

Sandbanks Community Group AGM

Held 4pm 8th July 2022 at the RMYC

Minutes

- 1 **INTRODUCTION.** David Morley (DHM) opened the meeting and with in excess of 80 members in attendance, declared the meeting quorate.
- 2 **ROCKWATER.** DHM then reported that Luke Davies, CEO of Rockwater, who had been scheduled to speak at the AGM, had found himself unable to attend, and there would therefore be no presentation to the meeting as to the status of the plans for the Sandbanks and Branksome cafes and associated planning applications.
- 3 **CHAIR'S REPORT.** DHM then presented the Chair's report - see Appendix 1, and then proposed to alter the sequencing of the remaining agenda items as Inspector Tamblyn was already in attendance.
- 4 **Q&A INSPECTOR DANNY TAMBLYN.** DHM then introduced Inspector Danny Tamblyn (DT), newly appointed as Neighbourhood Inspector for Sandbanks for a Q&A session. DT provided a brief personal history, followed by a brief description of how he saw his role within the community, emphasising that he had no immediate response function, his role being to address longer-term concerns and problems. There then followed a Question and Answer session to allow members to understand more about DT's role. DHM then thanked DT for his work and for attending the meeting. DT then left the meeting.
- 5 **HAVEN HOTEL.** DHM then gave a special report on the status of the long-running Sandbanks Hotels planning application – see Appendix 2.
- 6 **TREASURER'S REPORT.** DHM then asked Alison Sepping ("AS") to give the Treasurer's report. AS reported that the Group was in sound financial health, with c. £22.5k in the bank, and gave a brief account of the major items of income and expenditure. The accompanying statement of the accounts for 2021-22 – see Appendix 3 - was accepted by the meeting. DHM thanked AS for her work on behalf of the SCG in the year.
- 7 **ELECTION OF OFFICERS.** DHM stated that, in accordance with the SCG constitution, all members of the committee were resigning. Those offering themselves for re-election were :

Kate Allen, Lucie Allen, Norman Allenby-Smith, Tiffany Chawner, Lisa Higgins, Mike Jennings, Alison Sepping, Anthony Vickery

All the above were duly elected on a show of hands.
- 8 **VOTE OF THANKS.** The meeting then recorded a vote of thanks to :
 - Paul de Cordova, Bertie Webb and Sue and David Morley – retiring committee members;
 - Sophie Sajic – Head of BCP Seasonal Response
 - Frankie Kingsbury – temporary Head of BCP Seasonal Response
 - Sgt Sophie Williams – Head of local Neighbourhood Policing unit
 - Councillors May Haines and Mohan Iyengar

9 **AOB.** DHM then asked Norman Allenby-Smith (“NAS”) to say a few words about the issues that he was looking to address in the coming months. NAS then gave a brief summary of those issues :

- Traffic;
- Landscaping initiatives e.g. the roundabout at the entrance to Sandbanks;
- Water quality improvements – discussions with Wessex Water;
- Improvements at Kite Beach and the quest to have the beach adopted as a bathing beach by BCP and the Harbour authorities
- Expansion of al-fresco dining;
- Improving the public realm.

The meeting closed at 6:15pm.

APPENDIX 1

SCG Chair's report Summer 2022

What has SCG achieved in 2021/2022? - 21 reasons to support SCG as a paid-up member

1. **'Seasonal Ready'**. With fantastic support from our Ward Councillors, May Haines & Mohan Iyengar, we have engaged BCP and the police since last summer in planning for seasonal readiness 2022 - so far with effective results
2. **Police Operations**. We liaise closely with the police to increase operations against ASB in Sandbanks (Op Sandman) and in & around Poole harbour e.g. jet ski issues (Op Seagoing) and boy racers (Op Charge) - again, so far with effective results.
3. **Travellers**. We worked with BCP and the police to ensure the swift removal of a travellers' encampment at SB car park last summer and repeated twice already this year.
4. **Wessex Water**. We engaged with Wessex Water at director level and BCP to relay the concerns of members about the sewer collapse roadworks and persuade them to man the temporary lights 7am-11 pm to help minimise disruption. We were able to issue timely WhatsApp alerts about the works to keep members up to date. We engaged with the national media to help publicise the issues, with an article appearing in the Daily Telegraph quoting SCG.
5. **Barbecue area**. We helped achieve the removal of the barbecue area on SB beach (and its removal from Google Maps) last year
6. **Traffic marshals**. As part of the 'Summer Ready' plans, we successfully lobbied for traffic Marshalls at SB car park and the ferry queue for 2022 as well as increased community policing resources.
7. **Seafront Strategy**. We have a positive vision for upgrading the infrastructure and public realm in Sandbanks to benefit residents, visitors and businesses alike. It is set out in our response to the BCP seafront strategy consultation now submitted and live on our website via this link.
8. **Rockwater, SB Pavilion & Cafe**. Our willingness to constructively engage with BCP and the new owners of the SB Cafe & kiosks at the Pavilion, Rockwater, led to detailed consultation and discussion over the design & use of the SB cafe & kiosks & licensing hours, as well continuing involvement in the design of the Pavilion.

9. **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Grants.** We successfully applied for or initiated, three grants: a) two grants to improve the planters at SB roundabout and the flower bed at Midway Path for £6500 combined and b) one grant to repair and improve the launch ways into Poole Harbour for water sports users from Banks Road for £30,000.

10. **Brownsea Island Special visit.** We arranged a highly successful special winter visit for SCG members to Brownsea Island with guides from the Dorset Wildlife trust

11. **Haven.** We continue to run a five year PR, planning, legal and social media campaign that has taken the number of objections to the Haven plans to 6500+

12. **Party House.** Our relationships with the police and BCP helped lead to the swift shut-down of the Panorama Rd party house in early last year that acted as a deterrent to help prevent further incidents. We are geared up to do the same should any such incident reoccur. Members may have read in the media recently that AirBnB have now introduced a world-wide ban on party houses.

13. **Security.** We successfully lobbied for security cameras in SB car park to deter boy-racers and other ASB (to be installed soon). These cameras helped uncover the perpetrator of a serious hate crime offence in SB car park in March this year.

14. **Local voice.** The long term secret of success has been to establish good working relationships & constructively engage with Councillors, BCP officers, Police, Ferry owners, Rockwater owners, Sandfest organisers & local media

15. **Sandfest.** As a result of our relationship with the Sandfest organiser, we obtained 50 free tickets to Sandfest for SCG members last year and the same again this year.

16. **Neighbourhood Plan.** We have produced a formal Neighbourhood Plan under the national planning legislation to protect SB for the long term and launched a statutory consultation. The next step will be a local referendum and the plan may come into effect this year.

17. **Business.** We engage with local businesses and help their voice to be heard e.g. working with Rick Steins & Oriel to provide more pavement cafe style open air space and engaging with Wessex Water and BCP about facilities and clean up of sewage leaks for water sports users at Kite Beach.

18. **SB Hotel footpath.** We successfully campaigned for re-opening of the footpath through SB Hotel car park last year

19. **Communication.** We have achieved national and local media coverage for our campaigns and point of view and run an active website. We send out regular breaking news messages via our WhatsApp chat group which now has 450+ members. Topics range from

burglar alerts to storm warnings. This year we also sent out a new form Newsletter in both digital and hard copy format that brought in 20+ new subscriber members.

20. **Planning.** We helped achieve the withdrawal of the 30 PanoramaRd/SYC planning application again earlier this year - though the fight continues. We successfully objected to a plan by BCP to put advertising boards on the SB roundabout - the application was withdrawn. We have helped a number of members with planning issues and questions

21. **Finally.** We responded to dozens of emails and calls for help and assistance from members throughout the year on a range of matters including burglaries, overflowing rubbish bins, plane crashes, missing persons, speeding, beach fires, fallen trees, planning matters, burglars, street cleaning, loud music, boy racers, jet ski nuisance ? ferry issues and deer in the garden

Councillors, good morning. I'm David Morley, chair of Sandbanks Community Group.

I've been leading the campaign against these Haven proposals for over five years and I speak here today not only for the residents of Sandbanks but also for the many thousands of people who stand united in their opposition to these plans.

It looks inevitable that you'll refuse this application today on flood risk grounds, and we welcome that.

But we're asking you to *also* refuse the application on two other grounds.

First, the loss of the Haven site to hotel use is not necessary.

And secondly, too much of the value created by the scheme proposed would be siphoned off by the owner, FJB, as profit and not enough used for affordable housing or other public benefits.

If you decided the Haven on a standalone basis, separate from the other two hotels, *over* £7m would go to affordable housing, rather than *less* than £2m as proposed. The District Valuer says that's your decision, not his. You have the power to insist on £7m for affordable housing, not £2m.

At the very least, we ask that if you refuse on flood risk grounds alone, you make it clear that *doesn't* mean you accept any of the officer's other conclusions by default. If not, you invite a new application within weeks, that we will oppose as consistently as we have opposed this one.

We can all see that whether or not to lose the Haven site for hotel use is a fundamental issue.

We have always accepted the existing hotel may need replacement. What we can't accept is that there will *never again* be any hotel on that site.

Your decision today has far-reaching consequences for jobs, tourism and public access & amenity for generations to come. It matters to many people, including everyone here today - whether in this room [or unfortunately in the overflow room] or watching live.

The Haven site - famously associated with Marconi - has been used continuously as a hotel for almost two centuries. It's an irreplaceable and priceless community asset.

Once it's gone, it's lost forever.

So, why is it “necessary” to lose the Haven after all these years as a hotel?

The applicants say this is the only way you can get two shiny new hotels for Sandbanks - they will draw your attention to the glitter to distract you from the price to pay. But it's *not* the only way. We have a positive vision of *three* new hotels, *not* two. We've lodged evidence, supported by expert opinion, that proves credible operator interest in developing *all three* sites for hotel use.

The choice is not between two new hotels or none. Or as Mr Carr for the applicants is quoted as saying, doing nothing so that all three hotels “*end up as two-star venues*”.

We can't simply accept this because the applicants say so - as a community we must think carefully about what they are saying.

The applicants are asking you to conclude that the loss of the Haven hotel is a price worth paying for the redevelopment of two of the three sadly neglected hotels in the same ownership - FJB - for over forty years.

This flies in the face of the long-accepted principle that a planning applicant should **never** be advantaged by their own failure to invest in significant assets like these three hotels. No one is to blame for the current state of these three hotels except the owner. And it is not your

job to bail out FJB with a money-making scheme that destroys a crucial public amenity.

It's not a binary choice between two new hotels or leaving all three hotels to decline. There are other options that haven't been explored or given to you.

Don't just take my word for that. Our property experts say:

"Sandbanks...represents a significant opportunity to hotel operations, and currently carries a huge interest amongst many operators within the market"

Here's some context.

The Haven is arguably BCP's best hotel site. At the mouth of Poole Harbour, a rare example of a UK hotel on a Blue Flag beach and with spectacular views of Old Harry, Studland and The Purbecks. As one person said to me today, a World Heritage site in all but name.

Without planning permission, the Haven site is worth as it stands about £13m - the applicant's own estimate. With the change of use? Around £45m. As it stands, without anything more, simply by loss of hotel use in favour of flats.

And do you know how much the applicants estimate the *three* sites will be worth once completed as they propose? Over £145m.

And how much of that extra value is going to affordable housing? As proposed, less than £2m when it should be more than £7m. This isn't good enough and we have the evidence to prove it.

And, with an average value of at least £3/4m, the Haven flats are definitely no answer to local housing needs.

So who says it's necessary to lose the Haven?

What's the evidence?

There is none. The officer concludes it's necessary *only* because the District Valuer says so. No other reasons have been given.

In other words, the entire proposal - and let's get this straight - rests solely on a *cold* mathematical calculation based on one-sided numbers provided by the applicant. Yes, it's been signed off by the District Valuer, but with no market testing or independent examination of other options and using data, our experts strongly contest.

Councillors, this kind of exercise can be used to produce almost any result the applicants want. It's flimsy and wouldn't survive first contact with reality. Indeed, our experts have demonstrated, using the same numbers, that the other two hotels can be developed with *no* subsidy from the Haven.

Yes, you're entitled to rely on expert reports, but not blindfolded and oblivious to evidence from other experts and the reality of the market.

Market testing would show there *are* other genuine options for hotel use at the Haven site. We have lodged the evidence.

Now, the officer says market testing is not required. But that doesn't mean you *can't* or *shouldn't* require it. As elected representatives, you have a duty to the people of this borough not to discard a hotel site - let alone one of this significance - without even considering all the other ways to keep it.

It would be plain wrong to outsource your decision to the DV in this way.

His report simply will not bear the weight being placed on it.

So I ask you again to conclude that you're not satisfied it's necessary to lose the Haven Hotel.

If it wasn't for the fundamental nature of the flood risk objection there are other solid planning objections we would be making. Including the scale, massing, height & dominance of the proposed development at the

Haven and its detrimental impact on the landscape, character and scenic quality of the area. But I hope that's not necessary.

Councillors, in conclusion, over six thousand people have taken the trouble to register a formal objection to the Haven proposal - over 6000! As far as I can tell, no other application in recent history in the borough has attracted more than a few hundred objections.

We are in good company. The Environmental Agency, The Marconi Association, The National Trust, The RSPB and Dorset CPRE all remain against this proposal.

I ask you whether the unprecedented scale of objections & public concern - consistently maintained over the half a decade this application has been outstanding - tells you something about the proposal.

It does, it tells you now is the time to decide to refuse this application, not only on flood risk grounds but also because it's not necessary to lose the Haven and the proposal short-changes the people of this borough. Please bring this profoundly flawed proposal, finally, to a conclusive end.

END

Sandbanks Community Group Accounts July 1st 2021-July 1st 2022

Cash in Lloyd's Bank 01/07/2021.	22,500.22
---	-----------

Income.

Members subscriptions.	10,355.00
Corporate sponsor Rumsey.	1,500.00
BCP Council grant for planter refurbishment	5,000.00
BCP Council grant for Midway Path garden.	1,200.00
Total income.	<u>18,055.00</u>

Expenditure

Website development and fees.	2,024.13
Zoom subscription.	143.88
Mailchimp subscription.	194.16
Newsletter production costs.	2,864.60
Newsletter mailing cost.	141.11
RMYC room booking.	400.00
AGM and reception.	500.19
RMYC (Committee meeting refreshments).	23.40
Dorset Wildlife Trust corporate subscription.	300.00
National Organisation of Residents Assoc. sub	25.00
Public Liability insurance (Brunel)	356.98
Neighbourhood Plan preparation.(Edwards Covell)	5,000.00
Midway Path fencing.	46.29
Repayment of overpaid subs.	140.00
Total expenditure.	<u>12,159.74</u>

Excess income over expenditure.	5,895.26
--	----------

Cash in Lloyd's Bank 01/07/2022	28,395.28
--	-----------

Increase in fund at year end.	5,895.26
--------------------------------------	----------