

# Supplementary Papers for Council

Date: Tuesday, 15 September 2020



---

## 5. Public Issues

To receive any public questions, statements or petitions submitted in accordance with the Constitution.

3 - 28

Published: 15 September 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL MEETING – 15 September 2020**

### **Public Question from Angela Sullivan**

I am writing to ask the council to consider the plight of bars with live events, these often rely on standing clients, to make the majority of their income.

The government grant has now run out. They are making less than half the income required to pay their overheads, let alone make money.

Loans can be obtained but how can they be repaid?

Will the council consider using some of their unclaimed discretionary grant funds to help?

Help for jobs, and businesses is needed in the town, before they all close leaving owners in debt, ruined and out of work.

### **Response from Councillor V Slade**

Thank you for the question. The plight of the hospitality industry has been taken very seriously both by the Government in their Small Grants, their CBILs and Bounce Back Loans and in the more recent Eat Out to Help Out programme and by the council in our Discretionary Grant Scheme and the R3 Economy Working Group. Many bars and live music events were able to qualify for grants and we added businesses like Nightclubs who were banned from reopening to the second phase of the Discretionary Grant subject to them meeting the criteria set in the scheme rules at that time. A number of such businesses did apply for funding and the final applications are being processed.

The BCP Council allocation for the Local Discretionary Grant Scheme was set at £4.3m and as at Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September £3.9m had been allocated. It is anticipated that the vast majority of the remaining sum will be distributed to businesses that applied under the scheme. The Council do not have the ability to use any unclaimed discretionary grant funds as any of the fund not paid as at 30 September has to be returned to the Government and applications for an award from the fund could not be made after 28 August in accordance with Government guidance on business grant scheme closures.

Businesses are still able to apply for Bounce Back loans which are fully guaranteed by Government, are interest and payment free for the first twelve months and I would encourage any business that has not yet applied for such a loan to do so.

Where local lockdowns take place in the coming months, funding is being provided to businesses who are forced to close and more information will be provided should this become necessary in the BCP Council area.

## COUNCIL MEETING – 15 September 2020

### Public Question from Mr M A Rodger

Both Bournemouth and Poole Councils remain listed as compliant with the Covenant of Mayors\* project, this despite their mayoral functions no longer having the resources to remain compliant and despite both having lapsed into non-compliance prior to the creation of BCP Council due to the required action plans being long defunct by the time of their dissolution.

Given the importance of climate change mitigation, this continuing non-compliance is a disgraceful situation to encounter.

Is it possible for BCP Council to have Bournemouth and Poole withdrawn from the Covenant of Mayors project?

\*Previously “Compact of Mayors”

### Set out below are the following

#### LINKS TO LISTINGS & DOCUMENTS

Listing of Covenant of Mayors 'cities' showing Poole as a 'signatory'.

<https://www.covenantofmayors.eu/plans-and-actions/action-plans.html>

Defunct Poole Action Plan linked in above listing.

[https://mycovenant.eumayors.eu/docs/seap/4874\\_1389275887.pdf](https://mycovenant.eumayors.eu/docs/seap/4874_1389275887.pdf)

Academic paper rating Poole as not achieving the Covenant of Mayors requirement of cutting emissions more than that achieved nationally.

Hsu et al (2020) '**Performance determinants show European cities are delivering on climate mitigation**' Nat. Clim. Chang.

ABSTRACT & LINK TO DATA

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-020-0879-9>

#### ON-LINE COVERAGE OF ABOVE

Hsu et al (2020) '**Are European Cities Delivering on their Climate Commitments?**' CarbonBrief.

<https://www.carbonbrief.org/quest-post-are-european-cities-delivering-on-their-climate-commitments>

Listing of Covenant of Mayors 'cities' showing Bournemouth as still 'Compliant'.

<https://www.globalcovenantofmayors.org/cities/bournemouth/>

Defunct Bournemouth Action Plan in the past posted as its 'compliance' Action Plan document despite being defunct.

<https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/environment-and-sustainability/ClimateChangeandCarbonReduction/Documents/Climate-Change-and-Sustainable-Bournemouth-Communty-Action-Plan.pdf>

Linked website without significant updates to defunct Bournemouth Action Plan.

<https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/binsrecycling/GoGreen/GoGreen.aspx>

Web page stating Bournemouth still Covenant of Mayors 'compliant' dated 2017 (with links to an A3 leaflet described as Bournemouth's "Climate Change Strategy").

<https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/News/Articles/2017/june/bournemouth-is-celebrating-the-reduction-of-its-carbon-footprint-and-wants-to-help-residents-to-do-the-same.aspx>

### **Reply from Councillor Felicity Rice, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change**

When Council endorsed the draft Climate and Ecological Emergency Action Plan at its meeting on 17 December 2019, it also made a continuing commitment to participate in the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy initiative.

This initiative had been newly formed from the previous Covenant of Mayors and Compact of Mayors initiatives that the legacy Poole and Bournemouth Councils had taken part in respectively.

Any information on websites relating to these historic schemes bears no relevance to BCP Council's current engagement with the new Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy initiative. BCP Council data, including our new Climate and Ecological Emergency targets and draft Action Plan, has been submitted to the new scheme for verification and will be available on the Global Covenant website when it is updated later this year.

## **COUNCIL MEETING – 15 September 2020**

### **Public Question from John Dobson**

**Mudford Sandbank Beach House Café rebuild public consultation August 24<sup>th</sup> to October 5<sup>th</sup> publish supporting documentation**

### **Question to Councillor Margaret Phipps and to Councillor Dr Felicity Rice**

As a part of the current public consultation for the Mudford Beach House Café rebuild, the supporting documentation includes;

“View accurate elevation drawings to scale showing a realistic comparison of old vs new buildings.”

The referred drawing is PADstudio drawing 1914 23-018, Elevations D Underhill rebuttal dated June 2020.

Also;

“View ‘Street Scene’ illustration of profile of new building in harmony with the local environment”

The referred drawing is PADstudio drawing 1914 23-019, Contiguous Street Scene Elevations dated April 2020.

Both the referenced drawings depict a proposed Ground Floor Finish Level of the new Café at similar level to that of the previous café 1.830m AOD.

However the Environment Agency have written to the Planning Officer on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2020 copying the Architect recommending that;

“RECOMMENDATION:

To manage the risk to the still water flood level from increased tidal risks, we would recommend that finished floor levels for the proposed development are raised 300mm above the 2090 still water tidal flood level of 2.65m AOD, with an additional 300mm of resiliency/resistance incorporated into the design. This is due to reduced lifetime of development that accords with our Local Flood Risk Standing Advice for commercial development in Christchurch.”

### **Question;**

Are the Council proposing to ignore the recommendation of the EA, compromising their aspirations to address the global climate-change emergency, in developing a cafe to a level lower than the recommendation of 2.950m AOD? Or is the current information presented to the public misleading in that the depicted maximum new café ridge height of 9.020m AOD should in fact be publicized as at least 10.140m AOD over 1 metre higher? Will the Council take action to remedy this?

### **Response:**

BCP carried out environmental analysis and in February of this year commissioned an extensive report from STM Environmental. The advice of STM (experts in their field) has been fully implemented within the PAD studio proposals and this report in conjunction with drawings was considered by the EA who responded fully on 14 April 2020.

This report states that *“this is for a replacement building on the same footprint we have no objection subject to the following recommendations and informatives being included in any planning permission granted.”* The notes to the applicant advise that consideration is given to “flood resilient construction practices, ... choice of materials” to ensure the development is *“more resistant to flooding in the first place”*

The EA have recommended in the attached recommendations that consideration is given to raising the floor level a further 300mm above 2.65AOD i.e. 2.95mm AOD with a further 300mm of resiliency incorporated into the design.

The current proposal is located 190mm above the old building, to raise it further is not viable in accessibility terms - it is simply unachievable as Building Regulations dictate that Part M compliance requires a ramp for wheelchair access which would be a ramp of 12 metres length. A lift from the beach is simply not feasible, nor would it meet the requirement of Part B which also requires safe egress from the building during a fire (when lifts are shut down). A lift would also not work in a flood zone.

The decision was therefore made to ensure that the construction of the building is resilient and the engineering of the building fully accommodates this. Internally the construction of the walls is blockwork, for this reason alone (the roof is a SIPS style construction). Sockets and power outlets are all located above 2.65mm (and could be higher if required), and the drainage will be designed to ensure that it is not impacted by any flooding. The floor finish will be ceramic tile for durability and flooding. The design team have fully considered all the implications that this demanding location places upon the construction, but a balanced and practical view has to be taken which considers all the issues not just one viewed in isolation.

In terms of flooding (and fire, and acoustics) the proposed building will be a considerable improvement upon the previous one which was not designed to accommodate any flood resilient construction and indeed a like for like replacement considering this aspect alone would not be possible, not to mention all the other Building Regulation requirements which a like for like replacement would not satisfy (fire, acoustic, accessibility).

The Case Officer and the applicant (and BCP) are fully aware of all these issues and have engaged in lengthy dialogue. When the Case Officer makes their recommendation to the Planning Committee they will take into account all the information available and reach a balanced view – this may require certain Conditions to be placed upon the application which may require some modifications to the design, if the Case Officer feels that it is necessary to do so.

## **Public Questions from Stephen Barratt MSBHA**

### **BCP Council, Mudeford Sandbank Beach House Café rebuild planning application 7-2020-11229-M**

**Background Information to Question 1:** Despite letters and objections to your planning department, no response has been given to the discrepancy in the site plans submitted by BCP Councils architect PAD Studios, to the planning department for the above application.

The extant planning approval 7/2004/11229/J does not include the sheds and passage-way to the East of the site, however the current BCP planning application submitted, states there is no material increase to the footprint.

The current site plan submitted by BCP includes the sheds and passage way, despite no planning application approval being in place to include this within the current footprint of the Beach House Café site.

This error has implications for both the interpretation of the NPPF Green belt policies that seek to protect the openness of the green belt and comments received by the Environment Agency who have been misled into commenting on a footprint that is the same as currently approved rather than materially larger.

### **Question 1 to Cllr Margaret Phipps, portfolio holder for strategic planning, and Cllr Felicity Rice, Portfolio holder for environment:**

Why is BCP through their architect Pad Studio submitting misleading and incorrect information with regard to the extant site planning approval 7/2004/11229/J which materially affects the Environment Agency's comments and adherence to Green Belt Policies?

#### **Response:**

The design of the new building was developed with all statutory obligations in mind, and the issue of impact upon the Green Belt has been extensively discussed with the Case Officer.

Further clarification was obtained from a specialist consultant and a response detailing the Green Belt considerations that the design team have taken was submitted to the Case Officer. This will be presented to the Planning Committee in due course, who will have the ultimate decision as to whether the scheme complies with its statutory obligations.

**Background Information to Question 2:** The current Planning application 7-2020-11229-M does not include a Shop, refuse area or Gas Bottle storage location. BCP as the applicant, has not included a shop, refuse and waste storage, or gas bottle storage within its current planning application. These all form part of the Beach House Café tenants lease obligations and the shop was located within the original café structure prior to the fire.

### **Question 2 to Cllr Margaret Phipps, portfolio holder for strategic planning, and Cllr Felicity Rice, Portfolio holder for environment:**

If a change of use to the current BCP office (temporarily in use as a shop without planning approval) to a commercial shop is proposed and the gas bottle storage and refuse area are changing from their current locations, all of which will fall outside the



red line, why have these not been included in the overall plan for increased commercial activity on Mudeford Sandbank within the current planning application?

**Response:**

The shop has been temporarily relocated to the beach office site in response to the fire in November 2018, and the Council is considering its options with regards to its future use. If the decision is to create a permanent facility in the future on this site then that will be subject to its own specific Planning application at a later date, during which the commercial activity will be fully considered. It is important the café development application reflects the potential for a shop and the planning statement will be updated in due course.

The operational areas of the commercial refuse and gas bottle storage are being considered separately by the Seafront Operations Team, who are looking at the wider strategic context of the site which encompasses the infrastructure required to service all of the Councils functions, and that of its tenants including the Beach House.

## **Public Question from Sally Harris**

### **Beach House Café Rebuild**

Question to Cllr Vikki Slade Leader of BCP Council -

You are quoted in the media releases over the weekend , The Daily Telegraph, The Daily Mail & The Bournemouth Echo as describing Mudeford Sandbank as a " beautiful & unique beach location".. You go on to say you " wish to prioritise affordable aspirations" . The current tenant in these media releases has suggested he requires 20 more covers to justify any uplift in his rent. This in turn will increase the commerciality & footfall onto this environmentally sensitive site.

My question to you is:

How can the public gauge if the proposed rebuild borrowing is justified financially if the potential revenue stream from the tenant has not been negotiated & is not in the public domain. ?

### **Response:**

As a question of this nature was asked at the BCP Cabinet meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> June 2020, and a section of the answer still stands as follows:

- A rent review for this property was due in January 2019 which was suspended as a result of the fire, therefore there is an opportunity to work with the tenant towards a new rental figure which more accurately reflects the value of the tenancy.
- Similar properties along the BCP coastline attract a rent of £34 per square foot which is in considerably in excess of the current leasehold agreement for the Beach House; so, there is scope to realign this to deliver the annual repayments required for the additional borrowing.
- Officers are confident of being able to service the borrowing repayments from the rent improvements and from other changes to the operation of the sandbank facilities if required.

As the negotiations with the tenants are ongoing and of a commercially sensitive nature, the details of this cannot as yet be published in the public domain.

## **Public Question from Mary Timms**

### **Mudford Sandbank Beach House Café rebuild planning application 7-2020-11229-M**

#### **Beach House extras**

I am concerned at the lack of transparency over this application. The proposed new build of the Beach House cafe does not include:

1. A facility for storing waste/rubbish prior to collection.
2. The shop, as prescribed by their lease.
3. Storage to enable the sale of gas, also prescribed in the lease.

#### **Question 1: Could you please explain how and where these will be within the new build?**

If it is not included it becomes obvious that the footprint of the eventual cafe site is greatly increased and commercial activity which is necessary for the previous functions mentioned functions (1, 2, 3) which were within the original site will have to be 3 other developments.

I think the consultation survey being held by the BCP does not make this obvious and therefore is not an accurate representation of what your survey is about.

Would you not agree that the council must be transparent in the way it spends the public's money and that the information that the rebuild also necessitates further building on the spot with associated extra costs and impact involved in this?

#### **Response:**

The Beach Hut Association requested that further consultation take place and Cabinet agreed. That consultation is now underway and is receiving a high level of interest with regular meetings taking place with the Association involving Council officers and members.

The storage and disposal of waste from Mudford Sandbank is an operational issue which requires a co-ordinated approach, and our Seafront Operations Team are currently working on a strategic solution for the site as a whole.

The inclusion of the commercial waste which will be potentially produced by the new Beach House is an important part of this strategy, and given the strict limitations of space in the area around the restaurant site it was decided to separate these requirements from the main design of the building to enable a more co-ordinated and sustainable refuse collection service, with the Council working in partnership with the tenant of the restaurant with the aim to reduce the production of waste, recycle wherever possible to minimise the impact of the business on this sensitive site. This work is ongoing and will be implemented in due course.

The shop has been temporarily relocated to the old beach office site, and the Council is currently considering its options for the provision of such a facility in the future. If the decision is made to pursue this option on a permanent basis then it will be subject to its own individual Planning application if appropriate.

The sale of gas to beach hut owners will be maintained by the current tenants of the Beach House as it has been for many years, however due to the regulations involving the storage of the gas supply to the main building it was necessary to relocate the gas bottle 'cage' to an area well away from the main building for safety reasons. The Seafront Operations Team are also tasked with developing a plan for this along with the new waste disposal strategy, and will be working with the Mundeford Sandbank Beach Hut Association to ascertain the most efficient location for these operational areas.

### **Transparency of consultation**

Following from question 1, you are currently consulting on proposed plans however you are not being transparent as to the effects of the commercial activity proposed and the 3 additional locations outside the current application.

**Question 2: Will you now instruct your consultation team to adjust the website to make it quite clear of the full proposal? In doing so you will ensure that the council's intentions are fully transparent.**

I believe that you should also make sure that those who have already commented are fully aware of what they are commenting on.

### **Response:**

This has been fully answered in the question above, the 3 additional locations referred to will be dealt with separately.

## **Public Question from Kimbal Furmidge**

### **BCP Council, Mudeford Sandbank Beach House Café rebuild planning application 7-2020-11229-M**

#### **Background Information**

The analysis presented in document SOLAR ANALYSIS AND 3D MODEL VIEWS.pdf (attached) is clearly designed to mislead.

The document compares the larger temporary café which does not have planning permission, comparisons should be made with the original Beach House which has planning permission.

The analysis fails to include the summer months of July, August and September, which are the months the neighbouring huts will be used the most.

The times shown, midday and 4pm, are not relevant.

#### **Question:**

Why is BCP, through their architect Pad Studio, submitting misleading and incomplete information to distract from the damage to amenity of the adjacent huts in the proposed planning approval 7/2004/11229/J?

#### **Response:**

- The sunlight analysis carried out by PAD Studios is correct and was conducted using software that was geolocated to the exact latitude and longitude and the heights of our model, and is accurate.
- The months selected March, June and December were selected as a broad cross-section of the seasons, spring, mid-summer (June) and December. During July the sun is overhead at its zenith and shading is not an issue.
- By showing the Existing situation the best possible scenario is illustrated as the mass of the original building is not shown. The original building had an unbroken roof running north to south which is higher than the current situation and would therefore have demonstrated a worse case than the one illustrated. The existing scenario was selected as this is what people have become accustomed to.
- The times selected are also a cross section throughout the day, and are accurate. The critical issue is that there will always be shading regardless of the proposal and by using the best possible scenario (the current temporary building) a comparison can be made at various times of the day which illustrates this point well, especially at 4pm where it can be clearly seen that there is a degree of shading towards the west even from the current single story, flat roofed temporary buildings which is not made demonstrably worse by the proposed building.

## **Public Question from Lindsey Webb**

Following the June cabinet decision to pause support for above proposition and in response to the recommendation from the O & S committee which called into question the commercial viability of the project, why is BCP council considering borrowing £811,000 and spending £1,100,000 on a building that nobody wants when you could rebuild the café using the insurance payout, as confirmed in an email from Chris Saunders.

## **Response from Councillor D Brown**

A full public consultation is currently being conducted at the request of the BCP Cabinet, and this will seek to establish the level of public support for the current design of the new building. The findings of this consultation will be presented to Cabinet Members in due course, along with a full review of the business case which will re-examine the commercial viability for the rebuild within the new context of today's challenging economic circumstances. Members will then decide whether to support the continuation of the Planning application as it stands, or if an alternative option is required.

## **Council 15 September 2020 – statement submitted by Helen Ash on Vote of No Confidence**

Vote YES for Vikki Slade

Abstaining is wasted vote

Me and neighbours in Hamworthy appreciate Julie and Dan as independents working with the Alliance for residents.

Creekmoor friends welcome the independent mind of Diane Butler, no hidden motives/agenda, working with the Alliance to challenge and shape actions.

In the last year or so we have seen more positive action in Poole than under the Conservatives.

BCP controlled by Beesley and Bournemouth Conservatives is not good for BCP residents, democracy, transparency

We did not vote Conservative for a reason!

Any non-conservative councillors would have no voice to challenge or debate.

## **Council 15 September 2020 – statement submitted by Susan Chapman on agenda item 12 Motion on Vote of No Confidence**

Please all read David Wallace-Wells' "Uninhabitable Earth". The #YouthStrike4Climate generation deserves everyone's priority focus. Please invite them to talks about solutions. Their next protest is on 25.9.20.

We're carboned out.

We have all failed so far, we are all hypocrites at some level and we will all continue to make mistakes. A non-judgemental, cross-party attitude of collaboration should prevail for Safeguarding. Life on Earth is heading for ecosystem and biodiversity collapse, for crop and economic failures, droughts, fires, landslides, migrations, conflicts, as well as more pandemics as the ice melts, releasing dangerous pathogens.



**Statement regarding Bournemouth, Christchurch & Poole Council's contravention in 2019 of regulation 15(2)(a)(ii) of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015:**

**“The agenda item 11 report wrongly dismisses BCP's negating of statutory ‘public rights’ concerning the Annual Governance Statement as - quote - ‘a minor omission’. Partly on the untenable assumption that local electors - who should not need to police Council compliance - would not raise objections to unseen narrative information.**

**Before BCP finalised the 2018/19 reporting last September I advised the Council of this contravention.”**

**In October, via the Monitoring Officer, I notified the unaware regulatory Audit & Governance Committee.**

**Following my exhortations, the decision-makers acceded to obligatory disclosure but - it now evolves - in a skewed form minimising this material statutory breach.”**

**P Gatrell**

## **Council 15 September 2020 – statement submitted by Mrs Zoe Tees on one way system in Southbourne’s high street**

I appreciate the efforts of the Unity Alliance to respond to our terrifying Climate and Ecological Emergency and note the Echo's 14.9.20 article showing resident support for the active travel plan.

While cycling I've had to buy a camera, now very prominent on my helmet. I've been very frightened over several car bully incidents imperilling myself and my child. Please can we have a one-way system installed in Southbourne's high street so that a designated cycle lane can ensure the safety of cyclists. Various means of rerouting other traffic could later be discussed.

**A STATEMENT FROM THE *SAVE LAND NORTH OF MERLEY* ACTION  
GROUP TO ACCOMPANY PRESENTATION OF ITS PETITION,**



**September, 2020**

We present this petition on behalf of the residents of Merley and Canford Magna who have been opposing the UE1 development for five years. We would like to emphasize that we are wholly in favour of sustainable development in suitable areas. However, the UE1 site is not such an area. We are aware that, as a newly constituted council with a wider geographical reach, some councillors will be unfamiliar with our part of north Poole, a semi rural area on the fringes of BCP. We suspect that some will be unaware of the complete inappropriateness of this planned development. We shall, in due course, be submitting a report to the Planning Committee, outlining the matters that concern us.

Many of the issues run counter to the protections guaranteed by PP10 of the Poole Local Plan. Whilst, with a suitable willingness from the developers, some of these issues can be resolved, there are others, we believe, which are wholly irresolvable. Chief amongst our concerns are:

- The effect of the UE1 development on the setting of the Grade I listed building of Canford Manor, “a heritage asset of the highest significance”, according to Historic England; and a lack of concern about the lasting damage that will be done to the important conservation area of the historic Canford Village. Canford is a jewel in the heritage crown of the BCP.
- The poor accessibility of the site. Even BCP’s own Highway Authority review suggests that “it is likely that residents will drive to main employment and shopping areas”, rendering the desired Modal Shift away from the car very unlikely in this proposed development.
- A danger of water pollution and flood risk. The massively increased volumes of water, especially in the face of accelerating climate change, will run off the newly created hard surfaces of the steeply sloping hillside into the River Stour. This will not, however, be our problem. It will be the problem for those of you with riverside wards further downstream.

We do not believe that a reconsideration of UE1 would be inappropriate. The allocation was an understandable response to the government’s inflated and unrealistic housing targets – since revised by ONS. You should not feel committed to it if, for good reasons – such as BCP’s declaration of a Climate Emergency – circumstances have changed in the last three years.

Councillors, when the time comes, your Planning Committee could choose to be a beacon for countless local authorities around the country by saying to the developers this: “We allocated the site, but we have had to change our minds. The Climate Emergency really is much too important. The site is a poorly located for new housing, and its green fields are needed to absorb the 30% increased winter rainfall predicted by the Met Office. The proposals for UE1 were proposed in good faith by the Local Plan and now, in changed circumstances, we must in good faith. reject them.”

If your Planning Committee is forced to refuse the application because it cannot satisfy the conditions of the Poole Local Plan, then there are other options for this allocated site. If the Council chose to create woodland to absorb pollution from the A31, or a flower meadow to encourage pollinators, or a park for north Poole, which it currently lacks but needs, can you imagine the national headlines you would attract and the esteem you would be held in by the younger generations?

**Redacted**

Frank Ahern

(on behalf of Save Land North of Merley)

# ePetition details

## Land North of Merley

**We the undersigned petition the council to refuse the proposal under planning application APP/19/00955/P to build 600 houses on land north of Merley, which until recently was protected by Green Belt status.**

We believe that the detrimental effect of the increased volume of traffic in neighbouring areas will have a severely adverse impact upon the lives of local people, and upon the historic conservation village of Canford Magna.

Further, we believe that the development will put further strain on local amenities and services such as health and education provision which may not be fully mitigated by developer contributions.

We believe that development of this land (UE1 in the Poole Local Plan) is completely inappropriate.

We therefore urge BCP Council to consider other ways to meet its housing targets.

(Details of the planning application can be viewed online at <https://boppa.poole.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal= POOLE DCAPR 257036> )

This ePetition ran from 19/08/2019 to 01/11/2019 and has now finished.

423 people signed this ePetition.

## Land North of Merley

### ePetition responses

- FionaPagan Bishop
- Glen Fowler
- Chris Fowler
- michael bartlett
- Alison Hobson
- David Hobson
- sarah webber
- John King
- Wendy Hilton-King
- Margaret Platt
- Amy Smith
- Mark Smith
- Samuel Burchell
- Janet connor
- Tony Styles
- Gary Meakin
- Kevin Wall
- Rob Bartlett

- Sam Wood
- Sally Bishton
- Alison Bartlett
- Jonathan Namock
- Gareth Bristow
- Wendy Wadsworth
- Angela Burrows
- Alastair Tyndall
- Clive Jeffery
- Ian Zimmerman
- Victoria Lindsay
- Alex Lindsay
- John Lindsay
- Caroline Lindsay
- Susan Webb
- Jean Ellis
- John Boys
- Judy Wateridge
- Robert Jamieson
- ann jones
- Roberta Baynham
- Jason Falconer
- Helen McEvoy
- David Harmon
- Lindsey David
- D Prince
- GARY GILDER
- Caroline Rutter
- Andrew Baldwin
- Susan Baldwin
- Andrew HARTWELL
- PATRICIA MUNRO
- Barbara Walmesley
- Hilary Newbery
- Vicky MOSS
- Nigel Batten
- David Atkinson
- Tim Lister
- Julia Lister
- Lyn Marsh
- Lindsay Robinson
- Elizabeth Gravenor
- V Gravenor
- Terry Wilson
- Marian Pudney
- John Pudney
- Ken Dashwood
- Alistair Kendall
- Rita Clarke
- Andrew Lindsay
- Jacqueline Barringer
- Brian Barringer
- Steve Roberts
- Carla Watkinson
- Adrian Hobbs
- Maureen Hemming
- Adam Logan

- MARIE FRANKLIN
- John Waldsax
- Richard Hemming
- Lesley Richards
- Lynne Chellingworth
- Emily Scammell
- Elyse Spooner
- Clive Hampton
- Heather Watson
- Claire Dorey
- Lisa Keay
- Diana Mullings
- Hayley Walker
- valerie Arbon
- John Evans
- Angela Evans
- Christine Dewey
- Stella Scoble
- Hazel McCabe
- John Samways
- Paul Brown
- Paul Scotson
- Nikki Samways
- Matthew Wallis
- Richard Valentine
- Rebecca Valentine
- Pete King
- Carol Butter
- Selina Rumbold
- Karen Janes
- Lisa Bugh
- Stephanie Critchell
- Mike Pinnington
- Lorraine Davies
- Bryan Smith
- David Boon
- vivienne arkell
- Cristiano Alarco
- Peter Schouten
- Diane Schouten
- Melina White
- Graham White
- jenny garrett
- Michael Harms
- Daniel Brown
- Lucy Chalk
- Pat Eyres
- Robert Froud
- Samantha Amor
- Jerry Howe
- Neil Blaney
- Sharon Flynn
- Sue Wellman
- Michelle Lockwood
- Nathan Brown
- Michael McCafferty
- mark salkeld

- peter connor
- Alison Cole
- Kevin Dempster
- A MULLINS
- fiona langlois
- Anna Shore
- Richard Osborne
- Sarah Salmon
- Lucy Salmon
- Andrew Evans
- Dulcie Phillips
- Ellen-Jane Phillips
- Adrian Salmon
- Fiona Edwards
- Abigail Logan
- James Salmon
- Sarah Brown
- Stephen Brown
- Andrea Salmon
- Sue Handley
- Graham Handley
- Rhian Tomkins
- Julie Cheshire
- Valerie Sweetlove
- Chris Burt
- Marili Hammond
- Christopher Hammond
- Emma Penfold
- Karen Isaac
- Tracy Clark
- Janet Barnes
- Lee White
- Lisa Cluett
- David Bishop
- Rodi Karadimova-Watts
- Carol Potter
- David Thompson
- Stuart Cox
- Dwight Hudson
- susan clements
- MARION BRADLEY
- Linda Griffiths
- Alan Griffiths
- Colin Wilson
- Beverley Rozier
- Roger Peart
- Peter Impett
- Carolyn Smith
- Nicky Hawkins
- James Claridge
- Pamela Wollage
- Patricia Zimmerman
- Diane deWet
- Jackie Morris
- Steven Mulcock
- Jenny McCartney
- Steven Webber

- Julie Henson
- Frank deMello
- Matthew Beavan
- Nicola Beavan
- Chris Per6
- Joanne Perrett
- Nicola Lowe
- Linda Ellis
- Andrew Ward
- Duncan Ellis
- Heather Birch
- David Birch
- Tiffany Forbessinclair
- Kim Harmon
- Marlene Holland
- Daniel Mckeown
- Alexandra Poore
- Jane Cribb
- Pamela Johnson
- Sandra Blainey
- Brenda Edwards
- Sarah Horseman
- Cheryl Watson
- Sally Bishop
- Joan Dyer
- Janet Knight
- tony knight
- Jon Biglowe
- Justyn Lynk
- Joan Stenning
- Lynne Slatford
- Richard Slatford
- Michaela Slatford
- Daniel Stenning
- Ian Binnie
- Brian Lane
- Katie Winzar
- Graham Mcneill
- David Hendricks
- Clare Julyan
- Miles Skinner
- Hannah Bastable
- Katie Bastable
- Pam Farmer
- Helen Larcombe
- Valerie Bacon
- Stephen Palmer
- Mark Hetherington
- Susan Hetherington
- Claire Ambler
- Jane Brooks
- Tracy Fail
- Glenn Morgan
- Allison Colmer
- Paul Robson
- Angela Bastable
- Jenny Harris



- JOHN PYLE
- Phil Telford
- Deborah Donovan
- Joanne Pritchard
- Peter Kazmierczak
- Anne Lane
- Lisa Mehmet
- Eric Stevens
- peter morris
- Susan Burr ridge
- Melanie Fawcett
- T Fuller
- robert fuller
- Terence Murray
- Gillian Murray
- Susan Steventon
- Michael Martin
- Bernard Fowler
- Chris Harris
- Catherine White
- Barry Maunder
- Sue Maunder
- Raymond Greenham
- Julia Wilkinson
- Raymond Newman
- Carolyn Newman
- YVONNE HARTWELL
- Margaret Wilson
- Susan Brownless
- Helen Watson
- Gail Stuart
- Elizabeth Gray
- William Gray
- Lynne Harris
- Mark Parris
- Philip Murray
- Catherine Murray
- Jeannette Pike
- Angela Hopkinson
- Wendy Baker
- Katrina Roberts
- Paul Dyer
- Peter Cadogan
- Moira Stidder
- Charlotte Martin
- Amy Namock
- David Halliwell
- Amanda Adams
- Richard Burton
- Satah Clarke
- Jeremy Orme
- Andrew Charters
- simon phillips
- Ian Reynolds
- Francisco Compan
- Gabriel Lesmoir-Gordon
- David Coates

- Barbara Whetlor
- Anthony Millett
- Marie Whetlor
- Wendy Foot
- Stephen Moore
- Patricia Burden
- Ian Burden
- Joanne Squires
- Chris Worrall
- Sarahjane Parkinson
- Toby Parkinson
- Bhoomika Dave
- David Calvert
- Dawn Healy
- Samantha Ballington
- William Healy
- Sophie Trudgett
- David Kirk
- Derek Clarke
- Tony Barnett
- Erika Bartlett
- Stephen Bartlett
- John Goddard
- Christine Francies
- Susan Hampton
- Michelle Mellor-Smith
- Debbie Grice
- Richard Lee
- Sheila Holder
- Kathleen Haddock
- Christine Smith
- Martin Dudleston
- Mandy Guy
- laurence stephens
- Pam Cooke
- STEPHEN LLOYD-JONES
- Mandy Franklin
- Jessica Smith
- Barbara Knowles
- Janet Rogers
- Edward Knowles
- Katherine Bowen
- Tony Jones
- Mike Hubbard
- Nicky Mahmud
- Meryl Landes
- Peter Morgan
- Ian Wedge
- john hill
- Stuart Talbot
- FW HAMPTON
- Kathryn Cook
- susan Alcock
- Steve Curtis
- Adam Croker
- Brooke Powell
- Vicki Dunkerly

- HelenJane Telford
- Sue Ahern
- Monica Garcia
- Maria Pitt
- Susan Egan
- Sharon Mitchell
- Ryan Davies
- Jan Keen-Haudin
- Chris Pitt
- Martin Davies
- Nathan Squires
- Steve Simpson
- Maureen Lewis
- Anne Osullivan
- Howard Johnson
- David Channer
- Henry Oakley
- NIALL MUNRO
- Sian Smith
- Ann Hill
- Stephen Bond
- Alan Stanley
- Loraine Hughes
- Nicky Turkoz
- Conchita Burn
- Vanessa Sheppard
- Kim Todd
- jane hill
- Beryl Channer
- Derek Percy
- Catherine Ward
- Andrew Brown
- Margaret Kazmierczak
- Sarah Nixon
- Rob Ward
- Fiona Jones
- Jean Hodges
- David Arkell
- Anne Myers
- marion pope
- Sarah Pickard
- Mike Hennessy
- Sarah Evans
- Mark Ler
- Richard Daley
- Stephen Baker
- Fiona Hensby
- Rhian Rothery
- Stephen Phillips
- Alan Heyes
- Mark Coates
- Justyn Lynk
- Charlotte Kenyon
- Martin Sheppard
- Jason Wasey
- Allen Hodges
- Rebecca Baldwin

- Joseph Baldwin
- Harold Burridge
- Francesco Bove
- Brian Hollins
- Sam Freeman
- Frank Ahern