

## MINUTES

Community Working Group – Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2009

### Attendees:

- Stephen Thorne – Head of Planning & Regeneration Services
- Sue Ludwig – Business Manager, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Wendy Herring – Broom Road Residents Association
- Roy Pointer – Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association
- Candace McMahon – Lake Residents Association
- Vic Shears – Talbot Village Residents Association
- Bill Constance – Poole Old Town Conservation Group
- Doug Cook – Society of Poole Men
- Ken Bearcroft – Parkstone Bay Association
- Roy Godfrey – Broadstone Residents Association
- Alison Dalton – Bridging Communities

Agenda Item	Minute	Action Agreed
Introduction & Welcome	Stephen Thorne gave a brief resume of his career prior to joining the Borough of Poole, followed by an overview of the amalgamation of the Units and his aims and aspirations for the Working Group.	Action minutes to be distributed within the group.
Introduction by Group members.	All attendees gave a quick around the table introduction.	
Terms of reference for the meeting	The name was amended to reflect the different groups represented and will be known as the Community Working Group. Terms of reference were agreed as follows: “To work together, in the best interests of Poole to ensure that the community and the Borough of Poole, achieve the best quality development outcomes in an open and transparent way.”	It was agreed that the purpose of the group was not to discuss or debate specific planning applications unless they are used as an example to highlight more general concerns.
Hopes & Fears	ST asked the group to contribute their hopes / fears regarding the Planning service – comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build up a trusting, open and honest relationship</li> <li>• Allow access to improve</li> </ul>	ST will invite a least one member of his team to each meeting to clarify and explain different aspects of the Unit’s work, including Local Plan / Core Strategy, Multi Area Agreement

	<p>the planning process and involvement in the future development of the Town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement in the place-shaping agenda.</li> <li>• Improvement in access to the planning office and officers.</li> <li>• Better understanding of the planning process.</li> <li>• Customer Service welcome message referring callers to website is irritating and un-helpful.</li> <li>• Listen to concerns early on in the planning process and where there are conditions ensure they are complied with e.g. Poole Quarter Travel Plan not implemented after 3 years.</li> </ul>	(MAA), Enforcement policy etc.
Pre-application Advice	Concerns had been raised regarding the un-availability of Pre-application advice correspondence on the Planning web site, creating mistrust and suspicion.	ST advised that there are issues regarding commercial sensitivity and confidentiality involved in what is a paid service, and that research has indicated that no other LPA provides this information on its website. However, he did suggest a solution that was shared with the group. Should discussions result in a planning application being submitted then any pre-application correspondence will be moved onto the website and available for public viewing. This was considered a sensible and satisfactory response to the issue. ST to progress.
Site Notices & Residents' letters	ST clarified the statutory requirements with regard to neighbour notifications of planning applications and shared the revised local Notification Policy (effective 1 <sup>st</sup> September 2008) that goes beyond the	The group were content with the revised arrangements that have extended the scope of notification to include neighbours opposite an application site.

	statutory requirement.	Clarification was requested regarding the different dates for return of representations. Can the letters clearly indicate the last date that a representation can be received? SPL to progress.
AOB	<p>Can Developers/Builders be encouraged to engage with the local Community Groups?</p> <p>Pitt Report – the report contained no fundamental wrongdoing but was a summation of a number of recommendations that form a plan of action for the service. ST out-lined some of the actions proposed, including a revision of Committee voting, web casting of Planning Committees etc.</p>	<p>ST to raise with Developers at their meeting with him next month.</p> <p>Agenda items requested for future meetings to include: Changes to the Planning System (Permitted Development). Planning enforcement. Amendments to planning applications.</p>
Date of Next Meeting	It was agreed that the group would meet every 2 months to begin with.	<p>Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009 – 2.00pm – 4.00pm</p> <p>Venue: The Morning Room, Upton House, Upton Country Park. Free parking is available.</p>

**PLEASE NOTE: A request was made by one of the Group after the meeting to share contact details. Could you please confirm with Sue Ludwig (01202 633308 / [s.ludwig@poole.gov.uk](mailto:s.ludwig@poole.gov.uk) ) that you are happy for your details to be passed to other members of the Community Working Group.**

## MINUTES

Community Working Group – Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009

### Attendees:

- Stephen Thorne – Head of Planning & Regeneration Services
- Sue Ludwig – Business Manager, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Wendy Herring – Broom Road Residents Association
- Roy Pointer – Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association
- Candace McMahon – Lake Residents Association
- Bill Constance – Poole Old Town Conservation Group
- Doug Cook – Society of Poole Men
- Ken Bearcroft – Parkstone Bay Association
- Roy Godfrey – Broadstone Residents Association
- Ann Smeaton – Hamside Residents Association

Agenda Item	Minute	Comment & Action Agreed
Apologies	Received from Vic Shears – Talbot Village Residents Assn. & Alison Dalton – Bridging Communities.	
Minutes of last meeting	The minutes were reviewed and agreed. ST reminded the group of the expectation that Agenda's & Minutes should be fed in & out to other interested groups.	<p>Where possible timescales to be attached to actions.</p> <p>Consideration to be given to the posting of the Agendas &amp; Minutes to an appropriate area of the BoP website – ST to progress.</p> <p>A request was made that Agendas / Minutes are shared between the Community Working Group and the Agents &amp; Developers Working Group. - ST to raise with the A&amp;DWG</p>
The Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – 'Place Shaping'.	Nigel Jacobs – Planning Policy & Implementation Manager, gave a brief presentation on the Core Strategy and 'Place Shaping', and a fairly detailed explanation of how housing numbers had been decided upon and allocated.	<p>A copy of the presentation is attached at the following link and members may wish to use this at group meetings to inform and educate.</p> <p><a href="\\artemis\planningregeneration\Unit Data\UMT\09-07-08Res_Forum.ppt">\\artemis\planningregeneration\Unit Data\UMT\09-07-08Res_Forum.ppt</a></p> <p>(Note: the attached presentation includes some additional slides to those shown at the meeting, which had to be omitted due to time</p>

		constraints).
Permitted Development Rights	Richard Genge – Team Manager Development Control gave a presentation of the Householder Permitted Development Rights, which changed in October 2008.	<p>A summary of the changes in the legislation was issued to the group.</p> <p>Where there could be confusion about the 'principal elevation' of a property e.g. a corner or sideways-on plot, it was suggested that this could be noted on any planning decision notices. RTG to progress and feedback.</p>
Role of the Planning Chairman	KB raised the question of accountability of Members and the desire for a recorded vote. ST explained the new voting procedure for the Planning Committee using voting cards that was trialled at the last meeting and went well. The use of voting cards does not require a Constitutional change but a recorded vote for every decision would and there are implications for other Committee's.	<p>ST asked the Group to speak to their group members and seek feedback from anyone that has attended Planning Committee recently and experienced the voting as a member of the public.</p> <p>A discussion took place around the issue of the use of the Recorded vote for high profile / large developments. ST explained that individually a Committee Member has the right to request his/her vote be recorded. The preference of a recorded vote is an option for any decision but it has to be a proposed and seconded motion. It is more likely that this would happen with Major applications.</p>
Rights of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Appeal	KB asked the question about the avenues open to objectors, who do not agree with a planning decision. Applicants have a right of Appeal but there is nothing for objectors.	<p>ST explained the processes open to objectors – namely the Local Government Ombudsman <a href="http://www.lgo.org.uk">http://www.lgo.org.uk</a></p> <p>and Judicial Review <a href="http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk/cms/1220.htm">http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk/cms/1220.htm</a></p>
Consistency of Planning Approvals	KB questioned the consistency of some planning decisions and the level of understanding of guidance and policy.	NJ responded that there is no inconsistency with Policy but that policy interpretation may differ depending upon the particular circumstances of individual sites/proposals. Much work taking place to ensure that Officers and Members understand the policies and their context, including specific

		<p>training, a Tour of Inspection for Members, and an annual review of Delegated decisions. <b>A request was made that the Group nominate a site to be included on the Tour of Inspection (16<sup>th</sup> September 2009).</b></p>
<p>Consultation Process</p>	<p>It was agreed that early consultation with residents and neighbours, particularly on large/controversial sites can be beneficial to both sides and the suggestion was made that there should be public meetings on large applications at an early stage (pre-application).</p>	<p>ST commented that officers are encouraging Developers at the pre-application discussion stage to engage and consult with residents and neighbours.</p> <p>A suggestion from the Group was for a model of proposed development be put on public display when the development is large / controversial. ST to raise with Agents &amp; Developers Group.</p> <p>The Group requested a separate Planning Committee when the Quay Thistle Development is to be determined. ST to discuss with officers and the Chair of Planning Committee.</p>
<p>Planning Charter</p>	<p>The Unit is in the process of devising a service charter that will set out its commitment to all users of the service, including timescales and actions.</p>	<p>ST explained that this document would provide clarity and transparency and clearly set out the standards of service that the Unit will aim to provide to users. A draft copy of the Charter will be circulated to the Group for comment and input before a final version is agreed.</p>
<p>Pre-Application advice Post June 2009</p>	<p>Further to concerns raised by the Group, ST has amended procedures in the Unit to facilitate the publication of Pre-Application advice on the Web Site (where such advice has resulted in an application being submitted).</p>	<p>ST discussed the publication of pre-application advice with members of the Agents &amp; Developers Working Group at their meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> June and there were no objections to this revision of procedure.</p>
<p>Post Pitt Review Update</p>	<p>ST gave the Group an overview of the Unit's progress against the</p>	<p>An open invitation was made to the group members to take part in the IDeA Peer Review by contributing to a discussion group and joining the Unit</p>

	<p>recommendations set out in Sir Michael Pitt's report, including the up-coming Peer Review by the IDeA (Improvement &amp; Development Agency) on the 15<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> July.</p>	<p>and other contributors for an open feedback meeting on the final day. Invitations to be sent under separate cover. SPL to progress.</p>
AOB	<p>RP raised the issues of scaling from plans on the web site.</p> <p>ST suggested that the Group may like a Revolving Chairman.</p>	<p>ST outlined the difference between datum information and measurements on the plan and agreed that he was happy to look into how we can help. It is hoped that the next version of the WAM (Web Access Module) will solve this problem. ST to progress and update.</p> <p>Group resolved that ST continues as Chairman.</p>
Date of Next Meeting		<p>Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009 – 2.00pm – 4.00pm Venue: The Study, Upton House, Upton Country Park. Free parking is available.</p>

## MINUTES

Community Working Group – Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009

### Attendees:

- Stephen Thorne – Head of Planning & Regeneration Services
- Sue Ludwig – Business Manager, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Shelley Barnett – PA to Stephen Thorne, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Roy Pointer – Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association
- Candace McMahon – Lake Residents Association
- Bill Constance – Poole Old Town Conservation Group
- Doug Cook – Society of Poole Men
- Ken Bearcroft – Parkstone Bay Association
- Roy Godfrey – Broadstone Residents Association
- Ann Smeaton – Hamside Residents Association
- Alison Dalton – Bridging Communities
- Russ Fisher – Senior Arboricultural Officer, Planning & Regeneration Services

Agenda Item	Minute	Comment & Action Agreed
Apologies	Wendy Herring – Broom Road Residents Assoc.	
Minutes of last meeting	<p>Putting CWG Agenda &amp; Minutes on the website</p> <p>Principal Elevation</p> <p>Tour of Inspection ST disappointed with attendance. Good feedback from those who did attend taking the opportunity to discuss decisions made on various sites.</p> <p>Ward Walks ST informed the group that any issues (planning or otherwise) in the Ward need to be discussed with the relevant Ward Councillors so that they</p>	<p>Once it has been set up an email will be sent confirming this with a link to the page. ST to discuss with Agents &amp; Developers at next meeting about their Agenda &amp; Minutes being available online.</p> <p>ST to provide guidance on Permitted Development. RTG to progress and feedback.</p> <p>If the attendance is low in the future, ST mentioned the possibility of including Officers and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>Future dates are to be arranged, using the positive feedback from those who did attend.</p> <p>DC applauded initiative by ST.</p> <p>KB highlighted that the Ward Members need to be more conscientious about their areas. AD suggested the Ward Walk merge</p>

	<p>can be included in the Ward Walk on 14<sup>th</sup> Oct. ST focused on being proactive in the Borough rather than reactive.</p> <p>Planning Charter</p> <p>Consultation Process</p> <p>Pre-Application Advice RP questioned the delay in the pre-application advice appearing on the website because meeting minutes had to be agreed by the applicant and officers.</p> <p>Post Pitt Review ST &amp; SPL thanked the group for those who took part in the review.</p>	<p>with the Safer Neighbour Audit to save on resources.</p> <p>ST is working on a draft, which he plans to bring to the next meeting.</p> <p>ST to look into separate Committee option for Thistle Hotel application.</p> <p>ST agreed to chase the approvals regarding minutes, if not provided on time he may consider a bullet point system being introduced.</p> <p>ST meeting with IDeA on 1<sup>st</sup> Oct. The Report will be available in due course.</p>
<p>Planning Wam</p>	<p>ST has agreed the procurement of the system upgrade which will include a measuring tool. ST informed the group that a Tracker bar would be operational in the new system, which would require regular updates from Officers and allow the public to follow the progress of applications.</p>	<p>ST has suggested the use of free software from the internet to use as a measuring tool until our system is upgraded. KP looking into this.</p> <p>The Group was pleased to hear that the software would also enable automatic update info to be sent to anyone who registered an interest in an application.</p>
<p>Consistency of Planning Decisions re: Trees</p>	<p>RP raised the question regarding the proximity of Trees for specific sites and the perceived inconsistent advice. Russ Fisher – Senior Arboricultural Officer gave the group an overview of what is expected of an Arboricultural Officer relating his work to the British Standards. Taking into account Root</p>	<p>RG highlighted that specific applications are not usually discussed in these meetings.</p> <p>ST has agreed to look into the way the tree report is formulated.</p> <p>DC questioned the knowledge available for the maintenance of trees and suggested advice is offered.</p>

	Protection Areas and Canopy Spreads.	
Council / Planning Newsletter	<p>ST pointed out that what had originally been suggested as a Council Newsletter has now turned into a Planning Newsletter. ST refers to a successful newsletter introduced at High Wycombe.</p> <p>It was decided to set up a group to manage the project. The Group volunteered Terry Stewart as representative</p>	<p>ST highlighted that his resources are limited and will ask the trainee planning officers to put together initially one issue, with the creative help of SB.</p> <p>A copy of the High Wycombe newsletter is available at the following link:  <a href="http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/site/Pages.asp?step=4&amp;contentID=536&amp;categoryID=3618">http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/site/Pages.asp?step=4&amp;contentID=536&amp;categoryID=3618</a>  Terry Stewart has since accepted and the group agreed to a quarterly newsletter.</p>
Res Assoc Database	The Council have met with Poole Partnership to discuss a way forward with regard to providing Resident Associations details on the Borough of Poole website. Under discussion were Data Protection issues, the need for consistency across the Borough and a set of standards for inclusion in the list.	<p>KB &amp; AD highlighted that their Associations were based on donations rather than membership and therefore one of the standard criterion should not be whether or not there is a membership fee.</p> <p>All groups will have the opportunity to register their details, specifying whether they are disclosed online and SPL recommended that Associations register their information on the Poole Partnership website which has an area set aside specifically for this purpose.</p>
Town & Village Greens	RG asks; due to the Branksome Rec application are recreation areas, town and village greens under threat?	<p>ST commented that Towns and Village Greens are separate to Recreational Spaces and that development of such areas comes under the Policy of the area.</p> <p>Designation of a Village Green is not covered under Planning Legislation.</p>
Householder Appeals Service	New procedures for dealing with Householder Appeals were introduced earlier in the year.	The decision of the appeal will be determined by the initial application paperwork. There is now no option to write with further representations by the Applicant, Local Planning Authority or Third Parties. Attached is a bullet point presentation of the new procedure.
Planning Committees	RG questioned the coloured voting cards for the colour-blind.	ST proposed that he will ask Democratic Services to put a Y, R & G on the cards so there is no confusion.

	<p>Some requests were made for the votes to be recorded.</p> <p>The layout was also in question with regards to seeing the voting cards.</p>	<p>DC focused on the fact that a Councillor is elected to represent the Ward not a few. Ask your Councillor if you want to know their vote.</p> <p>ST informed the group that the layout had changed to improve the service for all parties involved.</p>
Flood Risk	DC & KB brought up concerns.	ST has instructed consultants report. A November draft will be provided which will include a section on How We Defend Poole.
Amendments by Applicants before Planning Decision	<p>ST highlighted how he has to achieve 'speed' with Government Targets.</p> <p>DC questioned the veracity of some applications</p>	<p>ST commented that long drawn out applications eventually look nothing like the original nor comply with amended regulations and in these cases should be withdrawn and refreshed for a new application. ST also highlighted that the Officers are constrained by time limits on applications, due to Government targets that are non-negotiable.</p> <p>ST informed the group that judgements need to be made against the guidance notes on invalid and valid registrations. A specialist will then look into the specific areas of an application, where further information is required to determine the application.</p>
AOB	<p>KB raised Night Flight noise over Broadstone</p> <p>D-day Plaque has now arrived back in Poole, renovated.</p>	<p>DC spoke to Annette Brook &amp; Bmth Airport and was assured that there were no additional night flights. ST also pointed out that this issue is not a general Planning issue where the impact is not part of a Planning application.</p> <p>A new location has been agreed to improve its longevity. DC thanked ST for his efforts with the renovation. ST explained that Jane Stewart of Planning and Regeneration had also been part of the solution and the group acknowledged her efforts. SB to send DC a copy of the Renovation Report.</p>
Date of Next Meeting		Wednesday 25 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2009 – 2pm – 4.30pm, <b>In Room 133</b> , Civic Centre

## Householder appeals service



From 6 April 2009 the Planning Inspectorate are introducing a streamlined appeal process for householder planning appeals (for planning applications registered on or after 6 April 2009).

### What is a householder appeal?

A "householder" appeal is one against the refusal of planning permission for development attached to a residential property or within its boundary.

It **does not** include:

- a change of use
- the erection of a dwelling
- appeals against non-determination
- appeals against conditions attached to a planning permission

### What changes have been made?

For the appellant a number of changes have been made. These aim to make the whole process easier to understand, to take part in and allow you to get a decision much more quickly.

- you have 12 weeks from the date of the planning decision notice to make an appeal
- the appeal form has been simplified to make it shorter
- you will no longer need to send the plan with your appeal
- you will need to set your full grounds of appeal using the appeal form
- the Inspector will look at your appeal afresh, having access to all of the other documents and material submitted at application stage
- third parties will no longer have the opportunity to comment at appeal stage, although comments made at the application stage will be taken into consideration
- you will receive a decision within eight weeks

## AGENDA

### COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

1400 – 1630 25 November 2009

### ROOM 133, CIVIC CENTRE, POOLE

Invited Attendees:

ST	Stephen Thorne	SL	Sue Ludwig	SB	Shelley Barnett
BC	Bill Constance	DC	Douglas Cook	RG	Roy Godfrey
KB	Ken Bearcroft	RP	Roy Pointer	AD	Alison Dalton
WH	Wendy Herring	CM	Candace McMahon	AS	Ann Smeaton
WL	Warren Lever	DE	Doug Evans		

---

		Raised by	Time	Response
1	Apologies	ST	14:00	ST
2	Minutes of last meeting	ST	14:05	ST
3	Ward Walk Feedback	ST	14:30	ST
4	Planning Newsletter	ST	14:40	ST
5	Preserving and enhancing Conservation Areas	RP	14:55	WL
6	Section 106 Procedures – in particular use of unilateral undertakings	RP	15:10	DE
7	Level information	RP	15:30	DE
8	Reinstatements after Developer works are carried out	RP	15:40	DE
9	Regeneration Vs Conservation	BC	15:50	WL
10	Internal Consultations in Planning Process	AS	16:10	WL
11	AOB	ST	16:20	ST
12	DONM                      20.01.10 Annual Meeting 10.03.10 @1800			ALL

## MINUTES

Community Working Group – Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> November 2009

### Attendees:

- Stephen Thorne – Head of Planning & Regeneration Services
- Shelley Barnett – PA to Stephen Thorne, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Sue Ludwig – Business Manager, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Roy Pointer – Branksome Park & Canford Cliffs Residents Association
- Mary Parsons – Lake Residents Association
- Bill Constance – Poole Old Town Conservation Group
- Doug Cook – Society of Poole Men
- David Howard – Parkstone Bay Association
- Pat Talbot – Broadstone Residents Association
- Warren Lever – Environment and Design Team Leader, Planning & Regeneration Services
- Doug Evans – Team Manager - Development, Planning & Regeneration Services

Agenda Item	Minute	Comment & Action Agreed
Apologies	Wendy Herring – Broom Road Residents Assoc. Ann Smeaton – Hamside Residents Association. Alison Dalton – Bridging Communities.	
Minutes of last meeting	<p>Planning Charter</p> <p>Principal Elevation</p> <p>Consultation Process- Thistle Hotel</p> <p>Members of the Group questioned the arrangements for the Branksome Rec Special Planning Committee</p> <p>The delay in the pre-application advice appearing on the website due to meeting minutes being agreed by applicants</p>	<p>This is currently being reviewed by the unit and is intended to be available in draft form for the next CWG meeting in January 2010.</p> <p>SB provided the group with a handout on the guidance on Permitted Development.</p> <p>At this time it is not seen as necessary for a special Committee for the Thistle Hotel application, it should be covered under normal business; depending on numbers wishing to attend.</p> <p>ST referred to his letter sent to those questioning the decision, which states fully the reasons and that lots of time and effort went into finding alternatives but they were either not suitable to accommodate the expected audience or available at suitable times. ST has a statutory duty to both the applicant and the public.</p> <p>RP highlighted that there was no incentive on applicant to deliver. ST agreed to look into speeding up the process. SPL and ST highlighted that it is not essential for them to be displayed before a determination just</p>

	<p>and officers.</p> <p>Planning Wam</p> <p>Consistency of Planning Decisions re: Trees</p> <p>Res Associations Database</p>	<p>as long as they are displayed, so that we are transparent.</p> <p>The planned upgrade did not include treeworks so it has been returned for further development. March 2010 is planned for implementation of the new upgrade. There will be an update on this at the next CWG meeting.</p> <p>ST has introduced site notes for officers to complete each time they visit site. ST is also looking into a general template so that report writing is easier to understand.</p> <p>Still under construction. RP highlighted the concept behind the database to channel feedback through to an association rather than individuals. SPL reiterated that the Poole Partnership website already has an area set-aside specifically for this purpose.</p>
Ward Walk Feedback	<p>SB has now compiled all the feedback from the Ward Walks. The issues that were not Planning have been fed back to the relevant Service Unit Heads without comment.</p>	<p>ST questioned how to progress with this information - a Key Activities Schedule.</p> <p>It was noted that the walk was very well supported by the Councillors and enjoyed by all.</p>
Council / Planning Newsletter	<p>The first Newsletter is now available online. The group appreciated the initiative and there was good feedback on the presentation and content. RP felt a few articles were more Poole News and that it could have more headlines of where we are with links.</p>	<p>The newsletter will evolve as more feedback is received. The group agreed the need for it to remain simplified so that it is understandable by all without the technical jargon.</p> <p>'Iconic' is a suggestion for the next editions Jargon Buster.</p> <p>DC questioned why aren't we listing buildings such as Partridge Walk?</p>
Preserving & Enhancing Conservation Areas	<p>RP questioned whether it was the natural environment that was to be 'preserved and enhanced' rather than the existing and proposed dwellings.</p>	<p>WL explained how many areas of conservation in Poole are mixtures of styles and influences, and this is taken into account along with other elements of the environment through the decision process. It is the spaces and buildings that are equally important. Also the number of variables such as historic consents and inspectorate decisions.</p> <p>WL noted to the group that the Environment Team is currently undertaking</p>

		<p>a review of the Town Centre Conservation areas, examining what makes up their special character, i.e. have we missed areas of special character in the past or has the character eroded so much that it no longer deserves conserving. They are also required to look into positive, neutral and negative buildings, to give a clearer indication about retention or replacement. The Environment Team work to Planning Policy Guidance 15/16 and Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1), which focus on enhancing/improving the character of the area. PPS1 has raised the bar in terms of design quality and responding to local distinctiveness.</p>
<p>Regeneration Vs Conservation</p>	<p>BC questioned whether the major developments are being looked at individually or collectively; taking into account parking, traffic, pedestrian flows, height etc</p> <p>BC emphasized concerns with current 'sky scraper' schemes surrounding conservation areas; do they no longer consider the height guidelines from 2002?</p>	<p>WL highlighted that the adopted SPG sets the framework for local development and is a clear set of design codes for the town based on rigorous assessment of the existing town – hence the 3-6 storey requirements. In addition all determinations take urban design, conservation and regeneration into account. It is not only the appearance of the development but also how it responds to the space and street requirements of the Local Authority (Streetscapes). A scheme may deliver many benefits and these have to be balanced.</p> <p>ST explained that the Master Plan is to be refreshed if resources can be found and that the Local Authority has to respond to the economic climate and therefore become more flexible. However the principles set out in the SPG remain consistent. ST highlighted that regeneration is a balance of constraints.</p>
<p>Section 106 Procedures in particular the use of Unilateral Undertakings</p>	<p>PR expressed concern with the unnecessary use of Council time in completing the Unsigned Unilateral Undertakings. An enforced upfront-signed undertaking has been suggested. DC questioned the legality of this new method.</p> <p>DC also questioned the</p>	<p>DE provided the group with an explanation of the new Section 106 system to be introduced by the Borough in the near future. The new system offers a fast track route that will require upfront payments or confirmation of a bilateral agreement.</p> <p>DE confirmed that the new process would be supported legally and would enable the applicant to understand the refund process should the development not go ahead. ST explained that the process is formulaic</p>

	amounts required for Section 106.	when working out contributions.
Level Information	RP questioned the lack of levels on applications and the requests for them.	DE explained acceptable methods of levels – not necessarily absolute. Levels are asked for when required, inevitably a survey will provide such information.
Reinstatements after Developer work is carried out	RP proposed a system to enforce reinstatement works after work has been carried out. PR suggested a letter go out with every approval stating what is expected 'Considerate Constructors Guide'.	ST explained that it is highways responsibility with regards to pavement/kerb reinstatement. Officers are already aware of certain developments and programs are in place to enforce.  DC mentioned the tiles/tarmac replacement at Dolphin Quays. ST and others have already flagged this up. <b>Additional note for more information see cabe- paving the way publication please note this extract - Under the provisions of the New Roads and Streetworks Act (1991), local authorities are funded to inspect 30% of reinstatement works (currently 6% at five work stages, although it is being considered for revision). The evidence of the case studies suggests that this regime of inspection is ineffective, or that the enforcement measures currently in existence are often not fully utilised due to their inadequate funding and therefore low prioritisation. Current legislation does not allow local authorities to recover inspection costs for all reinstatement works. The City of London and Westminster collected £750,000 in fines since the 2001 fining Regulations were introduced, demonstrating that the effort spent collecting fines has its compensations</b>
Internal Consultation in Planning Process	AS questioned whether all areas of Planning and Regeneration were consulted before decisions were made. ST highlighted that the merging of the two units to form Planning and Regeneration will take time to evolve.	WL explained that there are some schemes that have fully supported the views of the Environment and Design team. The unit is also working on more design/character training for DC officers. ST explained that a seamless report is currently under development to be supplied by the Case Officer after taking account of consultation with specialist officers from within the unit and externally. Internal consultations will still be seen on file and on the website.
AOB	DC questioned whether Conservation Officers are taking a proactive role in	WL explained that they have in the past and do a great deal behind the scenes in contacting owners and organisation

	<p>Dorset Architectural Heritage Week</p> <p>RP requested a briefing on Sea Defences and Flooding</p> <p>WL informed the group that P&amp;R is currently undertaking a Characterisation Study, which highlights key findings and recommendations in the Poole area.</p>	<p>through Dorset Design and Conservation Officers Group. DC noted that the date for submission is April and the Week itself is in September.</p> <p>ST to look into this.</p> <p>This will be available to view after Christmas.</p>
<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>Annual Meeting</p>		<p>Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> Jan 2010, 2-4.30pm, In <b>Room 133</b>, Civic Centre</p> <p>Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2010, 6pm in <b>Conference Room</b>, Civic Centre</p>