



**COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP**  
**Planning & Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy**  
 Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2012  
 2 – 4pm The Study, Upton House

<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	
<b>Borough of Poole:</b> ST – Stephen Thorne ( <i>chair</i> ), SE – Shelley Edwards ( <i>minutes</i> ) & SPL – Sue Ludwig	<b>Community Groups/Residents' Associations:</b> MP – Mary Parsons, AW – Ann Wood, EM – Eunice Marsden, WH – Wayne Hancock, CA - Chris Allenby, RP – Ray Prior, BA – Brian Appleyard, AD – Alison Dalton & TH - Tony Hamilton
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	
RTG – Richard Genge	TS – Terry Stewart & GW – Graham Whitehall
<b>1.</b>	<p><b><u>Attendees and who they represent:</u></b></p> <p>Stephen Thorne: Head of Planning and Regeneration Services          Shelley Edwards: PA to Stephen Thorne          Sue Ludwig: Business Manager for Planning and Regeneration Services          Tony Hamilton: Poole Agenda 21 to promote sustainable development          Chris Allenby: Poole Old Town Conservation Group          Ann Wood: Hamside Resident Association          Eunice Marsden: Parkstone Bay Association          Wayne Hancock: Branksome Park &amp; Canford Cliffs Residents Association          Ray Prior: Elms Estate Resident Association          Pat Talbot: Broadstone Residents Association          Mary Parsons: Lake Residents Association/Hamworthy/Friends of Hamworthy Park          Brian Appleyard: Canford Cliffs Land Society          Alison Dalton: Bridging Communities</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Terms of Reference:</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“To work together, in the best interests of Poole to ensure that the community and the Borough of Poole, achieve the best quality sustainable development outcomes in an open and transparent way.”</i></p> <p>TH requested that the word ‘sustainable’ be included and the group agreed. TH defined sustainable as ‘meeting the needs of today without jeopardising the needs of the future’. ST suggested that ‘sustainability’ be an agenda item for the next meeting.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b><u>Matters Arising from Annual Meeting Minutes</u></b></p> <p>ST was grateful for the presentation by Bill Constance and the other presentations. There were no reported queries or comments with regard to the minutes.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b><u>Fees Update</u></b></p> <p>SPL provided an update on Fees Charging - See Appendix 1          The group discussed the products/services that are currently not charged for. ST highlighted the lost income in free-go’s and that in the past year the Planning and Regeneration Unit including Building Consultancy has been pruned by a further 11.5</p>

	posts – now under resourced with more work to do.
<b>4.</b>	<p><b><u>Major Developments</u></b></p> <p><b>West Quay (2):</b> Architects have now been instructed. There have been some major issues that have changed since the previous decision; the nutrients issue in the harbour. Natural England are expecting developments to be nutrient neutral. ST is trying to address this in partnership with West Dorset and Purbeck. ST also raised that it is not just what it looks like that is important but what it will deliver for Poole – the whole package. A submission is expected in the early autumn.</p> <p><b>Pilkingtons:</b> There are employment issues still to be resolved. MP raised concern with regard to the quality of the Portlink Road and it is required to be of a higher specification than the existing Blandford Road. Residents are currently concerned with its width and lack of cycle ways. ST confirmed that the road will be designed to streetscape.</p> <p><b>Gallaghers:</b> The proposed Food store to replace the existing switching station is an issue as it is not compliant with Policy. MP highlighted that residents have requested an open space/grassed area for those who will live on the development. ST highlighted the advantages of opening up the waterfront to the residents and is currently pushing for pedestrian access in the form of a footpath around the waterfront through the north shore.</p> <p><b>3 Way Meeting:</b> A Landowners meeting led by the Strategic Director already takes place. ST highlighted that the landowners are mainly only interested in their own site and if the residents were to convene a three way meeting they need to decide what the desired outcome is. AD considered that the output could be that they have heard the voices of the community. CA informed the group that POTCG have invited the landowners to a meeting which Warren Lever is also invited to as it is with regard to creating a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>ST confirmed that 'schemes of significance' would require public engagement under the new Localism Act.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Update on SPG2 Refresh</b></p> <p>The SPG2 refresh is planned to be out to consultation for 10 wks from the middle of June 2012. The SPG (Supplementary Planning Guidance) will turn it into an SPD (supplementary Planning Documents) as part of the refresh to bring it inline with the adopted policies of the Council. The SPD will have greater weight as a material consideration when determining planning applications. The refreshed SPD will also extend its boundary to include Town Centre North as this area had a previous 'Area Action Plan which was not formally adopted.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Planning and Transportation</b></p> <p>The Strategic Director is awaiting an agreement from Members with regard to the Select Committee following the resolution of the Call-In Inquiry for the Gyrotory. This review will also dovetail into the SPG2 Refresh.</p> <p>There is a perception that Planning and Transportation are not working together. At service unit head level there is regular communications. The Highways officers have regular surgeries with planning officers regarding planning applications. The communication at policy level could have potential to improve however this is likely to come out of the review.</p>

7.	<p><b>Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plans</b>  The concern is that the Planning Inspectorate gives little or no weight to supporting 'Character' documents. ST reported that over the last 3 years Poole has evolved a robust policy background. The policies have been updated and the 'Characterisation Study' is a recent document. ST has raised the issue with the Chair and Vice-Chair of Planning Committee and an action has been agreed to write to the Planning Inspectorate and ask why this is happening. RP encourages to request the statistics of the individual inspectors concerned.</p>
8.	<p><b>Multiple Consultation Documents</b> – Deferred for TS attendance</p>
9.	<p><b>A.O.B</b>  <b>Name Change</b> - Dorset Lake Residents Association has been renamed Lilliput and Neighbourhood Association.</p> <p><b>CIL</b> – Community Infrastructure Levy - Contributions collected from a development. Whereas Section 106 funds had to be spent on mitigation of that specific development, CIL funds can be spent across the Borough. The CIL Examination in Public will take place in the summer for adoption late 2012/ early 2013. ST indicated that a percentage of the CIL funds collected would have to be set aside for the local community but this has not been agreed yet.</p> <p><b>Excellent Customer Service</b> - RP wanted to congratulate the Planning Front Office on its excellent service.</p> <p><b>Group Feedback</b> - MP wanted it recorded that she found the meeting very informative and useful and was grateful for her membership on the group.</p> <p><b>Navitus Bay Windfarm</b> - GW although absent raised an AOB item for an update on the Windfarm at Navitus Bay; see Appendix 2</p>
	<p><b>Next Meeting:</b>  Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2012 – Room 133, Civic Centre. 2 - 4:30pm</p>

## Appendix 1

19 Apr 2012

# Government to rethink planning fees again

The Government has announced that it will re-examine proposals to decentralise the planning application fees process and allow councils to set application fees locally.

The Government is rethinking the approach to decentralising the function following a consultation on proposals for changes to planning application fees last year, amid fears that the changes would have made the system unclear.

The previous consultation on planning application fees was not acted upon amid fears that developers would not have been able to get clear advice on the cost of submitting a planning application.

The planning fee proposals aimed to reduce the number of planning applications that have to be subsidised by the local authority, and therefore by local taxpayers. The consultation documents showed that the majority of councils received less in planning fees than they spent processing applications.

The Government is now working alongside the Local Government Association to set "benchmark" levels for planning fees, before it publishes its revised proposals, according to reports. The aim is to propose a number of measures and systems to introduce consistent fees that reflect the work required by Local Authorities.

"As Minister for decentralisation I think decisions should be taken as locally as is reasonable," said Greg Clark at a planning seminar, according to reports. "However, it becomes unreasonable if you couldn't get an answer as to how much fees are now going to be. It turned out to be very difficult to discover what fees would be."

"It's an area where, having called for greater decentralisation, we're not actually in a position to introduce it," added Clark.

The Royal Town planning Institute (RTPI) said that the inconsistencies and potential increases in fees were of great importance, in response to last year's consultation. The Government must ensure that "fee structures are reasonable and transparent...and that safeguards are in place", the RTPI said.

Westminster City Council led a campaign in November 2011, calling on the Government to let local planning authorities set their own fees. "[Councils are] either unable to charge for, or are required to subsidise, a significant proportion of the applications we handle every year", a group of Council's said in a letter to Clark. Under current legislation, there is no charge attached to applications for listed buildings, conservation area consents or for tree works. Westminster City Council spends £5 million a year of taxpayers' money subsidising half of its 10,500 planning applications which it is not allowed to charge for.

A further announcement on the Government's plans is expected in the coming months.

## NAVITUS BAY WIND PARK Overview

Update - 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2011 for Community Working Group

- Development Area announced in February 2011.  
Location – **South West of the Isle of Wight**  
Project Area – **76 square miles** - Water depth – **38m**  
Distance to shore (from nearest point – Peveril Point in Swanage) – **8.2 miles**  
Number of turbines – **150 – 300**  
Electricity Production – 2.8 – 3.5 terawatts (TWh/year) [1 terawatt = 114 MW]  
(equivalent to providing sufficient electricity for **615,000 - 820,00 homes**)  
CO2 emissions avoided – **1,186,000 tonnes**

**Note:** Under the Localism Act 2011, a new national infrastructure directorate has been created within the restructured Planning Inspectorate. This is the body to which the Development Consent Application will be submitted in 2013. Subject to obtaining the Consent, construction of the Wind Park will commence in 2016 and be fully operational by 2019.

### Progress to date:

Late 2011 - Borough of Poole have responded to the following:

- Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) – this set out a programme of community consultation, supported by Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI).
- Scoping Opinion - this defined the scope of the Environmental Statement submitted with the DCO also informs the process of the EIA.
- Planning Performance Agreement in respect of duties in our role as statutory consultee.

May 2012 – the Project is at Pre-Application Stage.

Eneco have now entered the formal consultation period. Under the Planning Act 2008 (S.42 and S.47) Eneco are under a duty to consult with **statutory consultees, local authorities**, landowners and significantly affected persons and with the local community in accordance with the SOCC.

Borough of Poole is required to continue to engage with the Developer, particularly over the EIA and the content of the ES. We can comment on the Preliminary Environment Impacts at S42 stage and on the ES when it's submitted with the application. We will need to factor in time to provide substantive responses to these documents.

In addition to engaging with the Developer during the S42 Consultations, we must:

- Compile a Local Impact Report within the time prescribed by PINS– this will be done after the EIA has been produced so as not to repeat those issues already likely to be extensively covered. Local impacts are likely to be port or shipping related, on the fishing or tourist industry, on divers or other recreational activity.
- Respond to a Statement of Common Ground – this could be in the form of a letter which sets out what common ground we agree on.
- Review Eneco's Consultation Report and compile a response to it. This response takes the form of a Consultation Adequacy Report –a substantive written report in which we will be comparing the SOCC with Eneco's Consultation Report to consider and determine whether consultation has been adequately undertaken.