

CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, REGENERATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

RECORD OF DECISIONS taken by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration & Economic Development, Councillor Luke Stubbs, at his meeting held on Tuesday, 21 July 2015 at 5.00 pm at the Conference Room A - Civic Offices

Present

Councillor Luke Stubbs (in the chair)

Councillor Ben Dowling
Councillor Aiden Gray
Councillor Colin Galloway

Officers Present

Claire Upton-Brown, City Development Manager
David Hayward, Principal Planning Policy Officer
Susan Aistrop, Finance Manager

29. Apologies for Absence (AI 1)

There were no apologies for absence.

30. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of members' interests.
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting (including Councillors Symes and Sanders who attended in the public gallery).

31. Potential Development Sites in Milton Update (AI 3)

(TAKE IN REPORT)

The City Development Manager introduced the report which updated the Cabinet Member on the potential yield of identified potential development sites in Milton. She said that the numbers of houses that can be accommodated on the sites in question is potentially lower than the figures shown in the August 2014 consultation document. She advised that given the degree of change from the August 2014 figures, it is considered appropriate to base future planning policy and development decisions on the revised figures set out at paragraph 3.5 of the report, but stressed that the numbers are draft only.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development said he wished to change the recommendation in the report so that it read

"The Cabinet Member is recommended to approve the matrix of housing numbers in section 3 of the report to inform the Management Framework"

The Cabinet Member advised that a deputation request had been made by Janice Burkinshaw and invited her to speak. She expressed concerns

- about the absence of notice
- about reference to a NET figure as she understood that to mean "not gross" and therefore perhaps that meant "at least" in this context
- about reference to 110 NET University of Langstone Campus dwellings as this implies this is sustainable and she is still trying to find out whether or not this has been adopted in the Portsmouth Plan
- about the timing of this report given its proximity to the establishment of a Neighbourhood Planning Forum that had not yet met.

The Cabinet Member thanked Janice Burkinshaw for her deputation.

The City Development Manager said that the numbers referred to were not set in stone but are a working assumption and the Cabinet Member advised that a specific number was necessary for the first planning application. The timing of the report was because its author, David Hayward, was leaving the City Council imminently. Going forward, the City Development Manager expressed her wish that the City Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Forum should establish a good working relationship and would look at ways to enable this to happen. This could lead to mutually desired outcomes such as creating wildlife habitats where appropriate.

During discussion, it was confirmed that the constraints referred to in paragraph 3.4 resulted from the NHS' submission of its outline planning application and resulted in the lower potential yield.

The Cabinet Member for PRED said that the impact on trees and the chapel had to be considered but it was vital to consider the traffic impact and that would be assessed later in the process.

A query was raised in regard to phase 2. Whilst the bulk of the development would be on the site of the main building, what about the current outbuildings? Would there be building on the footprint if these were demolished? Mr Hayward said that that element did not form part of the current calculations. In any event the numbers mentioned in the report are a working assumption.

.DECISION:

That the Cabinet Member approved the matrix of housing numbers in section 3 of the report to inform the Management Framework.

32. Milton Common Local Nature Reserve Restoration and Management Framework (AI 4)

(TAKE IN REPORT)

David Hayward introduced the report advising that its purpose was to request the Cabinet Member to approve the Milton Common Local Nature Reserve

Restoration and Management Framework. He explained that the proposed management framework (attached to the report as Appendix A) sets out how the city council intends to restore Milton Common and then continue managing the site in future. He explained that as part of the framework, it is proposed that formal designation as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) is pursued for Milton Common. Natural England has sent a letter of support for the framework attached as Appendix D of the report.

The Cabinet Member advised that a deputation request had been made by Janice Burkinshaw and invited her to speak. She was broadly in favour of the proposed LNR status for Milton Common but had the following concerns:-

- Community Wardens do not appear to visit the site as stated in Appendix A 3.44
- There is a problem concerning dogs both in terms of the effect they have on ducks and swans and also the conflict with other users such as joggers
- The document does not contain a plan for displacement of woodland birds from St James site nor for mammals.
- There seems to be no guarantee that the LNR status will ever be given as paragraph 5.17 of the Appendix states that this is just one way to mitigate and those putting in applications are free to make other proposals.

The Cabinet Member thanked Janice Burkinshaw for her deputation and asked officers to respond to the matters raised.

David Hayward said he would check that the information in the Appendix regarding visits by wardens is correct. If not, it would be removed from the document.

The issue of conflict between dog walkers in relation to other users has been looked at extensively. Most conflict is small scale but is worse at certain times - such as during the birds' breeding season. National research suggests that better outcomes result from appeasing dog walkers. There is no available budget for on-site patrols.

In response to a query, Mr Hayward further advised that a dog agility facility had been considered but the site's previous history meant that it was not suitable to sink anything into the ground to support any structures. A fenced in area had also been considered but rejected because Milton Common is too small. Ways of providing separate routes for dog walkers had also been considered but were not practical.

Councillor Darren Sanders was invited to speak at this point and he said that the same problem was evident at Milton Green and suggested that this should be considered at the same time as Milton Common and that perhaps members could be involved and perhaps also the Green and Clean team. Mr Hayward said that other mitigation measures were being considered and that a dogs forum is being set up modelled on the Dorset Scheme, so matters are progressing and some funding would be available.

With regard to a plan for displacement of mammals, the nature of the site is such that it would not be suitable for burrowing mammals.

With regard to 5.17 of the Appendix, it is correct that this is just one way to mitigate, but by providing a Framework, developers are quite likely to accept it as alternatives would be very costly.

With regard to the timeframe, it was expected that this would be in place by March 2016.

The Cabinet Member advised that he wished to make a change to the recommendations in the report to add the following words to the end of recommendation 3 "or in connection with information about Community Wardens following matters raised during the meeting."

He thanked officers for their good and thorough report and approved the recommendations with the amendment.

DECISION:

That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development .

(1) Adopted the Milton Common Local Nature Reserve Restoration and Management Framework (attached as appendix A to the report).

(2) Authorised the City Development Manager to proceed with the designation of Milton Common as a Local Nature Reserve including the submission of the Local Nature Reserve declaration to Natural England (attached at appendix C of the report).

(3) Authorised the City Development Manager to make editorial amendments to the Restoration and Management Framework, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development. These changes will not alter the meaning of the document and will be restricted to grammatical and typographical errors or in connection with information about Community Wardens following matters raised during the meeting.

33. Grant to Drayton Centre - Use of Drayton & Farlington CIL Neighbourhood Proportion funds (AI 5)

(TAKE IN REPORT)

The City Development Manager introduced the report which was to seek the release of up to £33,312 from the Drayton & Farlington Neighbourhood Proportion of the Community Infrastructure Levy "(the Drayton & Farlington CIL)".

During discussion, the following points were raised:-

- The Finance Manager, Susan Aistrop advised that there were methods of awarding the CIL funding that may be more tax efficient than others and that the Cabinet Member may wish to instruct officers to look into this.

- Concern was expressed that the report did not mention anything about quotations being received to repair the roof and what these were.
- It was confirmed that although the Cabinet Member could not refuse the request, it was open to him to ask for procedures to be put in place in these circumstances in order to demonstrate best value.

The Cabinet Member decided to amend the recommendations in the report.

DECISION:

That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development gave delegated authority to the City Development Manager to

- 1) seek clarification from the Drayton and Farlington Ward Councillors and to share quotes with members of PRED for the roof replacement works to the Drayton Centre and**
- 2) investigate methods of awarding the Drayton and Farlington Neighbourhood CIL funding in a more tax efficient manner.**

34. Investment in Advanced Engineering and Scientific Manufacturing (AI 6)

(Information Only)
(TAKE IN REPORT)

The report was introduced by the City Development Manager who said it had been brought following a Notice of Motion at Full Council the purpose of which was to inform the Cabinet Member about the current work being done to promote advanced engineering and scientific manufacturing sectors.

The Cabinet Member commented that he was pleased with the report and its contents and thanked those concerned.

Councillor Dowling and the other opposition spokespersons thanked the Cabinet Member, Councillor Luke Stubbs, for receiving the report at this meeting and also thanked the City Development Manager for the work done in producing the report

The report was noted.

The meeting concluded at 6.05pm.

.....
Councillor Luke Stubbs
Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration & Economic

Development