



COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy
Thursday, 24th September 2015 2.00pm – 4.55 p.m. Room 133

| ATTENDEES: | | |
|---|--|---------------|
| <p><u>Borough of Poole Attendees:</u> Stephen Thorne (ST) Head of Planning & Regeneration inc Building Consultancy (Chair) Nigel Jacobs (NJ) Planning Policy & Implementation Manager Doug Evans (DE) Team Manager - Development Rebecca Landman (RL) Planning Officer Clare Taylor (CPT) PA to Stephen Thorne</p> <p><u>Community Groups / Resident Associations Attendees:</u> 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 Tim Cundey (TC) Watch this Space Pat Bullock (PB) Friends of Hamworthy Park Wayne Hancock (WH) Branksome Park, Canford Cliffs and District Residents Association Malcolm Tyler (MT) Lake Residents Association Candice McMahon (CM) Lake Residents Association</p> <p><u>Apologies External:-</u> Ken Bearcroft (KB) Parkstone Bay Assoc Tony Hamilton (TH) Poole Agenda 21 Gerald Rigler (GR) Society of Poole Men & Broadstone N Forum</p> <p><u>Apologies Borough of Poole:-</u> Richard Genge (RTG) Planning and Regeneration Manager Keith Pegram (KDP) Change and Performance Manager Sue Ludwig (SPL) Business Manager Steve Dring (SD) Senior Planning Officer</p> | | |
| Item | Description | Action |
| 1. | <p><u>Around the Table Introductions</u></p> <p>ST welcomed all to the meeting and introduced NJ, DE and RL to those present.</p> | |
| 2. | <p><u>Minutes and Matters Arising – last regular CWG meeting held Wednesday, 13th May 2015</u></p> <p>CIL – it was noted that the current CIL policy is applicable only on residential, it does not matter which type of site – Brownfield or Greenfield sites.</p> <p>An email was received from GR regarding the timetable information. ST advised that it was unclear as to the information required and put this to the floor. It was thought that this referred to the Pop Up Shop schedule, which had already been distributed previously, prior to the Pop Up Shop to the CWG Group. CT has emailed GR for clarification.</p> <p>The minutes were unanimously agreed.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| 3. | <p><u>Recent Changes in Planning Regulations</u></p> <p>DE updated the meeting on amendments/changes that Government are in the process of making in respect of Recent Regulations. DE advised on the High Court, which took place at the end of July 2015, the vacant buildings Credit has now gone. There is further challenge by the Government. DE advised regarding the lifting of the threshold when seeking affordable housing on smaller sites.</p> <p>Starter homes was discussed and DE advised that the first application of its kind has been received. The definition of a starter home needs to be identified, when an application is received. BF enquired if this will affect CIL. ST advised that it will not although with future changes to CIL regulations this could change. It was noted that the Twin Sails Bridge is still being paid off.</p> <p>ST advised that, at a recent Building Consultancy Seminar, amendments were introduced to Building Regulations, particularly under Part M. New regulations had been clarified between Planning and Building Control. It was noted that there would be an impact on the DM Team with the new regulations.</p> <p>RL advised regarding the Ministerial Statement, which was produced in March and would streamline into Building Regulations, out of Planning, on 1st October 2015.</p> <p>RL explained in detail regarding the adaptable dwelling, making allowances for people who could develop disabilities or become immobile due to old age. Building Control could enforce conditions on Planning.</p> <p>ST advised that the Local Plan System decides the level of adoption to be implemented. ST will, with regard to Part M, arrange a meeting once progress is being made and further information is to hand regarding this matter.</p> <p>ST explained regarding Building Regulations and disabled access and the structures being designed into property to adapt for disabled people/old age, e.g. fixture and fittings installed into the wall to enable a handrail to be installed in the bath and ceiling fixtures to accommodate a sturdy hoist for later use.</p> <p>New applications – does this mean that plans have to have all features? ST advised no, not at the moment as we will need the revised Local Plan to address the issue. It was noted that this will only be applicable to new developments.</p> | |
| 4. | <p><u>Regen Site Update</u></p> <p><u>Power Station Site</u> ST updated that meeting on the Poole Power Station Site. It was noted that we have Housing Zone allocation on the site. ST advised regarding the Homes and Community Agency loan.</p> <p>The application on this site has been going on for nearly four years. ST will shortly be concluding options in dealing with this application. ST advised regarding Atlas, an offshoot of the HCA who troubleshoot stalled sites, who have advised BoP that this is not a planning problem but was about viability. We have a Statutory duty to process the application and ST has given Gallaghers a deadline of the end of October. BoP has done everything it can on this site and Atlas have agreed, it is the viability that is not being achieved.</p> <p><u>Nikal Site</u> ST advised that discussions are currently taking place regarding this site.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|-----------|---|--------|
| Contd/... | <p>The scoping request and the nature of an application was discussed. It was noted that this is a full environment assessment.</p> <p>It was noted that PQF has seen drawings for a nine storey structure with underground car park.</p> <p>ST advised that this was presented at MEF as per PQF presentation</p> <p><u>Former Pilkington Site</u></p> <p>ST advised that the units on the site appear to be selling.</p> <p>BF raised issues regarding Rigler Road:</p> <p><i>“The junction is simply not fit for purpose and there needs to be an urgent investigation into how its made safer and easier for vehicles to turn left or right into the Blandford Road from the Twin Sails approach and departure road. This is imperative to avoid very strong objections to the Gallaghers Site development area planning application. It's Hardly conceivable that Planning have not insisted that this access road junction is widened to allow for this development”</i></p> <p>ST advised BF that Nigel Hutton in the Highways Unit is the best person to contact regarding these issues.</p> <p><u>Portlink Road</u></p> <p>ST outlined the history behind the Portlink Road, which has commenced and due to complete in May 2017 for the section owned by Inland Homes. MT expressed that Portlink Road should be a priority.</p> <p><u>West Quay Planning Application</u></p> <p>DE advised that this is not on the Committee schedule as yet and when the Case Officer returns from holiday this will be progressed further.</p> <p><u>Travelodge</u></p> <p>ST advised that this site is progressing well.</p> <p><u>Quay Thistle Hotel</u></p> <p>ST explained regarding Quay Thistle Hotel and advised that the site is being marketed by the owners and, therefore, some interest is being generated.</p> <p><u>Sydenhams</u></p> <p>It was noted that there is no update at this stage.</p> <p><u>West Quay</u></p> <p>ST advised that there is nothing new to report.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| 5. | <p><u>Statement of Community Involvement</u></p> <p>RL gave an overview of the Statement of Community Involvement document, which outlines when and where we consult with locals in respect of developing and notifications. BoP are investigating different ways in which we can reduce costs and one of these cost saving ideas is Neighbour Notifications.</p> <p>Instead of letters being sent the surrounding neighbours, a Site Notice will be placed and updated. RL advised the improvements to this will be the introduction of a Barcode in the site notice so that scanning to your smartphone to look up an application. The cost saving will be in the region of approximately £14k per year.</p> <p>This new process will go to consultation on 1st October 2015 and is currently online, any comments are welcomed by BoP.</p> <p>BF suggested a larger notice, possibly the size of a “For Sale” sign.</p> <p>MT expressed concerns when people are away for 2/3 months at a time, they could come back to a development next to their property or the signs could get vandalised or stolen. ST advised that this could happen even if letters are sent, if people are away for long periods of time.</p> <p>ST advised that the DM Team put the signs up during their site visit. The signs are now being made from waterproof paper to prevent weather damage. The size of the sign could not be any larger than it is now for practical reasons for the DM Team. It is anticipated that this new process of notification signs only will help reduce the number of complaints being received because people haven’t received a letter but their neighbour has.</p> <p>ST advised regarding the QR Code for the smart phone, enabling viewing live applications. BoP will be going live shortly, as part of trying to improve service provision.</p> <p>Concerns were raised with regards the letters to the surrounding neighbours, which was a great achievement a couple of years ago and now it is felt that we are taking a step backwards. ST advised that BoP in law have to balance the budget, we have to come up with further savings going forward.</p> <p>MT – this is affecting the Borough of Poole as a whole.</p> <p>It was noted that for certain category of applications it is the duty of the Planning Officer to place the Site Notices and display an advert in the local press (the Daily Echo) and interested parties can register to receive the weekly list of all applications registered by email.</p> <p>ST advised that the revised SCI will be going to ECOS on 1st December 2015.</p> <p>MT – could we colour code the importance of developments for notices? ST advised that this would be difficult and different proposals have differing levels of importance depending on locations and impact.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| 6. | <p><u>Timetable for Policy Documents</u></p> <p>NJ updated the meeting on the timetable for policy documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy Review – January/February 2016. • Strategic Planning Work – revised plan. • CIL – Draft Charge 1st December – revised CIL rates. • SPS – Cabinet 13th October 2015. • Town Centre SPD – scheduled 5th November 2015. • Heathlands SPD – scheduled for Cabinet 3rd November 2015. • SHMA – signed off, awaiting final document then onto website. | |
| 7. | <p><u>Strategic Duty to Co-operate work that has started</u></p> <p>ST advised regarding the latest announcement made last week in respect of the single unitary Council, the statutory duty to co-operate, the combined local plan and the 5 year supply of land. NJ added that the strategic duty to co-operate is primarily about accommodating housing needs.</p> <p>Although we have a strategic duty to co-operate, we do not have a strategic duty to agree.</p> <p>BF enquired if BoP have a new Chief Executive, ST advised that we have, Andrew Flockhart, who was the interim CEO has now been appointed as the CEO.</p> <p>ST explained regarding the Place & Prosperity Group, which ST is involved with and the Growth Board where CEX's and Members meet.</p> | |
| 8. | <p><u>Nitrates in Poole Harbour SPD</u></p> <p>NJ updated on the nitrates in Poole Harbour and the fact that the smell is worsening, he explained regarding the nutrient pollution and problems. Wessex Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England are currently working on a solution to combat the effects on the Harbour. A portion of the CIL contributions will be used to tackle this issue.</p> <p>It was noted that a huge background paper has been produced, there is a link to the website and the document can be read.</p> <p>MT enquired if the problem being experienced is the same as Poole Park. NJ advised that this is the case.</p> | |
| 9. | <p><u>Poole's Affordable Housing Policy</u></p> <p>NJ advised that this items had been covered previously in the meeting with regards to the Ministerial Statement.</p> <p>ST – viability issues. In 1952, 20% of housing was private and 80% public whereas in 2015 80% is private and 20% is public, and the current dependence on private development, predominantly affordable housing, is part of the problem of non-delivery.</p> <p>ST – CPO'ing Gallaghers site. This site was discussed highlighting issues of profit and no affordable housing in this site. ST advised that BoP have no legal interest with the land, which is actually owned by Gallaghers.</p> <p>BF suggested BoP purchase the Gallaghers site. NJ advised why this would not be possible.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| 10. | <p><u>Spending of CIL Monies</u></p> <p>NJ explained with reference to the 15% local communities and the recommendations for CIL. 15% single pot, the rest on a Borough wide basis. A working party will be set up to discuss what the monies will be used for and on which projects.</p> <p>MT commented that the level of communication to the area committees is a concern.</p> <p>ST advised that steps are being taken to reconsider the function of Area Committees but this is a Member decision.</p> <p>PB enquired regarding the time limit on CIL money and what the monies can be spent on. PB advised that there was £90k worth of CIL money but this had reduced to £78k and it is not known where the money has gone and what it has been spent on in Hamworthy Park. ST advised that Shaun Robson would be able to provide the information on what the money has been spent on.</p> <p>NJ advised that CIL money is collected for generic projects.</p> <p>BF – Harbour Reach – should be £121k, which should go to the rest of the park, where is it? Where has it gone?</p> <p>DE – commented that this relates to recreational contribution and that Shaun Robson identifies projects for the money allocation.</p> <p>PB added that the money should be used to enhance the park, they should have a say in what they can spend it on – e.g. the paddling pool idea.</p> | |
| 11. | <p><u>Other Items Raised by CWG Members</u></p> <p>11.1 Graham Whitehall <i>I have been asked by the committee of Lilliput and Neighbourhood Association (LANA), to request an agenda item for the next CWG meeting:</i></p> <p><i>'Will Kate Ryan, the new Strategic Director, ensure that any planning decisions take into account the need to meet appropriately designed, family and affordable housing demands in the Borough of Poole?'</i></p> <p>ST response – yes, as far as she can. DE's team will evaluate any housing proposal in the context of affordable housing and will invoke the policy, where possible.</p> <p>GW raised concerns regarding the design of the properties, affordable housing and the appropriate designs for Poole.</p> <p>NJ gave an overview of the housing strategy and the types of properties, higher density and protecting family housing. There is a housing need for 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties.</p> <p>GW raised the issue of space problem and enquired if more multi-storey complexes will be considered.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------------|--|--------|
| Contd/.... | <p>NJ response – yes, we have to look at issues and the statutory duty to cooperate. We have to explore all areas, including height.</p> <p>GW raised the high rise issue with Salterns Hotel, which is being demolished, this will be a high density property.</p> <p>BF – exceptions to height, reference Gallaghers, would this go ahead?</p> <p>ST response – we are trying to be pragmatic with regards to proposals and sometimes specific policies that restrict height fetter analysing applications on their own merits. ST will need to evaluate all options and the use of the Green Belt and the increase in density and height in the town centre are two of these options. All options have to be considered before we can present to a planning inspector at inquiry.</p> <p>BF – Social Housing in the Green Belt, private housing in the town. This matter was discussed.</p> | |
| | <p>11.2 <u>Christopher Allenby</u></p> <p><i>“Poole Core Strategy Review No definite time-table for completion of the review Page 36 Appendix 2, Policies SSA9 and SSA9 Consider Unlimited Heights (Stack and Rack) between the bridges on both sides of the Backwater Channel</i></p> <p><i>Poole Core Strategy Review (Issues and Options Document) includes and refers to height reviews on all the regeneration Areas, 20 Storey buildings!!!!!! Are we competing with Abu Dhabi, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore and Dubai. Is it Now a free for all.</i></p> <p><i>With with no affordable housing on the Power Station site, low to no CIL Contributions across the Regeneration Areas, there will be no money for infrastructure. The whole waterfront will become second homes and holiday homes. They will look dull and dreary for half of the year whilst they are empty.(look at Dolphin Quays). The young people of Poole will not be able to afford these waterside properties. How will this contribute to solving Poole’s Housing predicament?”</i></p> <p>ST response – Starter Homes initiative of government. This application is the first in the Country. The discount of 20% is achieved by no CIL or S106 contributions which will have an impact on the amount PQF will receive.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|--------------------------|--|--------|
| <p>11. Contd./..</p> | <p>Other Items Raised by CWG Members</p> <p>11.3 <u>Christopher Allenby</u></p> <p><i>“Are our current Core Strategy and planning documents robust enough on the Heights, Indicative Densities, Parking and Affordable Housing on the regeneration sites. Page 41 SPG Vol 2 Whittles Way to Twin Sails Bridge ‘Include buildings fronting the waterfront between 12m and 18m tall (based on 3m floor to floor heights), which should be the tallest in the area. Buildings fronting West Quay Road should be between 9m and 15m tall but may be lower where the setting of nearby buildings demand – in order to respect the scale of adjacent areas and the town as a whole.’</i></p> | |
| | <p><i>Possible application, West Quay Marina, 9 Floors plus underground parking, some affordable housing only 12%, car parking moderate</i></p> <p><i>Current application, the ‘Carr Tower’ at Wilkins way 8 storeys (this is not a noted Landmark Site) inadequate parking no affordable housing (this whole application has been an application by negotiation with only one consultation with the local community).</i></p> <p><i>These two sites will be about 360 dwellings and over 10,000 m2 commercial space, these two sites occupy just over half of the area that had an indicative density of 250 dwellings, both are well in excess of the indicative densities per Hectare of 100-150.”</i></p> <p>This matter was discussed in detail.</p> <p>NJ response – Open spaces are more on the Quay, we would not expect to see open spaces in the Town Centre. DE added regarding the connectivity to open spaces.</p> <p>MT felt that with higher density blocks, children would be confined to home, not out in the fresh air and, if they did, their parents would not be able to keep a watch over them sufficiently. Poole needs places where children can play safely in the open spaces close to home where their parents can see them.</p> <p>NJ response – this is not likely to happen in the Town Centre. BoP are aware of the issues with public housing in tower blocks.</p> <p>NJ/ST – we would need to consider the use of Green Belt as part of achieving both housing and affordable housing provision.</p> <p>11.4 <u>Wayne Hancock</u></p> <p><i>“Planning committee - I am advised that the chair of the planning committee, in the case of a 50/50 split in the voting has to vote in favour of the developer. Is this correct? If so, for what reason? Why can't he or she vote as they wish?”</i></p> <p>DE response – 50/50 vote, casting vote goes to the Chairman. It is at the discretion of the Chairman, they vote as they see fit.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------------|--|--------|
| Contd/.... | <p>It was noted that in past the Chairman had voted against the recommendation, this was probably a previous Chairman.</p> <p>MT – Do Committee Members have training?</p> <p>ST response – yes, they are not permitted to sit until they have training from BoP.</p> <p>DE added – Committee Members have a day of training plus a top up of training regularly.</p> <p>ST – full Council appoints the Committee</p> | |
| | <p>11.5 <u>Wayne Hancock</u></p> <p>Design SPD - Has there been any progress?</p> <p>ST response – unfortunately, there has been no progress to date, du to staff shortages and the project at present stopped.</p> | |
| | <p>11.6 <u>Wayne Hancock</u></p> <p><i>“Poole’s Green Belt – Have there been any conclusions resulting from the consultation? Please clarify the next stage(s)?”</i></p> <p>NJ response – the consultation responses are on the website.</p> <p>ST re-iterated that the evidence indicates 700k houses per year need to be provided for. If there is an objection to using Greenbelt then alternative solutions need to be put forward as a 5 year land supply to deliver the housing is a requirement of the Council.</p> | |
| | <p>11.7 <u>Wayne Hancock</u></p> <p><i>Demand Notices – I received the following e-mail from John Sprackling regarding this matter:</i></p> <p><i>Wayne, you may recall, the Minutes of the CWG meeting on 13 May 2015 said "SPL advised the meeting that a Demand Notice is an Invoice and would not be displayed on the website"</i></p> <p><i>The attached document is posted on the Bristol City website. The relevant para. on page 3 says:-</i></p> <p><i>3. The format of any financial information is important. Where information is based upon generic financial calculations it is generally considered reasonable that this should be released. However, where the information is specific to the finances of an individual or an organisation, then it is more likely that the information will be withheld to protect commercial interests.</i></p> <p><i>A Demand Notice is based on generic financial calculations so that it is reasonable that it should be released. It will essentially be an updated Liability Notice and will include instalment information. If the BoP does not see fit to publish Demand Notices, then I would suggest that they publish the information in spreadsheets (say monthly) referencing application numbers (not individuals), amounts due and dates.</i></p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------------|---|--------|
| Contd/.... | <p>ST – response from Nicola Webb:</p> <p><i>“I have checked and there is no requirement to publish income invoices under the Transparency Code. That legislation relates generally to expenditure.</i></p> <p>NJ advised that SPL was correct in the last CWG meeting held regarding demand notices.</p> <p>11.8 <u>Gerald Rigler</u></p> <p><i>“Following the High Court Judgement in July that quashed the national planning guidance which exempted residential housing sites of 10 and under (or 1000 sq m or less) from providing affordable housing, what effect does this judgement have upon our local CIL Charging Schedules ?”</i></p> <p>Response from Policy sent via email:</p> <p><i>“There is no impact on the existing CIL charging schedule as a consequence of the High Court decision. However, with regard to the revision to our CIL charging schedule we have commissioned some further viability work to assess what impact it would have.</i></p> | |
| | <p>11.9 <u>Christopher Allenby</u></p> <p><i>“With the Poole bridge due to be closed to traffic for a substantial period of time, can the local communities have a commitment that the borough will improve the new footpaths to the east of the twin sails bridge. The east-bound footpath all the way through to Blandford Road has tree planting in it. (A temporary footpath awaiting development is only three years old). I, as a wheelchair pusher would ask the officer concerned to push a wheelchair the same route (or a double child buggy), having to lift wheels of a wheel chair over tree planting pot-holes is unsatisfactory. Perhaps wheelchair/pushchair users can be encouraged to use/share the cycle lane (obviously this will be busier with only one bridge open)”</i></p> <p>Response from Transportation via email:</p> <p>“Poole Bridge Approach Spans</p> <p><i>You will be reassured to hear that the issue you raise is already on the project work programme.</i></p> <p><i>The first stage of the Rigler Road footway was provided at the same time as the initial road construction prior to the opening of Twin Sails Bridge. It has always been the intention to provide the full width footway as part of the construction of the regeneration area.</i></p> <p><i>The Borough are currently in discussion with landowners and others regarding the best way to provide a temporary or permanent widening of the footway before the Poole Lifting Bridge works commence. “</i></p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| | <p>11.10 <u>Brian Finch</u></p> <p>Agenda Items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poole Quays Forum: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. That it was not setup with consultation with all groups within the area B. That it therefore cannot submit a Neighbourhood Plan that that the Borough can adopt without predujicing a large population of the area C. That the regeneration and development that it encapsulates is far too big for a forum that only covers half or less of the area D. That important parks and open spaces that need developer funding do not fall within that area <p>Remedies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. That the forum is dispanded and a new one formed covering all of Hamworthy with prior notice to ALL groups and stakeholders and that the management and its committee are formed with no overall control by a few, but by a committee made up of representatives of all interested groups and interested stakeholders. | |
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> B. That the PQF reduces their share of the development area by 65% to allow a fair distribution of developers funds to be shared over all the remaining parts of Hamworthy by a newly formed neighbourhood forum <p>2. Rigler Road Junction</p> <p>The junction is simply not fit for purpose and there needs to be an urgent investigation into how its made safer and easier for vehicles to turn left or right into the Blandford Road from the Twin Sails approach and departure road. This is imperative to avoid very strong objections to the Gallaghers Site development area planning application. It's hardly conceivable that Planning have not insisted that this access road junction is widened to allow for this development</p> <p>3. Area Meetings</p> <p>The Council are not supporting the future of area meetings in the principle they exist on. This is very similar to the political ethos across the country of taking away the ability of the public to challenge or engage, examples of this are the gagging law the demise of the legal aid system, the demise of the citizen advice bureau and the new word 'vexatious' which until now has has rarely been used to 'shut up' people that have a valid argument or criticism, the mind boggles how the same Government introduced the Localism Act with this underlying ethos, but it certainly explains why this Council are finding it impossible to adopt those ideals of the Localism Act The whole idea of a society where the public cannot access their rights of free speech and representation is frightening but just last week a motion to charge £600 for a freedom of information request was made in Parliament. We cannot allow this political consensus to allow this Council to implement such exclusion here in this Borough. This Town has demised under the Tory council over the past 20 years and this is now visible with rotting and badly maintained infrastructure as you travel across the Borough and the loss of essential services as in grass cutting and public toilets to name only a few. Planning need to address this problem fast.</p> | |

| Item | Description | Action |
|--|---|--------|
| Cond/.... | <p><u>Response from BoP</u></p> <p>ST advised regarding the Localism Act, the PQF process went through outlining the boundaries we could work with. If there are issues in respect of boundaries, if one impinges the other then the best person to speak to regarding alterations is Tim Martin, Head of Legal Services, who deals with this. It was noted that ST would forward BF's email to Legal & Democratic (Tim Martin) for a response.</p> <p>ST/NJ advised that if the community should express an intent to establish a Neighbourhood Boundary differently, then the Council will need to determine existing boundaries and decide whether to change it or not.</p> <p>It was noted that the Neighbourhood Forum's need to speak to each other (TH/BF), perhaps to agree a new boundary.</p> <p>ST advised that the note of area committees is a political decision and not for the CWG. This matter needs to be dealt with separately, and should be initially raised with your Ward Member, the Leader. Councillor Walton is approachable and should be given the chance to engage.</p> | |
| 12 | <p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>12.1 ST advised all present at the meeting that NJ has resigned and accepted another role in the private sector. ST wanted to take the opportunity of wishing NJ all the best for the future in his new role. NJ is working three months notice. In the meantime Steve Dring has been appointed as Interim Planning Policy & Implementation Manager until such time as a replacement is found.</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting finished at 16:55 hrs.</p> | |
| <p><u>Date of Next Meeting: The Community Working Group</u> <u>Wednesday, 25th November 2015 14:00 hrs – 16:30 hrs Room 134 Civic Centre</u></p> | | |