

## PORTLAND TOWN COUNCIL

Council Offices  
52 Easton Street  
Portland  
DT5 1BT

Tel: 01305 821638

E-mail: [office@portlandtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:office@portlandtowncouncil.gov.uk)

5<sup>th</sup> April 2017

Dear Councillor / Management Group Member

You are hereby summoned to attend a **MEETING** of the **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**, to be held at the **PETER TRIM HALL, ST. GEORGE'S CENTRE, REFORNE, PORTLAND** on **WEDNESDAY, 12<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2017** commencing at **7.00 pm**, when the business set out below will be transacted.

It is the Council's intention that all meetings of the Council and its committees be recorded aurally.

Yours faithfully

Ian Looker  
Town Clerk

## AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence** – to receive
2. **Declarations of Interest** – to receive any declarations from Councillors or Officers of pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests regarding matters to be considered at this meeting, together with a statement on the nature of those interests
3. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017** (attached) – to agree and sign
4. **Matters Arising from the Minutes** – to consider
5. **Open Forum** – to receive questions and comments from the public regarding the Neighbourhood Plan
6. **Local Plan Review and Consultation** – to receive a report from Mr Matthews (attached)
7. **Heritage and Character Study** – to receive a report from Mr Matthews (attached)
8. **Plan Update and Project Budget** – to receive a report from Mr Matthews and consider any necessary actions (see attached)
9. **Format of Next Meeting** – to decide whether it should be a workshop and, if so, to consider its content
10. **Exclusion of Press and Public** (discretionary)  
“That pursuant to the provisions of Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for Agenda Item(s) ... by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.”
11. **Date of Next Meeting**  
The next meeting is scheduled to be on Wednesday, 10<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at (venue not finalised), starting at 7.00pm.

## **LOCAL PLAN REVIEW AND CONSULTATION**

Following the workshop meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> March a summary paper was taken to the Planning and Highways Advisory Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017. Further discussion occurred at this meeting which allowed a final response to be compiled. This response (attached) was submitted to the Planning Authority and acknowledged by them on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017.

Andy Matthews

**West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan Review**

**Initial Issues and Options Consultation Discussion Notes – February and March 2017**

**Background**

In compiling a response to the Local Plan Review it was agreed that this would be a joint process with the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and the Town Council’s Planning and Highways Advisory Committee with the latter agreeing the final submission details.

Below are the composite notes of several meetings with the final agreement made at Planning and Highways on the 22<sup>rd</sup> March 2017. These notes will be submitted to the Planning Authorities Strategic Policy group in entirety as well as informing the content of the on line submission.

<b>Main Issues per LP Review:</b>	<b>NP Group Should:</b>	<b>Current Responses</b>
A single vision for the whole plan area	Consider whether the proposed vision accords with the NP vision and approach – <b>and make considered response by 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2017</b>	<i>It was felt that the Vision should include some referencing to the potential of Portland Harbour area as significant asset within the Vision scope</i>
The level of economic and housing growth needed across the area	Accept the revised overall growth targets for the LP area provides a strategic context for the NP	<p><i>The Planning Committee recognised that a figure of 775 dwellings per annum were calculated as required but also felt the following issues should be taken into account</i></p> <p><b>Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were there any characteristics to the growth levels in 2001-2007 which were specific to that period?</li> <li>• It is noted that the intention of the Western Growth Corridor development is to encourage visibility and inward investment.</li> <li>• Land may be being identified which will not be needed. Time profiling of land supply may assist with managing this impact.</li> <li>• There is no specific reference to brown field sites, although this is dealt with elsewhere in the review.</li> <li>• The review of sites following the Local Plan Inspector’s comments led to a rush of possible sites being identified that do not always have a strategic logic to them.</li> </ul> <p><i>Regarding a further five years, the Planning Committee felt that this would provide further robustness to the plan to resist ad hoc development however land may be</i></p>

		<p><i>being identified which will not be needed. Profiling of land supply may assist with managing this impact.</i></p> <p><i>The need to help meet the strategic targets of the Local Plan will be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
The approach to the distribution of development	<p>Consider how Portland and its settlements best fits into the growth hierarchy, using recent HCA study – <b>and make considered response by 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2017</b></p>	<p><i>There was general agreement for the approach to refer to the settlements on Portland as it would recognise the historic growth aspects of Portland the group wanted to ensure that every effort was in place to prevent further coalescence of settlements.</i></p> <p><i>The group recognised the settlements shown and also the group felt that the inclusion of Osprey Quay, the Verne and Portland Bill may be relevant. There was also discussion as to whether Westcliff should be considered as a distinct area.</i></p> <p><i>The group however also recognised the functional relationship between these areas which may require some aggregation as exemplified in the Heritage and Character Study.</i></p> <p><i>With reference to ‘defined development boundaries’, the group supported the strict control of these to underpin more certainty around the planning process.</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate scale the group noted the criteria and felt these together with the Heritage and Character Study should be used to determine development proposals on Portland.</i></p>
Growth opportunities at the main towns and the market and coastal towns	<p>Decide on method of determining preferred level of growth to inform NP policy approach</p>	<p>Development on Portland has taken place at 45 dwellings per year should we plan for this level continuing given the constrained nature of the Island.</p> <p>There was a debate about whether recently the number of dwellings were just 45 per year as there was a general feeling that more than this had been approved recently.</p> <p><i>The committee however recognised that over the forward planning period of 20 years this would provide approximately 900 additional dwellings which was in line with amount of potential sites on Portland currently identified. The committee also recognised the intention in the Economic Vision to create 3,000 additional jobs on Portland. The committee however reiterated the need to look at brownfield sites first in a strategic manner.</i></p>

		<p><i>There was a discussion around the housing need and information was provided that this was currently around 300 with Portland connections mainly young people requiring 1 or 2 bedroom homes. There was however no information about elderly needs particularly for downsizing although the Neighbourhood Plan evidence information showed a downsizing desire for that age group which as we know is anticipated to increase in numbers markedly</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the specific development proposals indicating an additional yield of 180 units, the committee confirmed the view that Weston Street would not be supported, because it closes a green corridor and also could allow the infilling of the area between Haylands and Weston Street.</i></p> <p><i>The proposals South of Southwell were noted originally it was felt that this would fit with the general issue of aligning the development boundary. However there was a need to consider retaining green space, minerals, impact on the landscape and heritage structures. However the Neighbourhood Plan group subsequently felt that this approach would undermine the emphasis on brownfield first and changed their thoughts around this site. The group discussed the removal of the fence to improve integration and also the issues around any building proposed on the car park as this was remaining busy with the current uses of the site. The group however were unaware of the SHLAAR 2016 update and relevant site proformas were taken to the Planning and Highways meeting to assist discussion.</i></p> <p><i>This was then discussed at the meeting and there was concern that because now these site allocations carry greater weight that they should be referred to the Town Council for agreement in future. There was also concern expressed that the Local Plan Review consultation should have included information concerning those sites in the Southwell area so that an accurate position of the strategic sites identified was reported.</i></p> <p><i>The group also considered other smaller sites at the area adjacent to France Quarry and Moorfield Road and representation around the brown field sites, particularly the redundant school sites and better use of the Hardy block area.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding infrastructure issues, the Neighbourhood Plan has identified the need to look at the following infrastructure areas in a structured manner relating to</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>increased demands - the transport network, community facilities, health and education.</i></p> <p><i>Also re brownfield sites on Portland, a number of brownfield sites already identified do not fit easily with a strategic approach to the Island's future needs.</i></p> <p><i>Larger brownfield sites which could become available should be included in any strategic housing need.</i></p> <p><i>The Hardy block area could be better utilised.</i>  <i>The availability and suitability of sites for development and their capacity is being explored in the context of a growth strategy for Portland and will be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
<p>Reconsider the approach to protecting employment sites</p>	<p>Consider whether any additional employment sites should be protected as 'key employment sites' - – <b>and make considered response by 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2017</b></p>	<p><i>The committee agreed with the workspace strategy indicators</i>  <i>With regard to the allocation of employment land A major focus of our Neighbourhood Plan is to encourage employment growth on Portland so we would like to see a positive approach to recognising this.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding additional employment land, please see previous response and the following comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Economic Vision for Portland specifies growth potential in several areas some of which are recognised directly by the LEP and others such as sustainable energy more specific to the Island.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Neighbourhood Plan process has identified several employment sites which could benefit from either amalgamation or modernisation.</i></li> <li>• <i>County's strategy towards Portland is to encourage self-containment to improve job opportunities.</i></li> <li>• <i>The potential use of Mining Voids has been identified as a development potential.</i></li> <li>• <i>Osprey Quay is currently defined as a mixed-use site.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Questions on Key Employment sites: We would not wish to see any loss of sites although we recognised future employment areas may require some modernisation etc.</i></p>

		<p><i>At this time there were no additional sites proposed although we would support a more strategic approach to the employment land offer across the Osprey Quay, Castletown and Portland Port.</i></p> <p><i>There was a discussion about the land areas identified for potentially larger leisure and tourism projects and the need to allow for these as options within a planned approach.</i></p>
Establish a hierarchy of town and local centres	Consider status of shopping centres using propose hierarchy - – <b>and make considered response by 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2017</b>	<p><i>The group agreed that Easton be re-designated as a District Centre. The group were mindful of the need to apply as much protection to our retail centres as possible. The group noted that a retail analysis study was being conducted as part of the Local Plan Review. The group felt that other services should be included such as Leisure Centres , Visitor Centres. It was felt that developments in Castletown should be reflected in making this also a Local Centre. There was also a commitment to maintaining Fortuneswell also as a Local Centre .</i></p>
Policy in relation to affordable housing	Consider implications of revised approach to affordable housing provision	<p><i>The group felt that it was difficult to respond to all the sections about housing and needed further information.</i></p> <p><i>The nature of local housing need will be explored further and addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
Develop an approach to a green infrastructure network	Categorise green infrastructure on Portland in accordance with LP categories	<p><i>The group agreed with the definitions of Green Infrastructure, the active use of green space on Portland is part of the Economic Vision for the Island.</i></p> <p><i>There was however recognition of possible other uses for Independent, Silklake and Yeoland's Pit (Broadcroft)</i></p> <p><i>With regard to any missing categories, the close-knit nature of Underhill surrounded by green space may require consideration of an urban green network concept.</i></p> <p><i>Is there a need to consider the setting of archaeological sites and landforms?</i></p> <p><i>The categorisation of green spaces on Portland, consistent with the strategic approach of the Local Plan Review, will be explored further and addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
Identify Coastal Change Management Areas	Review implications of Shoreline Management Plan – <b>and make considered response by 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2017</b>	<p><i>The group were made aware of the policy criteria set out in the Shoreline management plan but this was after the meeting and so a fuller discussion will need to be had at the Planning Committee meanwhile proposals are to report that the group noted the shoreline management proposals Paper B but felt that the importance of Chesil Beach and Portland Beach Road in terms of protection for the</i></p>

		<p><i>Island, the Port and the wider area may require expansion of the Hold the Line policy With regard to the development constraints scheduled. The group noted the policy intentions around the shoreline management plan and this would appear to be in line with the above proposals.</i></p> <p><i>The questions relating to rollback required more specific information given the policy intentions shown.</i></p>
Establish if technical housing standards can be justified	Identify special housing needs – to underpin NP policy	<p>As above re housing</p> <p><i>The nature of local housing need will be explored further and addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
Approach to wind energy development	Consider potential wind energy development sites	<p><i>The group considered the following issues:</i></p> <p><i>Our Neighbourhood Plan consultation process has indicated strong support for sustainable energy development but for which we have yet to designate appropriate sites. Portland windmills (the only ones in Dorset) indicate that the potential from the topography and climate have been identified in the past.</i></p> <p><i>The group noted the above but felt that Portland being a major path for migratory birds would create issues with wind farm developments and that the community would prefer to see tidal, wave, solar and other sustainable solutions .</i></p> <p><i>There was further debate around this and discussion around differing forms of wind turbines (smaller based on a tree concept) and also the location of larger turbines which may make them more acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>The identification of potential and suitable energy development sites will be explored further and addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
Ways to deliver sufficient plots for self-build and custom housebuilding	Identify demand and potential for self-build – to underpin NP policy	<p>As above re housing</p> <p><i>The demand for and efficacy of alternative ways of providing new dwellings will be explored further and addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
Community Reaction	Understand what the community’s reaction has been to the Issues and Options Consultation	<p><i>It would be very helpful to see what the people, business and other interest groups have said by way of comment on the Issues and Options Consultation and to ensure their views are taken into account during the next stages of neighbourhood planning.</i></p>
Process and Timetable	Establish productive links with the LP Review process Determine if, and when, the NP should be submitted	<p><i>The need to maintain a constructive dialogue between local and neighbourhood planners is recognised as being vital to a successful outcome for both plans.</i></p>

## HERITAGE AND CHARACTER STUDY

Details of errors and additional comments were submitted to AECOM on 17<sup>th</sup> March. Portland Port asked for consideration that their responsibility area should be assigned to Character Area 1 rather than 2. I proposed to AECOM that a compromise might be applicable based around their employment land area. This issue may be picked up under the further technical study proposed (see below).

At the time of writing I have asked AECOM if we could have a copy of the draft report by the time of the meeting. As you may be aware a notice did appear in the Free Portland News that the report was to be consulted on over a 30-day period. A verbal update will be made at the meeting which will cover:-

- A) Details of the dates of the consultation
- B) Further media distribution
- C) Outline details of the questions which will be asked.

Andy Matthews

## PLAN UPDATE AND PROJECT BUDGET

A recommendation from Heritage and Character Study was that further technical support on site allocation would be helpful. Locality, who manage these arrangements, are encouraging groups to take a forward-looking approach to the use of land to include:-

- Kickstart or add depth to regeneration efforts
- Develop public realm schemes
- Relocate or expand community facilities
- Encourage less reliance on cars
- Kickstart development on any sites which have been empty or poorly used for many years
- Other 

To provide a basis to work with the various agencies and landowners to achieve a balanced approach to the future of the Island
--

On the basis that we will receive support Paul Weston has rescheduled a project plan (attached) based on any site allocation support reporting at the end of May 2017.

### Budget

Mr Weston has submitted his invoice for the work he carried out in 2016/17. As regards the Council accounts this invoice may appear in the April 2017 payments ie 2017/18. Consequently it may be appropriate to allow for a reserve release to reflect the full Council budget allowance across the two years.

A further grant application has been made for £4,500 that will cover the period until October 2017. This will leave a total remaining grant entitlement of £7,125.

Andy Matthews

## Portland Neighbourhood Plan

Final Stages Project Plan

March 2017

Step:	2016		2017											
	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Heritage and Character Study														
Settlement Strategy <b>consultation</b>						3								
Settlement Strategy adoption														
Draft Plan refined														
Site Allocation Study*														
Site Allocation Strategy approved														
Site specific policies drafted														
Evidence up-dated														
1 <sup>st</sup> Draft NP completed and published														
1 <sup>st</sup> Draft NP informal <b>consultation</b>										4				
SEA Screening Opinion														
Strategic Environmental Assessment*														
Analyse response and amend Plan														
Pre-submission version of NP approved														
Formal (Reg.14) <b>consultation</b>													5	5
NP amended														
Basic Condition Statement prepared														
Consultation Statement prepared														
Submission Documents approved														
<b>Plan Submission to MDDC</b>														

**Proposed Consultation Method:**

- 3 HCA Study posted on website with invitation to comment
- 4 1<sup>st</sup> Consultation Version of the Plan posted on website and on exhibition around the Island for a 4-week period
- 5 Pre-submission Version of the Plan subject to Regulation 14 consultation (website, emails and letters) for a minimum of 6 weeks