

## TALBOT VILLAGE APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

I am making this representation as a person interested in the Historic Talbot Village, having also been involved in the earlier discussions on the Project Master Plan with the Partners in 2013. I read with interest the Appraisal and Management Plan during the public consultation process. However, I did not feel that called for a response from me, as I was generally happy with these documents.

I noticed in particular the retention of saved Policy 4.12 of the Local Plan, which deals specifically with Talbot Village, and is set out on page 34 of the Appraisal. I suspect that, like me, a number of people were happy to see the reference to this Policy, and the protection afforded by it.

To take a specific example from the Public Consultation Document, 6 vacant plots in the Village are identified (in Figure 3 of the Local Plan Policy Designation) (in the Appraisal) as possible development sites. In paragraph 5.2 of the Management Plan (headed "Updates to Planning policy and guidance") the public were consulted on the basis of this statement: "If enabling development is pursued, any significant development should be limited to the opportunities already identified in the Bournemouth Local Plan." These words have now been deleted in their entirety.

What we are given to understand is that, as a result of representations made by the Talbot Village Trust (these appear on pages 58 and 59 in Appendix 3) the Council considers that, to refer to any specific planning policy in the Management Plan is "not helpful". The Council's further observation on the Trust's response is that "it would be more helpful to reference the definition of enabling development and to Historic England guidance and the process of enabling development."

In fact, apart from Talbot Village Trust's own response, the only other reference to Policy 4.12 is contained in Sheila Warner's response on page 29. The responses might well have been different had the public been told about the principle of "enabling development" and asked their views as to whether this should replace Policy 4.12.

So what you are considering today is a fundamentally different Management Plan, and a fundamentally different Action 10. Policy

4.12 has been deleted, and in its place there is this reference to “enabling development” and how it is to be construed.

I have two questions for the Cabinet.

- (i) Is it right, and reasonable in legal terms, for the Council to adopt a Plan that was issued on the basis of the protection offered by Policy 4.12, but which Policy has now been deleted - resulting in a fundamental difference between the document put out for public consultation, and the document now being recommended for approval? Could the public say that they have been misled?
- (ii) In any event, should not Policy 4.12 be re-instated in order to give greater protection to this historic Model Village? That is to say: to re-instate the certainty of Policy 4.12 against the Pandora’s Box of “enabling development”. In this connection I would draw the Cabinet’s attention to the Consultation Report at Appendix 3, and the paragraph on page 5 headed “Early Stakeholder Consultation”. That paragraph shows that the Local Development Framework Committee did indeed give specific consideration to Policy 4.12, and their decision clearly was that it should be retained in the Consultation document.