



**COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES**  
**Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy**  
**Wed 20th Nov 2013 2.00pm - 4.30pm – Cattistock Room**

<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	
	<p><b><u>Borough of Poole Attendees:</u></b>            Stephen Thorne (ST) – Head of Planning &amp; Regeneration inc Building Consultancy (<i>chair</i>)            Richard Genge (RTG) – Planning and Regeneration Manager            Sue Ludwig (SPL) – Business Manager            Tim Martin (TM) – Head of Legal and Democratic Services            Gabriella Cobelli (GC) – PA to Stephen Thorne (<i>minutes</i>)            Laura Bright (LB) – Senior Planning Officer</p> <p><b><u>Community Groups / Resident Associations Attendees:</u></b>            Terry Stewart (TS) - CPRE            Mary Parsons (MP) Lake Residents Association / Hamworthy / Friends of Hamworthy Park            Graham Whitehall (GW) - Lilliput and Neighbourhood Association            Alison Dalton (AD) – Bridging Communities (for Chris Mills)            Tony Hamilton (TH)– Poole Agenda 21            Chris Allenby (CA) – Poole Old Town Conservation Group            Chris Lewis (CL) – Parkstone Bay Association            Ann Wood (AW) - Hamside Residents Association</p> <p><b><u>Apologies:-</u></b>            Julie Bagwell (JB) – Watch this Space            Chris Mills (CM) – Bridging Communities            Gerald Rigler (GR) – Society of Poole Men            Brian Finch (BF) - Friends of Harbour Reach</p>
1.	<p><b><u>Minutes of the last CWG meeting (4<sup>th</sup> Sept 2013) and Matters Arising</u></b>            There was a brief introduction round the table, as LB had not attended a Community Working Group Meeting, being new to the unit.</p> <p>1.1 <b><u>Item 1 - Email address sharing</u></b>            TH advised he was happy to share his email address with the group.</p> <p>1.2 <b><u>Item 2 Campaign for Sensible Tree Management</u></b>            MP mentioned an issue with the trees at one site in Hamworthy at the last meeting, but reported that the trees had since been felled at this site.</p>
2.	<p><b><u>CIL – Community Apportion – Update by Tim Martin</u></b>            Matters are still in progress from the last time this was raised at this meeting in May 2013. In the case of Neighbourhood Forum areas, the BoP, whilst retaining the CIL receipts, will engage with the community on how the money will be spent, though this may not be without disagreement.            Discussions continued and MP expressed concern that Hamworthy Park may miss out from CIL monies from the Gallagher’s site, as Hamworthy is outside the Poole Quay Forum zone, though RTG added that if Gallaghers exceed CIL liability, funding may come in via a S106. ST reminded the group that presently S106 still remains as an option. With the departure of Nick Perrins and other issues arising, the work on governance and apportionment has not been</p>

	<p>progressed but as CIL is still in its infancy, and also the fact that we only have two neighbourhood forums, this is not a priority.</p> <p><b>That said his replacement, Steve Dring, will start on 25<sup>th</sup> Nov and therefore progress on the governance of CIL will be scheduled into business as usual.</b></p>	Note
3.	<p><b><u>Community Working Group – Communication and Consultation – raised by Terry Stewart</u></b></p> <p>TS is concerned planning news is not reaching all resident groups, although he does send details to a select list. AD advised that the news does reach housing associations, and spoke of similar issues with a group she is associated with, as they pay someone to manage the database.</p> <p>The unit is restricted somewhat with data protection though ST accepted the need to communicate with the Neighbourhood Forums in future, though all residents associations are invited to the Community Working Group AGM.</p> <p><b>Action: TS to ask John Sprackling (JS), chairman of the Branksome Park and Canford Cliffs and district Residents Association to liaise with groups he has regular contact with, to see if they want to receive information from this group, and report back to ST or GC.</b></p> <p><b>Action: GC to therefore send JS the Community Working Group minutes separately going forward.</b></p> <p><b>Action: GC to email a table with the minutes, requesting details of resident groups that attendees normally send minutes to. Attendees to complete table for this to be then brought back to the AGM</b></p> <p>There was agreement that use of acronyms in the minutes should be minimised.</p>	<p>TS</p> <p>GC</p> <p>GC/All</p>
4.	<p><b><u>Campaign for Sensible Tree Management - Update by Richard Genge</u></b></p> <p>This went back to Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee in July 2013. 1500 area orders need reviewing, and a targeted approach is required. SPL suggested looking at areas where we had the most tree enforcement cases.</p> <p>Various issues associated with not having a sensible tree management policy were raised. At October's Arboricultural Working Group, attendees were asked to help devise a table of tree types they felt were best suited to specific areas of Poole with a view to replantation, as part of the BoP's Tree Strategy. The concluding question is have the BoP got the balance right; as members are concerned this may not be the case.</p> <p><b>Action: TS asked for a copy or link to the BS3998 guide. RTG will look into this and will oblige if possible (but there may be copyright restrictions).</b></p>	RTG
5.	<p><b><u>Status Report on Development Sites – raised by Terry Stewart</u></b></p> <p>5.1 <b><u>Power Station Site (Supermarket and Electricity Transmission Station)</u></b></p> <p>The application has presently been put on hold pending a viability analysis.</p> <p>5.2 <b><u>Harbour Commissioner's Plan and Proposed Marina</u></b></p> <p>MDL and Poole Harbour Commissioners are tendering for the seabed rights, with a view to developing a marina on the Poole side of the harbour. TH is concerned that Poole Harbour is slowly getting smaller. ST advised, however, that if this is a continuing trend there will come a point when Natural England will intervene.</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>City Deal and Dorset LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership) - raised by Terry Stewart</u></b></p> <p>6.1 <b><u>Local Nature Partnership</u></b></p> <p>ST gave an update. Portsmouth and Southampton have had their City Deal application accepted. There is a link with the Local Enterprise Partnership to the City Deal as any funding would be channelled through this Partnership. Protecting the environment is covered by the Local Nature Partnership (LNP). Substantial funding from the government has been allocated to the LEP but no funding for the LNP. Who manages the LNP has not been bottomed out yet.</p> <p>6.2 <b><u>City Deal</u></b></p> <p>The City Deal is a sustainable loan that funds infrastructure projects that, in turn,</p>	

	<p>brings forward growth and jobs. The main beneficiaries of the deal would be the airport and the port through infrastructure projects that, in the main, are transport related.</p> <p>City Deal, as it is a loan, will have to be undertaken by a Council which in these austere times, is not attractive. The City Deal will morph into the Growth Deal in 2015 when it becomes a grant and therefore more attractive to deliver. It is important to note this is not new money but top slicing from existing government budgets so we do need to bid for funding to prioritise schemes to progress.</p> <p>The Local Enterprise Board is the conduit for these monies into the local areas and therefore it is important to understand how Dorset can best benefit from engaging in the deal.</p>	
7.	<p><b><u>Michael Hayes, CABE and Phil Jones Report– raised by Chris Allenby</u></b></p> <p>There was an Access and Movement Workshop on 5<sup>th</sup> Sept 2013 and stakeholders and residents were invited to express views. The proposals have gone out to consultation. See link to webpage for further details:-  <a href="http://www.boroughofpoole.com/your-council/haveyoursay/consultation/town-centre-access-and-movement/">http://www.boroughofpoole.com/your-council/haveyoursay/consultation/town-centre-access-and-movement/</a></p> <p>LB gave an overview on the above reports. They were not included as part of the consultation so as not to overcomplicate matters. The BoP are taking a step back since publication of the Phil Jones report as the current consultation focuses on the whole area although does account for some of the Phil Jones Report as part of the consultation. A supplementary planning document will be compiled to go out to consultation again with a “preferred option”, which needs to be modelled to see if it works.</p>	
8.	<p><b><u>CLEUD (Certificate of Lawful or Existing Use for Development)- raised by Terry Stewart</u></b></p> <p>This matter was geared around developers having an application approved and then subsequently extending the dwelling. Should the extension be CIL liable? RTG advised that the BoP is reviewing this, and will seek to collect CIL funding where possible. <b>Action: If attendees have any examples where they feel CIL legislation should be implemented please forward to RTG.</b></p>	All
9.	<p><b><u>Time Limited Planning Permissions - raised by Terry Stewart</u></b></p> <p>TS emailed an article from the Daily Telegraph concerning time limited planning permissions. The article says developers can no longer bank land to build on years later. TS asked what Poole’s policy was on this. RTG advised that this would be reviewed once the legislation comes in. It may be that planning permission could be refused where there has been no development within a certain timescale, but in reality there would be nothing stopping developers from commencing development to bank sites.</p>	
10. 10.1	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p><b><u>0.75 Acre Rule – raised by Terry Stewart</u></b></p> <p>TS raised this in relation to a particular site. The Local Plan included, policy (H10), sought to protect areas of low density housing requiring new proposals for housing in the form of single detached dwellings in substantial plots, with no restrictions on the plot <u>size</u> in any area. The Core Strategy replaced this. Policy PCS23 requires development within Conservation Areas to ‘preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area’. It is the applicant’s call to determine if their development does this, and for the Local Planning Authority to ascertain any material harm by the proposal, though it does depend on the context of the site.</p> <p>It is not sufficient to resist a proposal due to its plot size if no harm to the area character could be substantiated. Given the characteristics of Branksome Park it is unlikely that any particular development could be repeated elsewhere and each application will be treated on its own merit, therefore avoiding any precedent being set.</p>	

<p><b>10.</b> <i>contd..</i></p>	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b> <b><u>Dolphin Quays Development – raised by Gerald Rigler</u></b></p>	
<p>10.2</p>	<p>GR has asked if the general impact of spaces within this development could be improved. Inspection of this site formed part of the Ward Walk earlier this year, and the Member Tour of Inspection. RTG, although acknowledges that this is a somewhat “dead end” to the Quay area, felt that the cost of letting the spaces with no fittings could be what is deterring investors.</p>	
<p>10.3</p>	<p><b><u>Repair of Hoardings – raised by Gerald Rigler</u></b> GR expressed concern over hoardings at one of the regeneration sites, in that they were not strong enough to withstand recent storm damage and had therefore been damaged. The repairs, however, had been completed at the weekend.</p>	
<p>10.4</p>	<p><b><u>Liberal Hall Site Hamworthy Centre – raised by Chris Allenby</u></b> CA raised the issue around whether there had been any pre-application discussions. RTG advised that he was not aware of any. AD wondered if the hall could be declared as a community asset. Community Asset status gives the community the right to seek to buy. If a building does have community asset status the community cannot sell it on. <b>Action: AD to speak to SPL for Giles Thomas’s details as he is part of the Economic Development Team and would be able to further inform the group on community assets.</b> <b>Action: GC to invite Giles to the Community Working Group AGM to expand on community assets, community right to buy and how the process works.</b> MP asked if anything was happening with British Legion Hall. RTG advised there had been no contact with the unit regarding development, although agents have been instructed to work on it.</p>	<p><b>AD</b>  <b>complete</b></p>
<p>10.5</p>	<p><b><u>Medium Term Financial Plan</u></b> ST updated the group on the Council’s current status with regards to the Medium Term Financial Plan and how unit savings have been achieved for this year.</p>	
<p>10.6</p>	<p><b><u>Community Working Group AGM Focus</u></b> <b>Action: GW confirmed he would be happy to do a presentation at the AGM.</b></p>	<p><b>GW</b></p>
	<p><b><u>Date of the Next Meeting: - The Community Working Group AGM</u></b> <b>Tues 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 – 6.00pm-9.00pm Committee Suite Civic Centre</b></p>	