



COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy
 Wednesday 25th July 2012
 2 – 4:30pm Room 133, Civic Centre

| ATTENDEES: | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Borough of Poole: ST – Stephen Thorne (<i>chair</i>), SE – Shelley Edwards (<i>minutes</i>) RTG – Richard Genge BKO – Bernadette Osmond | Community Groups/Residents' Associations: MP – Mary Parsons, AW – Ann Wood, EM – Eunice Marsden, WH – Wayne Hancock, CA - Chris Allenby, RP – Ray Prior, PT – Pat Talbot, AD – Alison Dalton, TS – Terry Stewart & GW – Graham Whitehall & SC – Sue Chapman for Tony Hamilton |
| APOLOGIES: | |
| SPL – Sue Ludwig | TH - Tony Hamilton & BA – Brian Appleyard |
| 1. | <u>Matters Arising/Minutes from Previous Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Sustainability' agenda item for next meeting when Tony Hamilton is present. • Proposed letter to inspectorate on 'Character' – following appeals analysis and a separate response from the Inspectorate stating that they were not willing to review any decisions prior to NPPF and the Localism Bill it was concluded unnecessary. |
| 2. | <u>Major Developments</u> West Quay (2): There is currently no application live. There was a presentation to the Member Engagement Forum (MEF) last week and there are other public engagement events going on. It is estimated than an application may be received in October, however this is not guaranteed. The amended proposals look more favourable with regard to visual appearance and mitigation package. Pilkingtons: There are a number of issues on employment land and viability as currently the scheme is showing as being significantly adrift from being viable. The financial mitigation that has been offered is under review. The port link road has been negotiated into the earlier phase of the scheme – Phase 3. Need to ensure that this corresponds with the Gallaghers scheme. MP queried the lack of cycle way on the Portlink Rd and if it is to be similar in width to that of the current Blandford Road then it is not fit for purpose. RTG responded that the width of the Portlink Rd would accord with the adopted standards of the Council and that it does include a cycle way, although Transportation are exploring a 20mph zone that could affect the design for cycles. Gallaghers: In discussion with significant changes to the scheme – currently the plans do not match up in particular the boundaries to certain parcels of land. It is an outline application with all matters reserved which means that there is no real detail. Currently BoP is trying to get more information included; especially on access as there are issues to resolve. TS asked about BoP's position with regard to the proposed supermarket on the switching station site – ST explained that the net floor space proposed is not considered to impact upon the retail centre of Poole and this is an outcome from the |

| | |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>consultants Retail Assessment based on the figures that Gallaghers have supplied. However, this is just a first step and not necessarily a green light forward.</p> <p>TS asked whether Gallaghers had confirmed the phasing for the site. RTG responses that they are looking for an open consent so that they can phase it in response to the market. However more information is required to ensure that the phasing is in the best interests of Poole.</p> <p>MP questioned the accessibility to public open space and in particular the access over the footbridge from Harbour Reach. ST explained that there is allocated mitigation in the Pilkington application to fund the crossing at Lower Blandford Road. There are current meetings set up with Gallaghers to decide on the amounts of open space to be provided on site and any further links off site.</p> <p>MP highlighted that when the weather is good early access to Harbour Reach would be most beneficial to Hamworthy Residents as Hamworthy Park is getting overcrowded. ST explained that there is some money set aside for Hamworthy bridge from the 'Growing Places Fund', however this is a loan rather than a grant, and therefore a 'pay back' strategy has to be adopted by the Council. Reports will be progressing in September.</p> <p>No updates available for: Lifeboat Quay, Railway Station and Quay Thistle</p> <p>RP asked for clarification – is it a no to development on the Talbot village site? Secretary of State decided. RTG explained that the decision turned on the precise wording of the habitats regulations. If a proposal came forward that did not impact upon the heathland, this would be assessed in the normal way; e.g. would be school or care plus residential home.</p> |
| <p>3.</p> | <p><u>Updates on:</u></p> <p>a. SPG2 Refresh Community Consultation in Hamworthy Library this Friday and Saturday. Community consultation in Methodist Church, Town Centre next Friday and Saturday. The officers have been engaging with a variety of different groups to include mothers and toddlers and the Vision for Poole group. This is an opportunity to review the community's wishes. ST highlighted that a collective response from CWG is an option to save time with individual responses.</p> <p>b. Select Committee for Gyrotory and wider Transport Following the Marston Bay Hog Gyrotory Call-in Inquiry last year a consultant has been appointed to conduct a review. Phil Jones Associates has been appointed, who will in due course advise the Select Committee of his findings.</p> |
| <p>4.</p> | <p><u>CIL / Section 106 Transition</u> BoP is currently working to introduce CIL in January 2013 (n.b this is dependent on receipt of favourable Examiner's report and then being formally adopted by Full Council). <i>(News update: Since the meeting the Examiner has reported and found the evidence sound)</i>. Planning are fully aware of the need to address the transition between s106 and CIL and already internally taking steps to address it such as acknowledging the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BoP will need to ensure that statutory targets for CIL liable development (i.e. new houses) are met for any application that is scheduled to be determined before CIL goes live in Jan 2013. S106 negotiations for such applications will therefore continue as normal as CIL will not apply. |

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applications that are submitted before CIL goes live but have a determination date scheduled for after the introduction of CIL will be expected to pay CIL and there will be no negotiations on s106 matters that will be addressed by CIL in the future (such as transport, open space, Heathland.) ▪ Planning will be shortly writing to all major development applications and other long standing applications that have the potential to go over undetermined into the CIL regime. Planning will need to ensure that such applications are either resolved and granted with s106 prior to CIL going live where possible or all parties accept and understand that CIL will apply at the point of adoption if not determined beforehand. ▪ Communication is being prepared (website updates, letters, emails etc.) to publicise the matter of transition between CIL and s106 to ensure that applicants are fully aware when submitting their application whether infrastructure contributions will be dealt with by s106 or that CIL will apply. |
| <p>5.</p> | <p>Repeat applications on the same site Where developers maximise the potential of a site through numerous planning applications. TS raised concern with the approach and felt the repeat notifications were not successful. ST commented that incrementalism is difficult for the planning service and that a refusal notice indicates why a specific scheme is unacceptable. It is an applicant's statutory right to make as many applications on a site as they wish to overcome those reasons. It means that our defence has to be robust in the first instance. EM highlighted that the group needs to inform residents that a refusal isn't the end and they can come back with a revised application, or exercise their statutory right through an appeal.</p> <p>RP – Why do we not list all of the reasons for refusal? RTG responded that we only list those reasons which we can substantiate at appeal. RP asked when an issue of character is borderline why do we not always refuse. ST responded that the presumption is in favour of development and that there are serious cost implications if the Council acts unreasonably.</p> <p>EM commented that some buildings are considered by the community to be horrible, however, the local planning authority approves. ST highlighted that in evaluating a design we have to be careful that we stay objective. Innovative design is important and if there is no evolution there will be nothing to list in 50 years time?</p> |
| <p>6.</p> | <p>Planning Enforcement Activity WH asked to include analysis on success of Enforcement Statistics into the Newsletter. This was agreed by the group.</p> |
| <p>7.</p> | <p>Visibility Splays WH commented than in certain areas of Branksome and Canford Cliffs cars are coming out of driveways and not seeing pedestrians. RTG commented that visibility splays can only be conditioned on new developments/applications and that is a standard 2m either side for residential. We rely upon our highway colleagues to advise on a case by case basis.</p> |

| | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8. | <p>Newsletter</p> <p>TS requested that the full website references are included within the newsletter and not the shortcuts. EM and the group congratulated SLE on the newsletter. TS queried who the newsletter was sent to. SLE explained that it is available on the website and the link is sent to the details of the community groups that are held. This will not be visible for the group to see due to the Data Protection rules. AD suggested to include the Community Development Workers on the email list and provided SLE with details.</p> |
| 9. | <p>A.O.B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Centre Conservation Area expansion is planned to go to Members in September. • TS commented that there are too many policy consultations out at the same time. ST explained that unfortunately due to the work programmes we cannot reschedule and instead suggested more use of the group to provide joint response. • Planning Fees Update – as of last Friday the government have back tracked on the Local Fee Setting and have instead indicated that from the autumn there will be a 15% increase in planning fees. ST/SPL evaluating the impact upon fee income. • GW raised the issue of disruption with the implementation of planning permission with particular regard to the Lilliput area. Issues of parking and noise. Unfortunately permissions cannot be conditioned on implementation as any permission can be started within a 3 year period. TS asked about the good Contractors guide which used to be sent out with permissions? • Navitus Bay updated requested by GW – Planning performance agreement was signed this week by ST and is awaiting a response from politicians. • Pre-apps – RP raised the issue that some applications are not showing their pre-app advice even when an application is live. BKO to review. • PR asked with regard to minutes of the last Agents and Developers Working group what it meant with regard to case officers siding with consultees. ST responded that the case officer should in the planning judgement evaluate all responses and representations and weight them accordingly. With the mergers of units there should be one planning judgement. ST acknowledged in the past that certain response were afforded disproportionate weight but hoped that this was historic. The action agreed was for ST to discuss with Development Management to emphasize the point. |
| 10. | <p>Next Meeting: Wednesday 17th October – The Study, Upton House. 2 - 4:30pm</p> |