

Portland Port, Castletown, Portland, Dorset, DT5 1PP
Powerfuel Portland Limited
LPA Reference: WP/20/00692/DCC
PINS Reference: APP/D1265/W/23/3327692
November 2023



PPF 15: PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF SIMON ELLIOTT – SUMMARY

SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1.0 Summary Proof of Evidence

- 1.1 In my Proof of Evidence (PoE), I consider the socioeconomic impact of the proposed Portland Port Energy Recovery Facility (ERF, “the Proposed Development”), as requested by Powerfuel Portland Limited (“the Appellant”). I was not involved in the planning application or any of the documents prepared at that time.
- 1.2 The Case Officer in their report to committee concluded that there were several socioeconomic benefits of the Proposed Development:
- Provision of onshore power to which they gave full positive weight.
 - Energy security on Portland, to which they gave moderate positive weight.
 - Employment generation, to which they gave moderate positive weight.
 - District heating, to which they gave moderate positive weight.
- 1.3 In my evidence I set out the key policy documents, an analysis of the acute economic deprivation affecting the area of Weymouth and Portland; and revisit the four benefits that the Case Officer identified.
- 1.4 In terms of energy security, I concluded that given the known constraints to energy supply to Portland (Mr Roberts’ Proof of Evidence) and the clear need to increase energy supply to serve the Port (as set out in Mr Other’s Proof of Evidence), the Proposed Development’s importance to the economic sustainability of this location is significant. As such I consider the Proposed Development’s contribution to energy security to be of substantial weight. This is inconsistent with the Case Officer’s conclusions described above, which I consider internally inconsistent as the onshore power and employment generation benefits flow from energy security. It follows therefore that energy security must be given at least the same weight as highest subsequent benefit.
- 1.5 In terms of onshore power provision, I concluded that the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development would have on local tourism expenditure from cruise ship visits carries substantial beneficial weight, which I consider consistent with the Case Officer’s conclusion that it should be given ‘full’ positive weight.
- 1.6 In terms of the employment directly supported by the Proposed Development during its construction and operation, I concluded that these would both attract moderate beneficial weight in the planning balance. This is consistent with the Case Officer’s conclusions.

- 1.7 In terms of the potential for a District Heat Network facilitated by the Proposed Development, I concluded that this would attract moderate beneficial weight in the planning balance. This is consistent with the Case Officer's conclusions.
- 1.8 I also find no socioeconomic harm, which despite the unsubstantiated misgivings of the Rule 6 party, has been echoed by the following:
- The Case Officer in their report to committee found there to be a positive economic effect.
 - The LEP in their response to the planning application gave their full support to the Proposed Development.
 - The Port itself is fully supportive of the Proposed Development, particularly its ability to implement onshore power capabilities and provide future energy security.
 - The world's largest cruise ship operator, Carnival, is highly supportive of the Proposed Development.
- 1.9 Finally, I cannot find any inconsistency between the Proposed Development and any socioeconomic policy pertinent to this case, particularly with regards to the NPPF and NPPW.



BIDWELLS