



COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy
Wed 3rd Sept 2014 2.00pm – 4.30 p.m. Room 134

ATTENDEES:		
	<p><u>Borough of Poole Attendees:</u> Stephen Thorne (ST) – Head of Planning & Regeneration inc Building Consultancy (<i>chair</i>) Richard Genge (RTG) – Planning and Regeneration Manager Sue Ludwig (SPL) – Business Manager Steve Dring – (SD) – Senior Planning Officer Gabriella Cobelli (GC) – PA to Stephen Thorne Margo Teasdale (MT) – Conservation Officer Steve Llewellyn (SL) – Senior Planning Officer</p> <p><u>Community Groups / Resident Associations Attendees:</u> Terry Stewart (TS) - CPRE Mary Parsons (MP) - Lake Res Assoc Hamworthy / Friends of Hamworthy Park Graham Whitehall (GW) - Lilliput and Neighbourhood Assoc Chris Allenby (CA) – Poole Old Town Conservation Group Ann Wood (AW) - Hamside Residents Assoc Brian Finch (BF) - Friends of Harbour Reach Gerald Rigler (GR) – Society of Poole Men Ken Bearcroft (KB) – Parkstone Bay Assoc Julie Bagwell (JB) – Watch this Space Tony Hamilton (TH) – Poole Agenda 21</p> <p><u>Apologies:-</u> Chris Mills (CM) – Bridging Communities</p>	
1.	<p><u>Minutes of the Last Meeting dated 28th May 2014 and any Matters Arising</u></p>	
1.1	<p><u>Item 3 CWG Communication and Consultation</u></p>	
1.2	<p>Questions from regarding this issue were passed to Emma Leatherbarrow after the previous meeting for her to raise with Cllr Butt.</p>	
1.3	<p><u>Website users</u> RTG explained the reasons why web users may have difficulty in finding the information they are looking for, although the unit do try and ensure information is consistent. The advanced field in the search engine may help. Action: RTG will ask Keith Pegram, our Performance/Systems Manager, to attend the next CWG to give a demonstration.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Development – Transpiring from Qu 8 raised at the AGM April 2014</u> TH wanted to know more information as he felt sustainable development in the Core Strategy is not sufficiently balanced, and that cutting down on travel should feature more. RTG advised the Core Strategy was aspirational at the time of completion, and needs refreshing so this will be fed in (to be reviewed early 2015) with an aim for completion by 2016. Although sustainability has not gone away, there is more focus on growth and jobs, and with more housing in Poole required, the picture is very much a balancing act.</p>	RTG
2.	<p><u>Member Tour of Inspection Feedback (Wed 2nd July 2014)</u> ST gave brief feedback. It was felt overall that these should continue as this forum addressed quality outcomes though there seems to be differing views on what is successful or otherwise. Doug Evans our Team Manager (Borough Team) is still assessing the forms. Action: CWG members who attended were encouraged to return feedback forms so comments can be accounted for.</p>	CWG

<p>3.</p>	<p><u>Viability Workshop with Agents and Developers – 24th Sept 2014</u> SD outlined the proposed aim behind the workshop, which was to discuss the viability aspects of residential and non-residential land uses. The outcome will feed into the revised Core Strategy and will also incorporate the Affordable Housing Policy and, if necessary, a review of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Rates. Discussions continued and various questions were asked around CIL and Affordable Housing. The Council has to strike a balance between development needs to help fund community benefits against the profitability of the development, to ensure that landowners/developers bring sites forward. This is crucial to enabling the Council to maintain a five year land supply of deliverable housing sites. Without this supply, the BoP is unable to control the location of development, which many mean they cannot refuse some applications or may lose at appeal on sites that they would ordinarily deem unsuitable for development.</p>	
<p>4. 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 4.9 4.10 4.11</p>	<p><u>Regen Site Update</u> <u>Terrace Row Development – raised by Chris Allenby</u> CA raised the issue of St. James Church being obliterated from the view by Terrace Row top floor as you drive into Poole along the Holes Bay Rd and wonders if any iconic views can be protected. RTG confirmed that, having reviewed the development on site, views of St. James’s Church had not been obstructed. <u>Development and Housing Projects Progress</u> CA mentioned that following the press comments about the Housing projects and development in progress nothing much seems to be happening with the Regen Sites. Comment was made that developers develop when they choose to, though we can, in some cases, compulsory purchase land if we feel those involved are being overtly obstructive. ST explained the significance of on costs on brownfield regeneration sites and how this effects viability and therefore commencement. <u>Gallaghers Update</u> There are still issues that need agreeing as this is still a live application as information that the BoP have requested is still outstanding. <u>Life Boat Quays</u> The scheme as approved is being implemented. <u>Nikal Site</u> Outline Planning Permission has now lapsed. <u>James Brothers Site</u> This has planning approval. <u>Sydenhams Site</u> Nothing to report. <u>Power Station</u> There are ongoing negotiations with the live application. ST explained that the overall viability of the scheme is yet to be agreed by the District Valuer, and negotiations continue between the Council as Highway authority and the developers. <u>Goodsyard</u> The planning application was disposed of in 2011 due to the failure of the S106 agreement being signed. <u>Dolphin Centre</u> Legal and General are the new leaseholders and are in discussion with the BoP currently. They are willing to invest subject to certain conditions. <u>Land “Between the Bridges” Development</u> CA advised that 464 residential units plus 8000m2 of commercial space is proposed to be included. The Core Strategy PCS11 suggests 250+ Housing units and 6800m2 of commercial and retail on this site, and wonders if developers are aware of the Core Strategy, as their pre application is over 80% increase of residential and nearly 17% increase on commercial space over and above planning guidelines? RTG advised that the Core Strategy suggests no upper limit of residential units,</p>	

	<p>only a minimum. The developer is at liberty to impose a higher number that would have to prove that the Local Planning Authority that the development can be accommodated on the site and that any increased impacts on the Special Protection Area can be mitigated.</p>	
5.	<p><u>The Removal of Selected Conservation Areas in Poole</u> This was raised by GW. MT gave a quick overview. The BoP have been consulting on selected Conservation Areas in Poole, namely Ashington, Brunstead Road, Canford Cliffs and Penn Hill. A report went to Economy Overview and Scrutiny Meeting (ECOS) in June 2014 and will return to ECOS in Nov 2014. Please see link to Website for more information:- http://www.boroughofpoole.com/planning-and-buildings/urban-design-and-conservation/heritage-conservation-areas-and-listed-buildings/.</p> <p>There has been a lot of strong opinion and additional comment that some residents may not have received letters, leading to a general feeling that communication has been poor. <i>SPL left the meeting to check that all neighbours were notified and returned to confirm that records showed everyone who need to be notified was informed via 2nd class post (though the envelope sent does not show specify that it contains a planning notification).</i></p> <p>Changes in areas could be negated. It has to be understood that just because an area is a Conservation Area it does not necessarily mean development will not happen. That said, every application in a conservation area is assessed on its own merits and has to respect the character of the area. The Planning Department, however, do become more involved if the building is listed and on the local list. The community have the Right to Bid to save a building, for example a local pub, if they can put forth a case stating that is a community facility. Certain changes are not enforced e.g. UPVC windows. TS mentioned a specific case where a gateway was allowed by the Planning Inspector.</p> <p>Action: TS to email the specifics for RTG to investigate. If anyone has any further queries relating to Conservation please email MT at M.Teasdale@poole.gov.uk.</p>	TS/RTG Note for CWG
6.	<p><u>Party Houses Update</u> TS advised that public consensus is that the BoP are not doing enough to address the issues connected with the above and that the impression is that the authority is not interested in supporting its residents. ST explained that the six cases concerned are being investigated and each one is being reviewed on a case by case basis. ECPS are the first point of contact in terms of noise issues though the “perpetrator” is not the owner of the property according to law. ST went on to say that substantial time and resource has been spent interviewing residents and compiling reports.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p>	
7.1	<p><u>Hamworthy Park</u> Detailed questions and answers are provided via the link below: - http://www.boroughofpoole.com/leisure-and-culture/sports-clubs-fitness/hamworthy-outdoor-education-centre/</p>	
7.2	<p><u>Site Notices</u> There was a discussion around a specific application in that there were no sites notices posted. RTG advised that all surrounding properties were notified. ST added that there is little that the Council can do if someone takes a site notice down. The BoP generally notify neighbours by post and sometimes site notices are posted in addition to the publicity requirements.</p>	
7.3	<p><u>Right of Way</u> This is a current application and it is not an issue to discuss specifically at this group, we are aware that the Right of Way application has been submitted but until it becomes adopted it is not a material planning consideration.</p>	
7.4	<p><u>Road Blocking around Construction Sites</u> Action: CA to email ST a photograph of a specific construction site as he</p>	

7.5	<p>feels that the road is getting blocked as this is a matter for highways and possibly the police. ST is happy to forward this on to Transportation.</p> <p><u>Community Working Group - Membership Refresh Item raised at the AGM in April 2014</u></p> <p>ST reminded the group that representatives from groups were nominated at the AGM which means that the Community Working Group is attendance is restricted to those members only, and hence, it is not a public meeting.</p>	CA/ST
	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting: (Please note new date is Thurs 20th Nov 2014 2.00pm-4.30pm – Room 134)</u></p>	