

	<p>form as being part of the validation process. Below is a link to the payment stages:- http://www.boroughofpoole.com/planning-and-buildings/planning/ldf/community-infrastructure-levycommunity-infrastructure-levy/</p> <p>The instalment policy can be viewed as a PDF on the download section, which is to the right of the webpage.</p> <p>SPL added that checks will be made to ensure that building does not start prior to issuing the official commencement notice.</p> <p>MH mentioned an issue he had with a first floor office conversion into residential dwelling. It has been empty for 6 months and they cannot find a tenant. It raised the point that each new issue requires clarification and consideration.</p> <p>ST accepted that this is a new process, but he would be happy to consider the legalisation and form a view if this is required.</p> <p>Action: NP and ST to discuss internally with a view to defining some direction and guidance to share with the Group.</p> <p>ST finally added that the unit are working towards clarity and consistency with the CIL process despite recent negative press.</p>	<p>Note</p> <p>NP/ST</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Issuing Plans with Decision Notices - Doug Evans</p> <p>Office practices are currently under review relating to the above, with a view to moving towards requesting one copy of the plan to save on postage and therefore the unit will look at not returning plan copies to the applicant. With portal applications the unit may review how drawings are approved or refused. No decision has been reached, though the aim is to have one single process across the board.</p> <p>DLE added that plans can be saved in a suitable format so that they can be reproduced if the need arises. ST concluded that we are moving towards relying on technology to move towards a paperless environment. This, in particular, applies to the Tree Team and the Building Consultancy Section. MP raised a particular outstanding tree application Plot C Cherry Close. Action: SPL to investigate further and come back to MP.</p>	<p>SPL</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>RICS Guidance Note and Harman Report : Financial Viability in Planning – Simon Greenwood</p> <p>SG circulated the above documents to the Group on 20th Sept 2012, which highlighted the competence of viability.</p> <p>There was a discussion around the original Three Dragons viability model, and SG feels this model, that appears to form a profit margin of 15%, is not realistic or feasible in the current climate.</p> <p>It was considered that the Three Dragons Model principles, with regard to profit, are ones that our officers have established and still use in particular in Housing and Community. ST felt that if the Group could suggest an alternative model, it could be discussed further with a view to signing up to it, but the District Valuer had been agreed at previous discussions as being the “honest broker”.</p> <p>DLE feels that it would not be possible to have a single generic model working. Moreover we need the services of the District Valuer to assess the viability statements once submitted.</p> <p>ST advised that the unit will have to address CIL Compliance, and also viability has synergies with this area of work. The complexities of this part of the development process, probably deserves a greater airing at the AGM in March 2013.</p> <p>Action:- GC to add to AGM agenda for March 2013.</p>	<p>GC</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Good Contractors Guide, Parking and Road Safety (raised at the Community Working Group in Oct 2012) - Stephen Thorne</p>	

	<p>A Considerate Contractors Scheme Guide was circulated to the Group source derived from website:- www.ccscheme.org.uk. A discussion took place around the issues that have been raised.</p> <p>MP advised that if contractors are building to The ECO Code for Sustainable Homes, points are awarded to contractors that follow a Considerate Contractors Guide and therefore on larger schemes this will become normal practice. The Guide will also be taken back to Community Working Group as a follow up to the last meeting.</p> <p>Action: MP to email ST with more details.</p>	MP
6.	<p><u>SANG Issues – Nigel Jacobs</u></p> <p>SG raised the issue of SANG provision in SE Dorset and how this was perceived as becoming a brake on development. He recognised what a good job had been done originally by the partners in putting a solution together in 2006, however, this was only intended to be an interim measure. SG cited some local schemes where Natural England were being unreasonable in their SANG requirements and he expressed a desire for a set of standards.</p> <p>NJ explained that the Dorset Heathland Planning Framework SPD which came into effect last September, has an appendix which explains the characteristics of a SANG and what needs to be included when looking to draw up SANG proposals. SANG is being provided as mitigation to the impact on development to 2026 will have on the Heathlands.</p> <p>This was to be included in the Preferred Option version of the Dorset Heathland joint DPD which goes out to consultation in February. It therefore is not a brake on development, rather an enabler.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Sensible Tree Management Petition – Stephen Thorne</u></p> <p>ST advised this petition was presented to Full Council and read out a summary of the contents from the report which went to the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Meeting in November 2012 and is going to the Economy Overview and Scrutiny Meeting on 24th Jan 2013. The overall context was that the Borough of Poole Tree Management Policy was too restrictive.</p> <p>Responsibility needs to be taken by householders around what trees are planted and thought needed around what the tree and area will look like when the tree is fully grown, and that new trees that are planted were the right trees. The Group raised points, one of which was that the process was part of a wider cycle and that trees come and go, i.e. one tree is lost to be replaced by others, and that it was important that the Borough of Poole adopted a grown up approach to tree management, and that sometimes it is better to allow one to be removed if more are to be replaced.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Estate Agent Boards in Sandbanks – Stephen Thorne</u></p> <p>The other petition which has been submitted from Sandbanks residents, relates to the alleged breaches of the Town and Country Planning Act (Control of Advertising) Regulations 2007 in that this was not being followed with regards the regulatory number of boards erected outside dwellings. ST was asked by members to bring this issue to the Group. After much discussion the Group concluded that no immediate action should be taken and that a voluntary scheme would not be enforceable.</p>	Note
9. 9.1	<p><u>AOB – Stephen Thorne</u></p> <p><u>S106 Issue</u></p> <p>MP advised that she had received an invoice for s106 contributions before Xmas where no commencement had taken place.</p> <p>Action: SPL to raise the issue to understand the facts and</p>	SPL

	feedback direct to MP. It was felt that the Viability item could be taken forward to the Annual General Meeting (date below) for further discussion – action above in item 4.	
	<u>Date of Next Meeting:</u> The AGM Meeting with the Arboricultural Working Group - Wed 6th March 2013 6.00pm -9.00pm Cattistock Room	