



ATTENDEES:		
<p><u>Borough of Poole Attendees:</u></p> <p>Stephen Thorne (ST) Head of Planning & Regeneration inc Building Consultancy (Chair) (GC) (plus G Cobelli – PA to Stephen Thorne) Nick Perrins (NP) Planning Policy and Implementation Manager Sue Ludwig (SPL) Business Manager Richard Genge (RTG) Planning and Regeneration Manager</p> <p><u>Community Groups / Resident Associations Attendees:</u></p> <p>Brian Finch (BF) Friends of Harbour Reach Gerald Rigler (GR) Society of Poole Men & Broadstone N Forum Graham Whitehall (GW) The Lilliput and Neighbourhood Association (LANA) Wayne Hancock (WH) Branksome Park, Canford Cliffs and District Residents Association Tony Hamilton (TH) Poole Agenda 21 Tim Cundey (TC) Watch this Space Terry Stewart (TS) Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) substituting for Ken Bearcroft</p> <p><u>Apologies External:-</u></p> <p>Ken Bearcroft (KB) Parkstone Bay Association Malcolm Tyler (MT) Lake Residents Association Ann Wood (AW) Hamside Residents Association Chris Allenby (CA) Poole Quays Forum Candice McMahan (CM) Lake Residents Association Pat Bullock (PB) Friends of Hamworthy Park check we have all of them Clive Bartlett (CB) Poole Old Town Conservation Group</p>		
Item	Description	Action
1.	<p><u>Minutes to the meeting on 5th July 2016</u></p> <p><u>Item 2 - Planning Website Deadline Dates - Stephen Thorne</u></p> <p>This relates to dates published on the tracker bar on the web raised in the meeting some time ago. Action: Still ongoing and largely due to resource pressure.</p>	RTG/ SPL
1.1	<p><u>Item 4 - Core Strategy (CS)</u></p> <p>Various general comments were made following the discussion at the last meeting. BF's email about Affordable Housing was circulated. This is high on the political agenda as we are not delivering the numbers. The Core Strategy is all about a holistic approach i.e. a balance geared towards what the need is in a particular area.</p>	
1.2	<p><u>Matters Arising – Enforcement</u></p> <p>TS asked if planning application conditions had to be enforced. Planning Conditions are imposed to make a proposal that is unacceptable, acceptable. Planning conditions will normally be enforced but the test of whether it is expedient in the public interest has to be assessed. ST reminded the group that, with a 25% reduction in resource, and a possible further reduction of 25% the ability to site visit every potential breach is not practical, relying instead on desk top appraisal and digital photography. The BoP is forced to addresses enforcement on a case by case basis, looking at harm and impact rather than following a rigid process.</p> <p><u>Matters Arising - Other</u></p> <p>The query was raised by TS about Poole Quays Forum challenging approved planning applications that are in breach of the Core Strategy e.g. West Quay Rd. ST asked for an example with regards to West Quay Rd and TS advised "density".</p>	

Item	Description	Action
4.	<p>Devolution Update (see link to Website Homepage below) Stephen Thorne http://www.poole.gov.uk/ Public consultation on this closes on 25th Oct 2016. There will be financial modelling done later this year. The outcome will be known as to the way forward once all councils have had the opportunity to evaluate comments made. Services are already beginning to be shared e.g. ECPS for Bmth / Poole. Various comments were made including concern with the democratic element with a larger council. ST explained that there may, in the future be some possible boundary changes but these will need to be subject of assessment by the Boundary Commission, and the consultation is with the boundaries as they are at present. The Planning Dept has yet to be asked to look at how the Future Planning Committee or Committees will operate. There is no definite decision to go to a unitary authority yet, though very unlikely Poole will stay as it is. The proposal is that a shadow authority will come into operation about May 2018-May 2019.</p>	
5.	<p>Likely Forthcoming Items (standing item) – Stephen Thorne Major Sites Update (will be a standing item going forward) Gallaghers – Issues previously preventing a pre-app from moving forward have been resolved as the land owner has resolved the contractual issues. Environmental and ecological surveys are being carried out at the moment. ST envisages that next year there will be more activity on this site in terms of Pre-apps and a planning application. Quay Thistle There has been some recent interest but nothing worthy of reporting. Other There are no recent updates on any of the other sites. Likely Forthcoming Consultations. See item 3 Neighbourhood Planning Update. There is a chance that Natural England may ask us to consult on Nitrates in Poole Harbour though this remains to be seen. <i>(Post meeting note: GC spoke to GR after the meeting – Likely Forthcoming Consultations will also be added as a standing item going forward.</i></p>	GC
6. 6.1 6.2 6.2.1	<p>Any Other Business Question raised by Malcolm Tyler</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Development, Open Spaces and Parks. The government are investigating responsibility for our parks/open spaces. Could this affect planning applications for major development that rely on open space as amenity space for the development? How would this affect open spaces that could be sold off and the new owners making a charge to access the said space in order to fund the running cost? Also how would this affect existing completed development - allowing for free access to a particular public open space as amenity as part of the approval process.</i> <p>NP confirmed there are no plans to reduce open space in Poole though Central Government are exploring park usage with a view to commercialisation of some parks. The allocation of the regeneration sites in Poole rely on the parks around them hence, there are no plans to reduce them.</p> <p>Questions raised by Graham Whitehall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Clarification of the question of the conditions and CIL contributions for the Salterns Development (as per email to Clare Spiller from Bertie Bowman).</i> <i>At the SPCG meeting on 12th Sept, it was agreed the preferred alternative for an Urban Unitary Authority for Poole, Bmth and Xch, with the remainder of authorities forming a Rural Unitary Authority. Is there any clarification on the boundaries for this and does it include Upton?</i> <p>Salterns Development GW wondered whether the conditions were met. Concern was around widening of the access road may result in a compulsory purchase order of the forecourts of the 2 corner properties. RTG confirmed that although planning consent had been granted</p>	

6.2.2	<p>it does not necessarily mean that development will commence. The legal agreement has been signed with regards to this site which includes the road improvements but it will not result in a compulsory purchase order. Also the first development phase will involve flood risk mitigation.</p> <p><u>Clarification of Boundaries – Unitary Authority</u> See item 4 – Devolution Update.</p>	
6.3	<p><u>Questions raised by Terry Stewart</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The applications for the 8 storey tower next to the RNLI, the West Quay Marina and the Salterns Marina were in breach of specific requirements of the approved Core Strategy. Will the revised Poole Local Plan have any strength if the Planning Committee can override specific rules?</i> • <i>The Minister of State for Housing and Planning dictated that “we have been repeatedly clear that demand for housing alone will not change Green Belt boundaries. Green belt boundaries will only be changed in exceptional circumstances“. What are the exceptional circumstances that allow Poole to propose development in the Green Belt? Does not the Housing Minister rule overrule everything else?</i> • <i>The process for developing the Housing Needs Assessment numbers requires that the total should be modified to allow for environmental constraints. Poole probably has more constraints than any other UK town in (sea on the south, Poole Bay - West, Bmth development - East and the Heathlands/ Green belt – North). This means Poole does not have any adequate spare land for development - this should be recognised.</i> • <i>Clarification of The Duty to Cooperate and neighbouring authorities in terms of housing number shortfall. It does not state that they MUST make up the shortfall.</i> • <i>When will the review of the Green Belt be published?</i> 	
6.3.1	<p><u>8 Storey Tower next to the RNI, the West Quay Marina and the Salterns Marina</u> TS feels the Core Strategy requirements are being overlooked i.e. the Planning Committee can seemingly override the Strategy with their decision making, and asked whether an assessment needed to be made regarding the impact of buildings over 6 storeys high, as there has been an 8 storey development that has been approved recently. ST advised that whilst the Site Specific DPD mentions 6 storeys, as mentioned earlier, members have to address the balance of sustainable development and in this case they considered that the benefits of the development of employment and society outweighed the 2 extra storeys and that 8 storeys is not an unacceptable impact upon the environment so long as it is a quality outcome. This probably feeds into light and shadow issues as well. We accept that in the Local Plan review a tall building policy will need to be considered with in certain cases further detailed information that will assist in assessing impact. NP added that the BoP accepts that the Tall Building Zone will need to be sensibly assessed. The BoP will be seeking views on this within the next few months.</p>	Note
6.3.2	<p><u>Exceptional Circumstances that will allow Development in Green Belt Land (also see item 2 – Matters Arising)</u> The Green Belt policy has yet to be decided and a whole range of issues need to be considered. Development on Green Belt land will, indeed, only occur in exceptional circumstances. Action: GC will also send out the draft Green Belt Review with the notes – it is also on the web – link below:- http://www.poole.gov.uk/planning-and-buildings/planning/ldp/local-plan-review/</p>	GC
6.3.3	<p><u>Environmental Constraints and Further Development (also see item 2 – Matters Arising)</u> Covered in item 2.</p>	

6.3.4	<p><u>Duty to Cooperate Clarification</u> ST confirmed that Bmth may look to the BoP to our Green Belt in order for them to deliver housing though we do not have to comply, though it only includes immediate neighbours within the county. ST suggested to TS that if he wishes to challenge the Objective Needs Assessment of 710 houses then the proper route to do this is via the Examination in Public of the Local Plan or lobbying the Secretary of State direct. The Council as the LPA are following process as laid down by government and in cooperation with adjoining authorities.</p>	Note for TS
6.3.5	<p><u>Green Belt Review</u> This was covered by NP (also see above - draft Green Belt Review). The review is published online under the Local Plan evidence base.</p>	
6.4	<p><u>Questions raised by Chris Allenby</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Question put forth by one of the PQF members:- "I challenged the council's approach to determining tall buildings at the last meeting. My concerns related to the fact that the council are approving tall buildings in the town centre without fully assessing all impacts - for example West Quay Marina and St. John's House were determined without the applicant having to provide assessments such as key view analysis, long distance view analysis, sunlight / daylight, wind etc." Please explain.</i> <p>This is covered above in TS's questions and in Matters Arising (item 1).</p>	
6.5 6.5.1	<p><u>Questions Raised by Brian Finch</u> BF wished to alert ST about a post on a website called The Conversation, namely about the travelling community having to "prove" their ethnicity under new planning rules. The DCLG is now suggesting that persons can only be defined as a traveller if they "travel" and if they cease to travel due to education, ill health etc. they cease to be defined as a traveller. There are a number of related points raised in the article about how traveller's lives are likely to be affected. ST gave a brief overview about the planning application for a temporary stopping place for travellers that was refused by the Planning Community a couple of years ago. The advantage of a TSP is that under the Criminal Justice Act the police can intervene at short notice. The current situation due to the refusal is that the police are not normally involved and the unauthorised encampments are managed by ECPS. ST went on to confirm that if this new legislation goes ahead, it does not change the need to provide permanent accommodation in accordance with the Objective Needs Assessment referred to above.</p>	
6.6 6.6.1	<p><u>Other Business</u> <u>Fracking Sites in Dorset</u> This was raised by BF and is about licences granted for fracking in Dorset. BF would like to explore discussions further in the next meeting.</p>	
6.6.2	<p>ST did state the a couple of years ago he was asked to provide a position statement of the BoP with regards to fracking and this is still there. Action: GC to add to the next agenda. <u>Approved Household Applications Stats over the Past 5 years and how many have been Built Out.</u> GR requested these stats from NP and SPL. Action: NP/ SPL to send over to GR.</p>	GC NP/SPL
	<p><u>Remaining Dates of Meetings for 2016-2017</u> <u>Regular CWG Meeting</u> : Wed 14th Dec 2016 - 2:00pm to 4:30pm - Rm 133 <u>CWG AGM:-</u> Wed 22nd Mar 2017 - 6:00pm to 9:00pm - Committee Suite</p>	