TEXT_AQUIND_ISH5_Session3_18022021

Thu, 2/18 12:39PM • 19:57

00:01
Okay, if we run it's 1210, we will resume and I am going to put items six, three on the agenda slightly further back, because whilst we're talking about Farlington, you might as well continue. So we'll take item six for first, if we may.

00:21
Question then for the applicant in the first instance, are any mitigation measures either on site or off site with regard to the displacement of users at Farlington, another playing field still under discussion are likely to come forward within the examination, Mr. Jarvis.

00:39
There are not other areas where displaced persons could be located, and therefore the applicant is looking to minimize the impact through planning obligations outlined in relation to agenda item 6.1, which is effectively a seeking to agree with Portland city council and approach to the realignment of pitches to minimize the impacts. I think the framework management plan for recreation impacts identifies the suitability of realigning nine by nine pitch, and this is shown in plate two that you referred to earlier, sir. And that the pitches for eight and 10, and cricket pitch three would still be affected, albeit not cricket square.

01:16
And that would leave the majority of the pitchers in place unable to be played on during the period. So principally, we're looking to mitigate the effects on site. There's no proposals for on site. And there's also at this time, no current proposal for any mitigation fund to be provided simply because it's just not considered that that would provide effective mitigation in relation to the impact. Okay. Okay. Thank you. And just to confirm that your position remains the same on that in respect of Brandstory Park and zetlin field as well, presumably?

01:49
Yes, we have looked to minimize the impacts, and with regard to two brands Park, we are seeking to realign the pictures such that they're not impacted. And in respect to certain fields, I understand that it's only goalposts that are there. So whether we move those or not is up for debate, but that's not seen as such a critical issue and at the minute isn't proposed to be included in the sexual ethics agreement.

02:12
Okay, thank you.

02:15

Miss Kuhn. Is there any light either yourself or Mr. McGuire can shed on this and in particular, most of the focus has been on filing some playing fields, quite rightly, perhaps? Also, if we could just have a summary of Portsmouth's composition regarding Britain's free Park and zetlin field and the mitigations proposed by the applicant, please. So, I'm going to turn to Mr. McGuire for that. Thank you.

02:42
So suddenly to assist, I would agree there is very limited opportunity for onsite mitigation. What's been described, mitigation is of course, the best avoidance to reduce the impact.

02:55
Obviously, we are looking through the FM pri to see where they have proposed some of those slight reduction opportunities such as the bransby, realignment and Farlington realignment. So whether they are feasibly possible, the applicant's contention is of course, that they are we will be looking at that. And that will at least give us a grounding of what the unmitigated impact will be.

03:22
It's good to see the applicant acknowledging contrary to previous statements that there is unmitigated impact. But the statement that they feel any sort of mitigation fund would not be appropriate as it wouldn't achieve mitigation. It's surprising we have been suggesting and encouraging them to engage us in discussions on the community fund. Throughout this process, obviously, it's not just the direct mitigation of playable hours of pitch. That is a key issue for socio economic impacts. It is the community contribution that community clubs get from regular meeting, that unavailable fund which would potentially in discussion with those clubs and local community groups, enable the city council to support community cohesion, or otherwise support outdoor recreation and wellbeing when you look at the broader purposes of playing pitches rather than just the number of game fixtures that would have to be cancelled in any given season. Obviously, now we have hopefully, enough information to quantify up exactly what we've lost, we would be able to start a negotiation on the scale of that community fund. And how I serve reminded that there is not time within this examination. To do that, because of the choice by the applicant to leave. It's so late to bring this forward. We remain therefore, so committed to the suggestion that our community fund to support communities recreation and wellbeing in Portsmouth isn't appropriate mitigation to the loss of the unmitigated loss to playing pitches across the number of sites that have been identified exactly how much that should be.

05:00
beats are unfortunately not in a position to provide any quantifiable outcomes. And I expect even once we've had a chance to go through the FM pri, we will have a bit of opportunity to be more certain than that, which of course, I would apologies. But I won't go into the details of why we think that's had to occur. So later in this process, as we've I think, exhausted matter already. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. McGuire.

05:26
Mr. Jarvis, is there anything you wish to come back on that?

05:31

Just to outline sort of more clearly that the relationship between the impacts on the playing fields in any financial contribution if there's no evidence established relationship between the two, it's not considered as such a fund is necessary to mitigate the impacts that have been described. And therefore, there is still no proposal for such a fund to be included within any section one ethics agreement. So thank you.

05:57
Okay, and Does anyone else have anything to say on this item or the matter of those playing fields? We'll be coming to the University of Portsmouth separately in a moment.

06:08
Okay, nothing heard.

06:10
In keeping with moving questions around on the agenda, we will continue on the theme of playing pictures and surfaces if we may. So six, three gets put to the end of this section. Questions. 6.5 will be coming to Mr. Harris, and asking, does the University of Portsmouth have any comments on the mitigation measures and method statements that are now offered by the applicant? That's paragraph 629 11. of rep seven hyphen 032. And do these ameliorate or alleviates the university's earlier concerns regarding the effects of the proposed development on a sports pitch provision? Just before you answer that, I don't know if you are aware have had the chance of looking at the applicants, D seven c submissions,

07:00
basically saying that detailed sort of mitigation is they're limited to just looking at the duration of works on the University of Portsmouth site, and there are no other sort of measures in terms of the construction programme. Firstly, have you had a chance to look at the information at that deadline? And secondly, how would you respond to the question as a whole please? monitor? Thank you. Yes, I have had a chance we have had a chance to review that material. And it's covered in the statement I'm going to give now. Okay, excellent. Please continue. Thank you. So yes, we have reviewed and the mitigation method statements offered by the applicant in the context of our written submissions and appearance to date. This also covers the deadline, seven submissions of the old camp and FMP that we've been, the examination has been discussing this morning, which so you're aware, so we received direct from the applicant by email on the 15th of February. We also held a meeting with applicants team at 4:30pm, Monday this week, which followed an email we received from them on the 22nd of January in response to our 20 21st of December email. And we'll provide that email exchange the examining authority as part of our deadline eight submission, as we published our 21st of December email and in relation to one of those responses there. And so from our review of the relevant documents and is fed back to the applicants team on Monday, our position is that the mitigation measures and method statements do not ameliorate or alleviate the university's earlier concerns regarding the impact on sports provision, and operations specifically on the eastern parcel of the Plainfield land. This read the reasons for this are as follows. All three pitches remain in the order limits, which needs to be this wide to accommodate construction and associated works. All three pitches are to be used outside of the university term time period during the summer for the reasons explained to the examination to date, and this includes as a women's euro 2022 tournament training base, we're all playing fields and pitches

are to be made available for use. We certainly appreciate the acceptance of our proposal by the applicant to keep the works as far to the east and extent to minimize impact, which is reflected in the indicative temporary works area shown plate for the FMP. We also appreciate the proposal in the old camp to prepare and agree a construction method statement before works commence. It's also helpful that the whole road now appears to be unnecessary, based on the information provided in the applicants email on the 22nd of January. However, we understand from the applicant that the works in the indicative temporary works area are subject to further future geotechnical investigations and analysis by the appointed contractor should this order be confirmed and as the geotechnical investigations have not been undertaken, and a contractor has not been appointed. This cannot be offered as a firm commitment, which is why the temporary works area remains indicative and the order limit is unchanged.

10:00
So the indicative status, the temporary works area within the ordinance boundary, and additional investigations and advice needed therefore leads a significant question mark in our view of the applicant's ability to reduce the impact on sports facilities as promised in the old camp and FMP. We therefore have to assume a worst case scenario position in terms of the temporary recreational and operational disturbance, which will occur due to the continued presence, excuse me, in the order limits and recommend the examining authority forms the same conclusion.

10:34
Sir, I'll continue with the view that pictures on plate four, and five of the FMP dealing with each pitch in turn, it's reasonable to form the following conclusions. In terms of the Northern football pitch. This will be unavailable for a minimum of four weeks during University term time. It will also be unavailable for eight weeks during the summer when it is needed for other activities and commitments. Now, no impact will occur if work is focused on the temporary works area. But this is uncertain for the reasons I've explained. As half the page is in the order limits and there is no space to potentially realign, we have to conclude it will be unavailable for the construction period between 12 to 16 weeks as a minimum.

11:15
In terms of the middle or northern rugby pitch. The alignment and position of that pitch means it extends into the temporary works area and cable route. And as there is insufficient space to the west of the pitch for realignment, this pitch will be completely unavailable for the construction period between 12 to 16 weeks as a minimum.

11:35
And finally, in terms of the Southern rugby pitch. We do note the additional layout analysis presented in the PST report, which is appendix three of the FMP which includes a potential temporary pitch layout, which is shown in plate three, an appendix to the PST report. that avoids the indicative cable route and works area, but does keep that pitch in the in the works sorry, in the order limits area. Now the ability to deliver this realignment and keep the pitch open does rely on works being kept to the east, but does offer some potential to maintain a pitch in this location. So every was only just received this document on Monday. This week, the university has sought advice from its own specialist pitch advisor on the feasibility of such a layout, together with the thicker turf proposal that you will have seen in that

document. And we hope to confirm our position and the residual impact on this pitch by the deadline late submission.

12:32
And finally, just in reviewing the FMP we did notice additional comments made in there on the condition and perceived usage the pitch following the PSD survey, which is referred to in FMP paragraph 4.2 point 3.4. And this suggests that the pictures have not been used for the past two years, and have been damaged by Brent geese activity. This infers although it's not stated in the submissions that the pictures are not as well used as we present that are not in a good condition. We wish to reassure the examining authority that the pitchers were used to their capacity pre pandemic. And the current usage and lack of pitch markings is as a result of the pandemic. The pitches were made managed and available for use by elite sports for training, which is permissible under current lockdown rules. And so we therefore strongly disagree with the implied statement of under use for conditioning the FMP.

13:24
Just concluding so we do recognize the progress made by the applicant in addressing some of the university's original concerns, including the effect on the western pitches through the modification of the order. Focusing works on the eastern boundary node can now confirming no need for haul road. However, we have to may not maintain our objection to the current proposed order, based on the impact demonstrated in submissions, particularly on the northern middle pitches, and the uncertainty regarding the ability to achieve the mitigation proposed where the affected land is still retained with the order and subject to further investigation. And as I said, Our final position will be confirmed in our deadline eight submission once the university has received their own advice on that pitch, realignment and proposal. Thank you.

14:08
Okay, and not wishing to prejudge the outcomes of you envisage that that position of the University of Portsmouth will change at all. I'm not envisaging it will change that. But obviously, we'd like to take that time in order to review that advice. Absolutely. Understood on that. And, Mr. Jarvis, how would you like to respond to that response?

14:34
Just to acknowledge the comments made by Mr. Harrison to confirm that we'll continue to liaise with the University of Portsmouth as we can in relation to the potential management of the impacts in this area. If we can make further progress, we will but I do note the position being taken may not change. Thank you. Okay, thank you. And just on that point, Mr. Jarvis about the condition of the pitch and the pandemics influence be taken out

15:00
board presumably,

15:02
the position stated in the report is the position stated in the report. And that was based on discussions with persons present at the site on the university. I believe

15:12
I wasn't involved in those discussions, so can't comment on them. But if you would like any further information in that regard, we can seek to respond to any queries in that respect.

15:22
Okay, now, I think that a fitting that some sums it up nicely, Mr. Harris, is there anything further you wish to add on this question on the university's position?

15:33
No, thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

15:37
Okay, the turning into what is effectively now the last question under this section.

15:44
Questions. six, three,

15:47
is the proposed drafting of the applicant's employment and skills strategy, which is rep seven hyphen 077, acceptable to the relevant local authorities. Now, we had some discussion on on the requirement of the DCI yesterday. And that mainly started with Winchester city council who put it forward. So it makes sense if we come to yourself Mr. Cornwell first in answering this question, if you would give us some assistance, please.

16:19
Thank you, sir. Yes, we've obviously been looking at the employment and skills strategy document that was submitted a deadline seven. We clearly welcome it's submission having been lobbying for it.

16:35
Since our local impact report was submitted, we are endeavoring to provide the applicant with some feedback, we're conscious of the time limits that are imposed honors with regards to the deadlines. We're going to do what we can within the available time, obviously, we may well be looking to slightly adjust the requirement to reflect that the strategy document is as it were a guide to what should form to be submitted at a later date. But obviously, that discussion on the requirement will be part of the more general discussion we have with the applicant following yesterday's hearing. Thank you. Thank you very much.

17:26
In no particular order, I'll just go around the relevant other local authorities and see if they wish to respond on the employment and skills strategy.

17:36
First of all, South downs National Park Authority.

17:42
Good afternoon, Mike Houston, Southdown’s, National Park Authority. I'm I confirm that we have reviewed this document and we have no comments to make at this time. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Hughes. And for East Hampshire and haven't Borough Council.

17:57
Hello. Yes, nothing to add from Eva East Hampshire, or haven't prospective. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. From Hampshire County Council.

18:11
Nothing died from us. Thank you, sir. Thank you. And lastly, Portsmouth City Council, please.

18:18
Sir. Paul Smith is generally happy with it. We may have some input into the monitoring. But that's all. Okay. Thank you very much. Does any other interested party wish to raise an issue on the employment and skills strategy before I go back to Mr. Jarvis?

18:38
Okay, nothing had Mr. Jarvis. Any concluding comments on this question from what you've just heard?

18:46
No, no, thank you.

18:49
Okay, thank you very much for that. Now, I note then that we've come to the end of agenda item six, we have a long agenda item seven on highways and transport coming up. I wonder if my colleagues would just like to comment on whether now is a suitable location to have an early lunch of perhaps an hour duration. And that we'll come back after that. Mr. Roscoe. So you're on screen.

19:25
Mr. Wallace? Yes. I presumed that Mr. Martin was going to join us on screen, but I see you've already had a comment from him. I'm quite happy to go either way. Thank you. Okay. What are then propose is that we adjourn now for lunch. We'll take an hour. It's now 1230. We'll come back at 130 and you'll be having me ceremony over the agenda item seven. Thank you very much.