

Minutes-Liaison Meeting BMHC Development 21st June, 6pm

Attendees- RBDLG; Claire Hewitt, Jeanette Edwards, Isabel Brotherston, Helen Tate, Trustees; Saima Alvi, Abdul Kawooga, Cllr Angeliki Stogia, Generation; Patrick Ross, Shehzad Chaudhri. apologies -Robina Ahmad

1. Update on the current status of BMHC development- Patrick

No reports produced since last meeting.

Needs analysis is still being undertaken by BMHC in order to get a better understanding of their spatial requirements from a future development. Since the last meeting a detailed weekly timetable has been produced setting out: all the future activities it is hoped will take place in the centre; when it is envisaged they will take place; and how many users will attend each activity. This has been passed to the architects who will now undertake a revised spatial analysis to identify how these activities can best be accommodated within a redeveloped centre and explore potential efficiencies. The highway engineers will also use the timetable to look at traffic needs and understand traffic generation. Over the next couple months we hope to make progress in both these areas.

Historic England have fed back their initial views on the draft Viability Report produced for BMHC by Savills. The feedback is generally positive and they have just raised a couple of points / suggestions.

Isabel - have HE looked at other buildings in development proposals.

Patrick- This report specifically links the level of income from the residential element of the redevelopment to the cost of managing and maintaining the existing listed building. HE

were broadly comfortable with the rest of the development seen in the plans that were consulted upon two years ago.

Isabel - Does Nasar stepping back have any impact on the development.

Saima -No this won't impact anything it is business as usual.

2. Review of Liaison meetings (with reference to our correspondence). See extracts inserted into items below, and in full in attached email from BMHC and response from RBDLG

- 1. Agendas and minutes for future liaison meetings:**
forwarded to BMHC for input/Agreement; Residents' Group will arrange for these to be posted on the Whalley Range Community Forum (WRCF) website.
- 2. Presentation of written notes/summaries for agenda items in electronic form** before meetings if possible, or if not, then at meetings. These to be posted on the WRCF website as papers from the meetings.
- 3. The sharing of Generation investigative reports in brief electronic format** - Agreed by both parties that this not to take place.

Jeanette - We're very pleased that we can go forward with agreement and publishing of agendas. The relationship we have built through the liaison meetings is very positive. We were just a bit concerned that these liaison meetings might be considered as part of a consultation with the community, when we don't feel this is what is taking place.

Shehzad - We're happy to be put into writing that our meetings to date are not designated as part of our consultation process if this is required. However we believe this will change once we have specific proposals to consult with the group upon.

Saima - Our commitment is to communicate with neighbours re the proposed development. This not to gain brownie points, we genuinely want to listen to you.

Isabel - Can we agree to forward a summary of items to be discussed pre-meetings, as we have done with this meeting?

Shehzad/Patrick-Happy with agreement and that we produce an email summary pre meetings

3. Consultation process-

1. Timescales for BMHC development planning application

2. Process of engagement with RBDLG in the lead up to the planning application

[Extract from BMHC email - Once we have those revised proposals and are satisfied that they meet our requirements, we will then present them to RBDLG as well as others in order to gather feedback, with the potential for modifications to the proposals in the light of any concerns raised about them. This will be done well in advance of any planning application being submitted.

BMHC would suggest that it take the form of the revised proposals being presented to the Residents' Group with initial responses and feedback, followed by a further meeting when the Group has a chance to discuss with the wider membership to gather and feedback those views.]

3. Consultation process as part of the planning application.

[Extract from BMHC email: BMHC intends to progress its own consultation process over and above the statutory planning consultation process, which will be a combination of: a) wider public consultation; and b) direct engagement/consultation with specific groups including: Councillors; user groups; resident/stakeholder groups (such as RBDLG). They would also welcome suggestions from the Residents' Group of those they feel should be involved. A consultation statement setting out the process, findings and resulting actions, will be published as part of the planning application.]

Minutes

Jeanette - We are very happy about the outline you have given us about how this process will work. Could you give us any more information?

Patrick – Envisage a 3 stage process. Initially BMHC and Team presenting to the steering group, the steering group take it to wider group and gather feedback, finally plans are presented in some sort of open or public event to wider group

Angeliki - If you could do a time line of what happens before formal application, going backwards. Planning application -statutory consultation - informal consultation and feedback. Also could you set out what principals around engagement that you want to follow, like inclusivity, transparency.

Shehzad - We can do a timeline working back from the application for planning. We can work out time limits for each stage.

Patrick - We can set out the principles of the engagement as well.

Jeanette- One suggestion we have is that the BMHC users are consulted as part of this process, we have spoken to a number of users, who feel that they have not been included in the engagement with the wider community, so far.

It was recognised that the Group were one of many local groups and could not speak for the whole community, so there was a need to engage the wider community in consultation

Isabel - You mentioned previously that there might be some room for changes to be made when we see the new proposals. What kind of things do you for-see as being open to adaptations? For example the commercial blocks at the back and the underground car park?

Patrick - Do not want to pre-empt the process, but it is likely as is usually the case with consultation processes such as this there will be things that may be really important and fundamental to the application and these are likely to be non negotiable -e.g. Prayer Hall, whilst there may be other things which are more open to change.

Isabel -Will there be changes to the proposals even if you say Historic England have no problem with the proposals? We are concerned that this will meet with resistance?

Patrick – We will have a better understanding of this when we have the needs analysis for the space completed.

Angeliki - if the plan comes back more or less the same then going in the wrong direction.

5.

Saima - We should share minutes with all the people who were in the meeting so that they can be agreed.

Helen - We should have a time limit for the minutes to be agreed.

Saima - 2 weeks should be enough time for agreement.

Isabel - minutes and update and Helen share with WRCF

Next meeting - Wed 11th October 23, 6pm.

Patrick - We should have made progress with the Spatial analysis and traffic analysis. If we haven't we will get in touch.