

**MILTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING FORUM  
MINUTES OF MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 10 AUGUST 2017 AT MILTON VILLAGE HALL**

|         |                          |           |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Present | Rod Bailey (RB)          | Chair     |
|         | Kimberly Barrett (KB)    |           |
|         | Paul Docking (PD)        | Secretary |
|         | Peter Higgins (PH)       |           |
|         | Martin Lock (ML)         | Treasurer |
|         | Paddy O’Hara (PO’H)      |           |
|         | Paul Pritchard (PP)      |           |
|         | Pam Pritchard (PJP)      |           |
|         | Cllr Ben Dowling (BD)    |           |
|         | Cllr Darren Sanders (DS) |           |

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Gerald Vernon-Jackson and Cllr Lynne Stagg.

**2. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2017, with the following amendment was proposed by PP and seconded by DS.

*Item 4, First paragraph, last sentence: “PH suggested that we should obtain a projection of PCC school population, across all schools, up to 2033 so that it could be compared to the current 2023 numbers as part of our evidence. DS said that he would ask*

**3. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

There were no matters arising not completed or covered by the Agenda.

**4. Update from the Chair on the Work of the Forum**

RB reported that, since the last meeting, he had met with the HCA, LDA PCC and University, but not with the NHS, to discuss the framework for St James’. He asked the meeting to note that a framework agreement was not as binding as a masterplan would have been. Phase One was presented as an emerging plan for consultation. It would remove 2 villas and replace them with “woodland pavilions”, consisting of 3 story flats. The green spaces would remain. There was no design detail for the buildings. He had hoped to get feedback from the well-attended consultation held that evening, but had not had any to date. He said that he would chase LDA for their feedback. Arrangements had been made for RB and others to meet Stephen Morgan, the new Portsmouth South MP. In addition, the fora chairs are also having a meeting with Penny Mordaunt MP.

**Action: RB to obtain feedback from LDA arising from the public consultation.**

**5. To decide how to further the objective of a school on the Langstone Campus.**

There was, seemingly, some convergence between PCC planners and our aspirations for an educational use for the University Langstone site. DS said that the evidence that he has requested from both Planning and Education will be the key and he expects this to be available in Jan 18. RB noted that he had been given no contra-indication from PCC that an option for educational use for the site should not be in our plan

**6. To decide our strategy and response to the Issues and Options Portsmouth Plan consultation**

RB said that PCC had released an Issues and Options Consultation Paper for the Portsmouth Plan re-write. Comments had to be submitted by 28 September 17. Of concern was the designation of the St James' Hospital and University Langstone site being designated a Strategic Site. PO'H asked what "Strategic" really meant. After some discussion, it was generally agreed that it denoted an important site. PH asked for clarification of the process that the Portsmouth Plan would go through after the consultation. It was the understanding of councilors present that the comments would be collated and addressed by PCC Planners and a paper would eventually go to the cabinet member responsible. It was noted that the Options and Issues was really being driven by the NPPF and housing numbers. PO'H said that he thought, having examined the numbers in the HNA, that the PUSH figures were flawed. DS said that, unless they evidence otherwise, the figures claimed by PUSH would have to be built elsewhere in the region. PH asked why the City Centre was an opportunity site, not strategic, to drive employment and housing numbers. BD noted that the Options consultation did not appear to offer much support to Milton Market. BD suggested that we create a guide to filling in the consultation and a meeting was arranged for Tuesday 5 September at 1830, venue TBA, between RB, BD, KB to attempt this.

PP said that we should ensure that we mobilise as much support as possible through all means. It was generally agreed that that we should have a coherent comment letter from each fora, as well as individuals responding. There would be a Milton Neighbourhood Forum Open Forum on 6 Sep at which it was hoped that PCC planning staff could attend to explain the plan. It was agreed that RB would ask Dave Chetwyn to draft a letter on behalf of the Forum, which would be circulated as a basis for members to make comments to PCC. It was noted that we needed to work to the existing Portsmouth Plan with our Neighbourhood Plan, but had to keep in mind the possibilities of the emerging Portsmouth Plan

**Action:** RB to ask Dave Chetwyn to draft a response on behalf of the Planning Forum.

A small working group consisting of RB, BD, KB will meet on 6 Sep to look at a “how to” guide.

## **6. To review progress on the plan and decide on further progress.**

7.1 PD tabled a revised HNA from AECOM. He asked the Committee to note that this had resulted in a higher housing need than the first draft. He said that he had negotiated an extension to the usual deadlines with Locality and would be contacting the project leads. It was agreed that we should endeavor to make responses to the latest draft of the Housing Need Analysis and the Habitats Regulation Assessment by **September 6**. Responses should be sent top PD, who will forward them to AECOM. PD would ask whether the HRA needed to be revised in the light of the HNA

**Action:** All to consider and comment on the HNA by 6 Sep.

PD to contact Project Managers at AECOM with the reply date

PD to receive responses to HNA/HRA

PD to ask whether the HRA needed revision in the light of the HNA

7.2 RB drew attention to the paper circulated by PD in which outstanding work on the Neighbourhood Plan was tabled and grouped by theme. Those present said that they were happy with the allocation to them. PD and ML agreed to take on the infrastructure grouping. PH would focus on education input and it was hoped that LSt would add something on the CCG and bed blocking. It was noted that there were still some gaps, especially around retail provision, and members who had not an allocation of plan writing were urged to volunteer. It was agreed that all concerned would try their best to produce something ready for the next meeting on 14 September. PD would circulate contributions received, as appropriate.

**Action:** All to review their contribution against the outstanding plan work document, and complete their contribution by 14 September, and send it to PD

## **7. Financial Update.**

ML said PD needed be added to the signatories for the account. PD also undertook to maintain contact with Dave Chetwyn for invoicing.

**Action:** PD to arrange with ML a date for signing of bank forms

PD to liaise with Dave Chetwyn for invoicing

## **8. Any Other Business not notified before or covered by the Agenda**

DS raised the issue of whether we should be interested in Community Land Trusts. After some discussion, it was felt that a presentation to the Neighbourhood Forum Committee would be more appropriate.

BD raised the issue of a planning application for the Brewers' Arms site, consisting of 9 flats. KB said that she would post on KM G to bring this to a wider audience.

**Action: KB to publish planning application details for the Brewers Arms on KMG**

#### **10. Date of Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting would be on 14 September at 7pm in the Village Hall.

**Actions arising from the Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 August 2017**

| <b>Minute Number</b> | <b>Action</b>   | <b>Lead</b>    |
|----------------------|---|----------------|
| 4                    | obtain feedback from LDA arising from the public consultation   | RB             |
| 6                    | ask Dave Chetwyn to draft a response on behalf of the Planning Forum.   | RB             |
|                      | A small working group consisting of RB, BD, KB will meet on 6 Sep to look at a “how to” guide for the consultation                      | RB<br>BD<br>KB |
| 7.1                  | consider and comment on the HNA by 6 Sep.   | All            |
|                      | contact AECOM Project Managers at with the reply date   | PD             |
|                      | ask whether the HRA needed revision in the light of the HNA   | PD             |
|                      | receive responses to HNA/HRA by 6 Sep   | PD             |
| 7.2                  | review their contribution against the outstanding plan work document, and complete their contribution by 14 September, sending it to PD | All<br>PD      |
|                      | arrange with ML a date for signing of bank forms  |                |
| 8                    | liaise with Dave Chetwyn for invoicing  |                |
| 9                    | publish planning application details for the Brewers Arms on KMG  | KB             |