

**PORTLAND TOWN COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 9th JANUARY 2019 AT 7.00 PM
AT PORTLAND COMMUNITY VENUE**

PRESENT: Councillor Jim Draper (Chairman), Jo Atwell, Sue Cocking, Ray Nowak, Rod Wild, Charlie Flack and Tim Gomm together with Andy Matthews (Neighbourhood Plan Working Group)

IN ATTENDANCE: Seven members of the public.

365 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Rob Hughes.

366 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Draper, Councillor Nowak and Mr. Matthews declared non-pecuniary interests in Portland Land Trust. Mr. Matthews also declared a non-pecuniary interest in Portland Community Partnership.

367 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7th March 2018

The minutes were formally agreed and signed as a correct record.

368 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman explained that the meeting of the 9th May (as advertised in the minutes) had been cancelled and that if there were Neighborhood Planning items for consideration then they had been included in the monthly Planning Committee meeting to which Mr. Matthews had been in attendance.

369 – OPEN FORUM

The Chairman explained that there were two main issues to be discussed; the first being the Neighbourhood Plan and the second being the Stone Firms request for an Environmental Impact Assessment ‘Scoping Opinion’ for a proposal to mine part of the coastal strip. He explained that a response to the Scoping Opinion was required before the next Planning Meeting was due to be held so it would be considered at this meeting.

a) Neighbourhood Plan

The Chairman stated that the Neighbourhood Plan was now at a stage where it could be submitted to a Full Council Committee for approval before being submitted to the Local Planning Authority for scrutiny and examination.

Mr. Matthews explained that the Plan had been through two major consultations in the past year and that the aim was to be able to give the Island much more of a say over future planning issues. He further explained that the intention was now to submit the Plan to the local planning authority which would then issue notice of its receipt and invite representations (Regulation 16) which would last six weeks. Anybody that has issues with the

content of the Submission Version of the Plan should make their views known to the planning authority during this next phase, which would be passed on to the Examiner to consider. He explained that this meeting was not about making any wholesale changes to the plan but rather about answering queries that residents may have about the current plan.

Mr. Matthews provided a review on the previous 8 years work and described how the Plan had developed and further how it had arrived at its current state. He emphasized that the Plan would provide more say in planning, employment and housing decisions and how island resources were used. He explained that the Plan also anticipated the proposed future local industrial strategy, which if achieved would fit well with the green space agenda and conform with the EU regulations on habitat regulations. He went on to explain that planning policies affecting certain areas on Portland, may need to conform to a habitat regulations assessment which sought high level mitigation, control and management of such areas. He also explained that the Government had recently issued an environmental White Paper which also allowed for changes to environmental protection including those linked to the proposed withdraw from the EU and there was now some debate over whether the Plan would be judged solely against the current EU designated areas or include potential areas proposed under the Dorset Local Nature Partnership's Ecological Network.

He concluded by reiterating that this was not the meeting at which to request fundamental changes to the plan, but he would encourage residents, should they have concerns to lodge those questions or comments, such that they could be considered by the Examiner in due course. He then asked if any members of the public had any questions.

A question was raised by a member of the public regarding 'brownfield sites' and whether if an area which had been designated as a brownfield site and was in use, whether it was assumed that the buildings on that site would be demolished i.e. Portland Hospital.

Mr. Matthews explained that the Local Plan had to set out a number of housing number targets and that the Planning guidelines now included an annual delivery rates to be adhered to. What the plan tries to ensure, is that there is sufficient development land within the development boundaries and ideally of a brownfield nature (previously developed land) to resist development on green field sites. By taking the initiative in appraising the suitability of certain sites the plan sets down clear planning parameters as to what the community would expect in the event of development proposals so in the case of the Hospital -replacement provision and also recognition of Heritage aspects. A similar situation exists with say Hambro Car Park where again alternative car parking provision would be required to be identified.

A further question was raised seeking confirmation that the Plan would now be consulted on. Mr. Matthews confirmed that this was now the proposed submission version of the plan and that once the habitat regulation assessment was resolved it would be submitted to the local planning authority for their action. His concern was that as there are no set timescales for the

completion of their action, there was a risk that to leave it, it would get caught up in the Local Government Change process and would not receive the priority that it requires. Once submitted for examination the Plan will carry a material weight in planning decisions but will require approval at a referendum to be formally adopted as part of the development plan for the area. The Chairman reiterated that to delay would be to risk delaying these next stages, potentially by as much as one year. The outcome of any delay would have a real impact on the amount of community infrastructure levy (CIL) that would be attributable to Portland, and thus have an impact on the number/scope of infrastructure projects that could be undertaken. The agreement of the Plan would ensure that a larger percentage of the CIL would come directly to Portland and not be lost in the Unitary's plans. It was acknowledged that there remained concerns that to approve the Plan would put Portland hospital at risk, however with the agreement of the Plan and the inclusion of the requirement to replace any development removed with an equivalent provision, this risk was greatly reduced.

The Chairman encouraged all to register any concerns once the formal assessment was underway and reminded everyone that the priority remained to protect greenfield sites and consider development of the brownfield sites.

Mr. Matthews stated that the Plan did include a housing policy which focused on local affordable housing needs and included a second homes policy which included a principal residency requirement. Whilst voluntary it would require the developer to ensure that any development included a level of affordable housing. This would be helped by changes in planning policy to require developers to clearly set out and adhere to any development viability assessment. Whilst the second homes policy was regarded with caution by the planning authority; they consider that it may stop development, this statement also ensures that the community of Portland has some influence on the likelihood of increases in the number of second homes.

The Chairman proposed that the Neighborhood Plan be formally submitted to a Full Council Meeting so that it could then be submitted to the Planning Authority for their action. Unanimously agreed.

(a) Scoping report by Portland Stone on mining along the coastal strip

The Chairman re-iterated that this was not an application to mine but rather a document on how Portland Stone intend to mitigate the effects of the mine and allows for the Council and Public to make comment on their proposal.

Councillor Wild, as a member of the archeological society, declared a non-pecuniary interest.

Councillor Flack explained that the Council had received notification of the scoping report which allowed 21 days for a response to be provided, and as that response was due before the next Planning committee met it was imperative to discuss the issue tonight. He explained that the original planning

permission for an open cast quarrying had been provided in 1951, however, Portland Stone had come to an agreement with the County Council that (for a fee) they would not proceed with this type of extraction. Reading from the scoping document he highlighted the history of the issue and referred to some items that he felt warranted further discussion.

These included the number of HGV movements per day (between 120 – 140), the lack of limits on working hours and the need for the haul road to go under a main sewer. A discussion ensued on the potential risks perceived in proceeding with the project and whether the mitigation proposed was appropriate or sufficient. It was proposed that the following concerns be submitted:

- i. The volume of traffic in support of the preliminary work was considered excessive (120 -140 trips). In particular
- ii. The visual impact of the storage area and the impact on tourism. It was suggested that a better storage site would be Coombefield quarry.
- iii. The lack of limits on working hours – there were concerns over what evidence could be provided to mitigate the noise from overnight working.
- iv. The proposed route is in close proximity to the bus route of a busy school. There were concerns that there were a real health and safety issues with heavy lorries close to a busy narrow road with young children on their way to school. It was felt that it was contrary to promote a healthy life style (cycling to school) whilst agreeing to a scheme that could potentially put children at risk.
- v. Concerns over the impact on the archeological and heritage sites and the risks to these.
- vi. The proposed entrance in Southwell is opposite housing and not only would the noise be an issue, but it is a small village (with listed buildings in close proximity) and could not accommodate large lorries without impact on the infrastructure.
- vii. The tipping area impinges on a site of a special area of conservation and the potential mitigation to overcome this.

The Chairman explained that these concerns would be submitted and, in the event, that there was anything further required then we would be notified.

370 – BUDGET AND PROCESS

Mr. Matthews stated that the Neighborhood Plan reserves had £800 remaining and from that he had had a request from the Webmaster to submit his invoice which is likely to be around £250. In addition, he asked that if there were problems in resolving the HRA issues that he be allowed to explore having it commissioned directly, and if an acceptable cost, offsetting it against the remaining budget. This was agreed.

371 – DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday 9th May 2019

starting at 7.00 pm, at Portland Community Venue.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm.

Signed: Date:
(Chairman)