

BRANKSOME PARK & CANFORD CLIFFS

RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

THE PARISH OFFICE • THE BRANKSOME ST ALDHELM CENTRE • 401 POOLE ROAD • BRANKSOME • POOLE • DORSET • BH12 1AD

MINUTES OF THE MONTHLY MEETING - SEPTEMBER 11, 2019

PRESENT: Adrian Wardlow, Chairman (**AW**); Roger Allen, Vice Chairman (**RA**); Vicky Moss, Special Projects (**VM**); Dugald Eadie, Planning Officer (**DE**); Julie Reid, Minutes Secretary (temporary)
May Haines (**MH**) and Mohan Iyengar (**MI**), Ward Councillors
26 members / wardens

1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES

The Chairman began by thanking those attending the meeting and announced apologies.

Apologies from: Carol Parkin, Secretary; Mike Parkin, Membership Secretary; Jackie Heap, Treasurer; John Sprackling, President; John Gunton, Magazine Editor; Helen Shuster-Bruce, Special Projects; Neil Endicott; Audrey Cox; Sue Telford; Val Lamb; Elizabeth Kilvington; Merilkin and Stephen Potter; Mike Kilbride.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

These were agreed as true record and signed by **AW**.

3. MATTERS ARISING

All matters arising were to be covered in this meeting (**AW**). No others were raised

4. SPEEDING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY

AW handed over to **VM** to present her report.

VM referred to the map of incidents and the petition document that she had circulated. She pointed out that there is a better map on our website. (see footer). She referred to various recent incidents and near misses on some accident black spots. Getting a traffic survey was discussed and ways of paying for it out of CIL funds or by the Association. Councillors thought that CIL money could not be used for a traffic survey. **VM** to get quote for cost of a traffic survey.

The petition is available on the BCP website.

She reported on recent speed watch activity and the recording of a vehicle travelling at 55 mph in a 30 mph road.

VM said speed watch is a good deterrent and then other traffic calming measures were discussed with suggestions from members.

MI explained that across the BCP council area there would be priorities of accident black spots and BPC area might not have very many.

AW suggested we get as many members to sign the petition as possible to reinforce our case.

5. NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

AW suggested holding this item over as **HS-B** was not able to attend at the last minute. He also explained that it is a very complex task, and we could do with more people on a sub-committee to help.

6. PLANNING REPORT

DE presented his report. List of planning applications and results are appended to these minutes.

Of particular focus were *7-9 Lindsay Road*. The plan in our Conservation Area was criticised but in the light of the successful appeal by McCarthy and Stone on the adjoining site, the question was whether it was worth opposing the plan. Roy Pointer felt that on principle while Lindsay Road still had Conservation status the BPCRA should make a formal objection, supported by **RA** this was accepted.

12a Western Road was discussed at length, particularly in relation to the removal of trees. Tracy Holmes pointed out that there is a public hearing on this matter at the Civic Centre (9.30 for 10:00 24th September 2019) and urged members to attend. The status of conservation areas was considered and how the inspectors often consider the local plan as old and out of date.

No2 Wilderton Road was also discussed at some length. **AW** stated he had an interest in this (as an aggrieved neighbour) and would not comment.

MI explained his view and Red Card action on this planning application for this site. He mentioned this was the first time in four years he had challenged an officer's refusal in favour of a committee hearing. His view being that the officer's decision was based narrowly on the wish to restore the current building – which was neither enforceable nor likely to happen from a cost-benefit angle. As such the current building and the site in general would deteriorate further and a wider discussion was needed about its future. This he felt could happen at committee even if the latest application was refused.

On a question from Tony Ormerod, members discussed whether a listed building could be forced to be maintained, and **DE**, who had lived in a Listed Building confirmed that you could not alter such a building but there was no way of preventing an owner

BRANKSOME PARK & CANFORD CLIFFS

RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

THE PARISH OFFICE • THE BRANKSOME ST ALDHELM CENTRE • 401 POOLE ROAD • BRANKSOME • POOLE • DORSET • BH12 1AD

from letting it fall into disrepair. **TO** also questioned the scaffolding around the building but the reason for it was not known. While **MI** stated he had sought local opinion on this building, a member who is a neighbour complained that he was not consulted.

Dawn Goodson asked if there was any news on the proposed demolition of the five nearly new houses in Balcombe Road. **DE** had no new information on this.

VM suggested contacting the local MP (Sir Robert Syms) about maintaining our Conservation Areas. **RA** suggested writing to him on this matter.

RP said the Association should back up our Planning Officers who often find their decisions overturned on appeal.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) Lloyds bank closure and other shops in Canford Cliffs. Neill Endicott was not available to present.

Chris Harrington reported on the results of the Petition organized by two Lloyds Bank customers which had attracted 409 signatures. Two articles had also been published in the Daily Echo re the proposed closure. The response by the Senior Bank Manager overseeing the closure was considered unsatisfactory. Credit was given to **MH** & Sir Robert Syms for their support in trying to persuade Lloyds Bank to retain a presence in Canford Cliffs. Sir **RS** had offered to present the Petition to the HoC which was accepted by the organizers. **MH** gave a brief update having worked alongside Sir **RS**. He was working on the presentation, which **CH** confirmed required a special wording format for the HoC. **CH** reported that the MP for Yateley had organized a Petition of 1000+ signatures against a Lloyds Bank branch closure in his area, but the branch was still closed. **CH** expressed thanks to Cllr. **MH**, Sir **RS** & Mr. & Mrs. Whitehall (non-Association members) for their work. The offer of a Lloyds mobile bank unit was turned down by the council. **RA** explained his efforts, but ultimately commercial considerations for Lloyds include: Canford Cliffs' low density housing, nearby Westbourne branch, on-line banking, overheads of branch & staff. Many rural villages have no banks & this is where mobile units are useful. **BPCCRA** has responded to members requests to oppose this closure, but it now appears inevitable

b) and c) **AW** suggested taking b and c together.

A question is to be put to the Cabinet Meeting on the 30th September on the Local Cycle and Walking Plan. JS passed this on to **AW** & **VM**

Cllr **MH** informed the meeting that this has been around for some years and there is now an officer responsible for Walking and Cycling. This will cover footpaths and cycle lanes etc. Cllrs **MH** and **MI** are on the Scrutiny Committee but papers have not been passed on yet.

d) Unauthorised Traveller Encampments: **MI** informed that the Sandbanks incursion had been moved on and **MH** confirmed that Shore Road had also been cleared that day.

The newly combined BCP Council has had differing views and strategies in the past but the ongoing difficulties Cllr **MI** explained are that blocking and moving on may move the problem to a more sensitive place. The Travellers may also break into a site and be more annoyed that they had to do that. **MI** also pointed out that many councils all over the country share this problem and nationally attitudes are becoming firmer.

RA asked if part of the problem was that BPC have no official site for Travellers and this makes it slower to move them on. **MI** agreed but pointed out that when sites were proposed local opposition prevented them opening.

There was related mention of increased crime in the area related to sheds and bicycles.

Bob Reid reminded the members that the Association has a table at the Neighbourhood Watch coffee morning at Sandbanks Hotel on the Friday 20th September 10 for 10.30am. and all are welcome to come along.

The meeting closed 20.55

NEXT MEETING WEDNESDAY 9TH OCTOBER.

BRANKSOME PARK & CANFORD CLIFFS

RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

THE PARISH OFFICE • THE BRANKSOME ST ALDHELM CENTRE • 401 POOLE ROAD • BRANKSOME • POOLE • DORSET • BH12 1AD

Planning Lists for Meeting 11 September 19 List 28 – 36 included (6 September 19)

DECISIONS

APP/19/00763/F 12/07/19

4 Burton Road

Demolish the existing single house and replace with 5 houses, with very little space for parking, and built quite close to the boundaries. This was **Refused (06/09/19)**, for similar reasons to those in the many objections. This plot is in the Branksome Park Conservation Area, and the proposal is quite ridiculous. There have been over 45 objections, and the Conservation Officer has confirmed that it breaches the Conservation Area guidelines. Given the failure of the set of 5 houses just round the corner in Balcombe Road, this application seemed particularly strange.

APP/18/01595/F 11/12/2018

36 Tower Road

Demolish existing building and build block of 12 flats. This was **Approved (06/09/19)**. The Case Officer was happier with the revised plan, which did not include basement parking, and was slightly smaller. The development is consistent with the rest of the street.

APP/18/01446/F 7/11/2018

2 Burton Road/22 Balcombe Road

As expected, this amended proposal has been **Approved (05/09/19)**. Compared with some of the nearby applications, this one is much less controversial. However, it once more increases the density of housing in a plot which is on the edge of the Conservation Area.

APP/19/00845/F 02/07/19

26 Western Avenue

This application is to demolish and replace the house which was derelict due to a fire. This was **Approved (22/08/19)**. Several neighbours were worried about the imposing height of the proposed building, but the Case Officer, in granting permission, states that the "ridge height has been reduced". Unfortunately this cannot be confirmed from the available plans. Apart from the height issue, the property is quite consistent with the style in that road.

APP/19/00721/F 06/06/19

44 Western Road

This application was for two detached houses, and the neighbours in Ashton Court were particularly annoyed about it. It was **Refused (06/08/19)**, mainly because of the density and the lack of parking and access.

APPEALS

APP/19/00030/X

12 Western Avenue, an appeal has been lodged (4/04/19) in relation to the refusal of permission to remove several trees on the edge of the new building site. This case will be the subject of a Public hearing at the Civic Centre at 10:00 on 24 September 19.

APP/18/01330/F

On 19 July 19, the Appeal for the 20 Leicester Road site splitting proposal was **Dismissed**. The Inspector recognised that the proposal was not consistent with the Conservation Area guidance. He also stated that the proposed dwelling would not offer good living conditions to future occupiers.

APPLICATIONS

APP/19/00957/F 06/08/19

7 & 9 Lindsay Road

Demolish the two existing bungalows and replace with a collection of 10 individual houses. Once more, this should be impossible in the Conservation Area, but of course the McCarthy & Stone development next door is being used as a precedent. This proposal is not a surprise, and it is very difficult to know how to react.

BRANKSOME PARK & CANFORD CLIFFS

RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

THE PARISH OFFICE • THE BRANKSOME ST ALDHELM CENTRE • 401 POOLE ROAD • BRANKSOME • POOLE • DORSET • BH12 1AD

APP/19/00744/F **17/06/19**

2 Wilderton Road

The original application for 25 flats was refused in January 19. As expected, the developer has made a new proposal, this time for 21 flats, and one storey less. It is difficult to see how this is any less damaging, but we still have the issue of how to preserve the existing building. The current status of this application is unclear – most participants accept that the building needs to be replaced, but the key issue is the scale and density of the new block of flats. Three storeys might be better.

APP/19/00676/F **28/05/19**

8A Lindsay Road

Demolish the existing detached house and build a block of 11 x 2-bed flats, including basement parking. This is another controversial application on the edge of the Branksome Park Conservation area. The point of access is a particular issue, as it is on a sloping curve where the traffic goes down the hill to the traffic lights at Penn Hill. There have not been many objections, probably because there are not many neighbours, and there is also a sense that this is going to be affected by the “precedent” of the McCarthy & Stone development just down the road. BPC CRA has lodged an objection, mainly because of the Conservation Area and the traffic implications.

APP/19/00622/F **22/05/19**

56 The Avenue

Work has already started on this site, but the developer has now put in an application to add another storey to the block of flats, increasing it from 9 to 11 apartments. BPC CRA has lodged an objection, mainly because of the traffic implications.

APP/19/00252/F **13/03/19**

43 Western Road

The previous plan for three blocks of flats was refused by the Planning Committee, but this is yet another proposal, this time for three separate houses. The third house at the back of the site is particularly contentious, as it involves demolishing an old Victorian wall. The planning consultants continue to argue that the new buildings will be “hidden”, which is simply not true. Residents in Burton Road and Dover Road would be particularly affected.

APP/19/00267/F **28/03/19**

109 Lilliput Road

The previous application for a block of 3 flats was rejected on appeal. This new proposal seems remarkably similar, and it is not clear why any different decision would be expected. All comments from neighbours (and from BPC CRA) make this same argument.

APP/18/01616/P **08/01/2019**

18,18a,20,20a,20b Balcombe Road.

Demolish the 5 brand new houses and replace with a block of 30 flats. This is one of the most ridiculous applications that I have ever seen, and it has been strongly criticised by lots of neighbours (and by BPC CRA). There has also been press coverage in the Bournemouth Echo and the Sunday Times. Apparently the developer has been unable to sell the five houses, which presumably means they are too expensive, given the density of the site and the awkward location. Amended plans were listed on 03/07/19, but it is hard to see how they make any difference.

APP/18/01392/P **26/10/2018**

3 Brudenell Road

The house on this site has already been demolished, and a reasonable development has been approved. However, this application is seeking to build a block of 6 flats and a terrace of three town-houses. The neighbours are very upset (at least 12 objections), also one from the Society for Poole and from BPC CRA.

APP/18/01273/P **15/10/2018**

6 Burton Road

Outline application to demolish existing dwelling and erect a block of 8 no 2 bed and 4 no 3 bed flats with parking, cycle and bin storage. This proposal is completely out of order on the edge of the Conservation Area. **There have already been around 50 objections, including BPC CRA.** The immediate neighbour, in a listed building, has arranged for an objection by a professional planning expert. Apart from the visual impact, there is a lot of concern about parking and traffic issues. Since the last meeting, there have been some amendments to the proposal, leading to another batch of objections.