting held Thursday, 24<sup>th</sup> September 2015</u></b></p> <p>ST requested comments on the minutes from the last meeting. The following items were raised:</p> <p><b>Item 8 – Nitrates in Poole Harbour SPD.</b> Please provide the link to the background paper. The link is:  <a href="http://www.poole.gov.uk/planning-and-buildings/planning/ldp/spds/nitrogen-reduction/">http://www.poole.gov.uk/planning-and-buildings/planning/ldp/spds/nitrogen-reduction/</a></p> <p><b>Item 6 – Timetable for Policy Documents.</b> It was noted that this is much clearer. GR advised that he had emailed BoP regarding the Poole Core Strategy Review. The Strategic Planning and the Duty to Co-operate and Strategic Planning Forum was discussed in detail. ST explained regarding the Local Plan process, the Growth Board, LEP, LNP, Place &amp; Prosperity Group and the way in which these work and fit in with each other.</p> <p>TS requested that BoP provide an organisational chart of the CEO's. ST will look at this.</p> <p><b><u>Action: ST to prepare an organisational chart of the CEO's in respect of the Strategic Planning and the Duty to Cooperate.</u></b></p>	

Item	Description	Action
	<p>ST advised regarding the SPPMF (Strategic Planning Policy Managers Forum), which he chairs and advised that there are no powers within this group. GR enquired if there are minutes available from this meeting online. ST advised that this is not a public meeting, there are no minutes, only notes, which are not made public. The meeting is designed for the members to express their views confidentially.</p> <p>It was noted that the new Planning Policy &amp; Implementation Manager, Nick Perrins, has been appointed and will be commencing with BoP in mid February 2016.</p> <p>GR advised that he had sent an email with the timetable for the Poole Core Strategy Review, which needs to be updated online. ST will request Steve Dring (SD) to update as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Action: ST will request Steve Dring (SD) to update the timetable for the Poole Core Strategy Review, at his earliest convenience.</b></p> <p><b>Item 11 – paragraph 3.</b> It was noted that CA should be included in the Neighbourhood Forum’s discussions in order to agree a new boundary. CPT to update the minutes to reflect.</p> <p><b>Action: CPT to update the minutes of the last meeting held to include CA in Item 11, paragraph 3.</b></p> <p>TS enquired as to who has control, from Planning, in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan. RTG advised that BoP would encourage against a controlling plan. ST explained that the SPD is a guidance document only and in a lower position than the Neighbourhood Plan. A DPD is also in a higher position than an SPD.</p> <p>Building heights were discussed at length – e.g. 6/7 storey building applications and the likelihood of these becoming more common.</p>	
3.	<p><b><u>Regen Site Update</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Nikal Site</u></b></p> <p>CA updated regarding the Nikal Site, the scoping has finished and there is a full application approaching. BF enquired if an update on pre-planning consultations could be of interest to tenants. RTG advised that pre-application advice is given in confidence, the designs have changed radically over the last year and there is nothing to report at this stage. BF raised the issue with the Nikal Car Park, which RNLI are using, Nikal are charging. BF felt that this should be enforced. It was noted that past experiences of trying to enforce in a similar situation has resulted in the inspector stating that there is no harm in running a temporary car park. RTG advised that the future of the car park is seen as a regen site. ST added that once an application has been received, BoP will not be able to enforce the car park. RTG advised that if we were to “enforce” it would be more of a gentle reminder of the expiry.</p> <p>CA suggested a meeting between Poole Quays Forum and the Residents. It was noted that this would be a good idea.</p>	
4.	<p><b><u>Planning Website Improvements – Feedback from Community Working Group</u></b></p> <p>SPL gave an overview of the website improvements currently in progress, e.g. making it easier and more user friendly to browse the website from a smart phone or Ipad. SPL requested feedback from the group, which will then be fed back to the team. ST added that the Q-Codes on the site notices are in operation, these can be scanned to access information quickly. It was noted that a QR app needs to be downloaded when using this facility. It is a service provision introduced to improve our service.</p> <p>TS stressed that not everyone surfs the internet. MT added that some difficulties have been found in web browsing. SPL advises that this is part of the BoP’s anticipated improvements to the website.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
5.	<p><b><u>Other Items Raised by CWG Members</u></b></p> <p><b><u>5.1 Consultation on Community Involvement – Terence Stewart</u></b></p> <p>The Chairman’s Response to Community Involvement document, which was circulated by TS prior to the meeting, was discussed.</p> <p>TS enquired regarding the definition of neighbours next to the site, is BoP taking all relevant parties into consideration. ST responded by advising that it is whatever legislation states, it is either neighbour notification or site notices, BoP is under no obligation to provide both, however, it currently does. BoP is required to make savings and by abolishing neighbour notifications, it will make a saving of £14k per annum. ST added that the surrounding areas, including the back of the site, will have site notices.</p> <p>The weekly lists were discussed in detail. SPL advised that registering to receive these can be carried out on the website. After discussion, it was agreed that SPL would ask KP to prepare some detailed notes on registering, which could be circulated with the minutes. TS advised that these he has been receiving the weekly lists. BF added that the weekly list is received from Karen Atkins in PDF format, you can click on search and type in Hamworthy West, everything will appear on screen.</p> <p>CA enquired if applicant could notify neighbours. ST advised that the local land authority holds responsibility and there is no legal requirement for applicants to do this.</p> <p>MT stressed that BoP needs to take into consideration older people, who make not necessarily have access to, or even feel comfortable with, using apps on mobile or Ipad or utilising the internet.</p>	
	<p><b><u>5.2 Target Neighbour/Standard Expiry Dates – Graham Whitehall</u></b></p> <p>GW advised that the details section on the planning portal, which sets out the target and expiry dates needs to be investigated, some clarity is needed, as the dates are not clear. It was noted that this is in respect of the tracker bar. RTG advised that this issue will be investigated. SPL added for the record that the deadline for comments is a minimum of 21 days to make any comments, a decision may not necessary have been reached.</p> <p><b><u>Action: Planning Website – deadline dates to be investigated by RTG</u></b></p> <p>BF advised regarding the Modern Mindset (<a href="http://www.moderngov.co.uk/">http://www.moderngov.co.uk/</a>) website, which is a software company specific for Councils. They can incorporate a meeting management system, where these can be recorded. SPL advised she will investigate their website further.</p> <p><b><u>Action: SPL to investigate the Modern Mindset website</u></b></p>	
	<p><b><u>5.3 Gallaghers Site – Chris Allenby</u></b></p> <p>a. We have lost Gallaghers for the moment on the power station site. Reported to be non viable. ST confirmed and advised that Gallaghers had withdrawn their application, due to not being commercially viable. However, CIL contributions are still relevant and, with the new tariff, this will probably be zero.</p> <p>b. Is there a defined date for the completion of the Gallaghers section of the port link road? ST advised “no”.</p> <p>c. Densities – it was noted that the limits are defined by the Strategic Habitats Regulation Assessment carried out, involvement from Natural England was discussed. TS enquired regarding standardisation of densities. RTG advised regarding the Strategic Habitats Regulation Assessments and the issued faced. The reduced bedrooms allowance to accommodate more dwellings was discussed. Open Space allowance per dwelling was also discussed.</p> <p>MT suggested a representation to Gallaghers/Inland Homes in respect of Port Link Road, to get things moving.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
	<p><b>5.4 CWG Efficacy of the Group – Email from Brian Finch</b></p> <p>ST advised that an email had been received from BF and read this to the group. BF responded as follows, in order to clear up any confusion:</p> <p><i>“Just to explain my email and the context it was sent in:</i></p> <p><i>I have personally and publically applauded Stephen’s contribution to public engagement and participation, of which Stephen is well aware of.</i></p> <p><i>My email had a point to make which it seems may have been confused.</i></p> <p><i>The point I was making is obvious if you have seen the council’s attitude and real life practice to public consultation and engagement, which I assumed most of you that this was sent to are aware of.</i></p> <p><i>I feel it is only a matter of time till this group suffers the same demise as area committees, and whatever this group produces still has to go through council and cabinet which is a majority tory council.</i></p> <p><i>I have sat in many committees since the elections and they are bombastically pushing through motions that have taken years to achieve with councillors with no previous input or experience with local issues or communities. Officers are cock a hoop that most their work gets through now and is not challenged or scrutinized with any degree of sincerity.</i></p> <p><i>This type of policy breeds contempt and that could be mistaken in my email if the author didn’t know the facts which I do.</i></p> <p><i>Stephen knows me well enough by now to know that I have due respect for him, I have no respect for his superiors whatsoever because there is none due or deserved.</i></p> <p><i>I’m making no excuse for my email, I’m explaining the meaning of it, whether you agree with my views or not is not my business, I explain this for the benefit of showing due respect for Stephen which he deserves in bundles.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you”.</i></p> <p>After discussion, it was unanimously agreed that the Community Working Group is extremely important and should continue.</p>	
	<p><b>5.5 Items Raised by Terence Stewart</b></p> <p>a. It is important for the Minutes to be distributed widely and promptly to all Resident and Community Associations. 7 weeks for the Sept. 24 minutes is too long.</p> <p>ST response: Agreed. Unfortunately, the minutes were delayed due to Officers workload and CPT awaiting approval. It was agreed that approval will be sought from one of ST, SPL or RTG and CPT will have the minutes distributed within two weeks of the meeting.</p> <p>b. Please can the Agendas and Minutes continue to be distributed to the previous members of the CWG to keep them informed.</p> <p>ST advised that the Agenda and Minutes are distributed to current CWG Members for forwarding on to the various groups as appropriate. After a lengthy discussion it was agreed that CPT would add TS to the distribution list to enable him to forward on.</p> <p><b><u>Action: CPT to add TS to CWG Distribution List for all future Agenda’s and Minutes</u></b></p> <p>c. Conclusions and timings for next steps on the Responses to the Draft Core Strategy and SPD.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
	<p>ST advised that the responses have been consolidated, following the consultation and comments. The next step is the Strategic Planning and Duty to Co-operate, which ST gave an overview of the options and new plan going forward with reference to the number of residential units BoP are faced with supplying. ST advised regarding the 5-year land supply plan, which needs to be in place to ensure developers refrain from bombarding BoP with spurious planning applications, which they know the inspectorate will grant. This will happen if there is no 5-year land supply plan in place. RTG advised that developers are more than likely to be fully aware of the fact that the demand has increased from 500 to 710 residential units.</p> <p>d. Building on the Green Belt.</p> <p>ST gave an overview of the options: 1) – 500 houses per year. 2) Building Density – higher. 3) Expanding into the Countryside/Green Belt. 4) Any Other.</p> <p>TS enquired if we build denser, would it mean that there would be no need to build in the Green Belt? ST advised that BoP are investigating the issues and we need to consider all options. The density, Green Belt and the quantity of houses this would create was discussed. It was felt that applications for properties with less bedrooms will be received in order to create more residential units but with less density.</p> <p>TS requested a revised groupings map. RTG/ST advised this is located in the Town Centre SPD. ST – it is very likely that the Town Centre will change drastically over the next 10 years.</p> <p>MT enquired if it will meet the need? ST advised yes and gave an explanation of the SPD going to ECOS on 01/12/15.</p> <p>TS enquired if the SPD can be located in the local library. After checking, SPL advised that the documents go to the central library, Democratic Services are responsible for ensuring the documents are there. Note: It was assumed that Committee Minutes would not be distributed to the Libraries due to cost cutting.</p> <p>e. Publication of the Seafront Plan to residents ahead of going to Committee.</p> <p>This matter was discussed at length. ST advised that the SPD had been to Scrutiny four times plus the Workshop. It was noted that there had been changes to the document and ST advised that this was to be publicised in due course, anticipated to be next week but not guaranteed. The document is now in a position where the Members can either adopt or not. The document will need to go to full Council first.</p> <p>f. Definition of Areas to receive CIL Levies, Who decides which projects benefit and process if Area Meetings are abolished?</p> <p>ST advised that the Community Apportionment, which went to Cabinet in November decides the neighbourhood apportionments. Item 3.11 of the Cabinet Report states: <i>“Through the CIL Neighbourhood Portion Working Party the areas of Poole not covered by Neighbourhood Forums will have their CIL funds managed by this rest of the of the Borough working party (see Appendix B) made up of Councillors with representation from across the Borough. Councillors can put forward their proposals for CIL funded projects in their respective wards and the working party as a whole can decide upon the priority of these projects and where the CIL funds will be allocated. Through discussions with local people and Council Officers it would be the Councillors responsibility to establish what infrastructure needs there are in their ward. Representatives from the Borough’s Neighbourhood Forums should also form part of the group to ensure that any cross boundary needs between Neighbourhood Forums and Wards can be discussed and resolved where necessary.”</i></p> <p>ST advised that it is not known, at this stage, if the Area Meetings will be replaced with another similar meeting. ST confirmed that there is no executive authority at all.</p>	

6

**Any Other Business**

**6.1 Notifications**

TS requested that notifications are sent to CWG members of when items are going through Council/Cabinet in respect of CIL. It was noted that there are regular Newsletters – see item 6.2.

**6.2 Planning Newsletter**

It was noted that the Planning Newsletter, usually prepared and distributed by Policy, had not been received by CWG members for a long period of time. After investigation, it was found that the last two were released in March 2015 and July 2015. CPT will circulate these to the CWG with the minutes. The link to subscribe to receiving the Newsletters is:

<https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/UKPOOLE/subscriber/new>

**Action: CPT will circulate the two Planning Newsletters, for March and July 2015, to the CWG with the minutes.**

**6.3 Raising Issues**

ST advised that the raising of any issues can be carried out through Pauline Gill in Democratic Services.

**6.5 Printing Documents**

SPL advised that the Planning Unit is unable to carry out any documentation printing due to resource and printing issues.

**6.6 Chris Allenby**

CA advised that Poole Quays Forum wish to present the PQF Neighbourhood Plan in due course and enquired where this needs to go. ST advised he will investigate and let CA know.

**Action: ST/SD to advise CA the process for independent examination.**

**6.7 Gerald Rigler**

GR raised the matter of Brownfield before Green Belt and enquired if ST is aware of the flawed housing targets, which he then circulated to ST. CPRE challenging the inspectorate. ST advised that he is aware.

Highways, Contamination, Flooding, Building Regulations.

There being no further business the meeting finished at 16:45 hrs.

**Date of Next Meeting: The Community Working Group  
Wednesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2016 17:30 hrs – 21:00 hrs Committee Suite Civic Centre**