

APPEAL BY POWERFUEL PORTLAND LTD
AGAINST THE REFUSAL OF DORSET COUNCIL
TO GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION REF: WP/20/00692/DCC

PINS REF: APP/D1265/W/23/3327692

**PROPOSED ENERGY RECOVERY
FACILITY (ERF) &
ASSOCIATED WORKS
PORTLAND PORT
CASTLETOWN
PORTLAND**

SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE
IMPACT UPON THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

FOR

RULE 6 PARTIES

- (1) THE PORTLAND ASSOCIATION
(2) STOP PORTLAND WASTE
INCINERATOR GROUP

BY

MRS NICHOLA BURLEY
MA, Dip Cons Arch, MRTPI, IHBC

November 2023

SUBMISSIONV1

HERITAGE VISION LTD

www.heritagevision.co.uk



RTPI

mediation of space · making of place



1. AUTHOR

1.1 Qualifications & experience

This proof of evidence has been prepared by Mrs Nichola Burley IHBC, MRTPI, Director, Heritage Vision Ltd. I hold the following qualifications in architecture, conservation and planning: BA (Hons) Arch, Dip Cons Arch, MA T&CP. I am a full member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), with HESPR (Historic Environment Service Provider Recognition) status approved for Heritage Vision Ltd by the IHBC. I have worked in both private practice and the public sector as a Conservation Officer and Heritage Planning Consultant for 30 years. Between 1996 – 2004 I was Historic Buildings Officer for Devon County Council and prior to that I held conservation and planning posts with local planning authorities and a private practice in the South West and South of England. For the last 20 years I have practiced as an independant historic environment planning consultant as Director of Heritage Vision Ltd. Notably my work has included providing appeal hearing evidence for local planning authorities and property owners and acting as expert witness at public inquiries with regard to impact upon the historic environment, including in consideration of an onshore wind turbine; a large structure, seeking to reduce reliance on fossil fuels but impacting on the historic environment in doing so.

1.2 Endorsement

The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal, reference APP/D1265/W/23/3327692, in this statement, is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institutions and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

2. SUMMARY OF THE PROOF OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 The purpose of this evidence is to support the Statement of Case (SoC) of the Rule 6 parties, (1) *The Portland Association* (TPA), (2) *Stop Portland Waste Incinerator Group* (SPWI), as submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 10th October 2023, in consideration of the impact of the proposal upon the historic environment, including upon the Outstanding Value of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site.
- 2.2 There is agreement by all parties to the Inquiry that the proposal would not cause any physical harm to the significance of any heritage assets. It is agreed that the proposal would cause harm to the settings of heritage assets where settings contribute to the significance of heritage assets. The full proof of evidence demonstrates that the proposal would cause harm to a greater number of heritage assets and at a greater level of harm than identified by the Appellant and the Council.
- 2.3 It is agreed with the Appellant and the Council that the following designated heritage assets are impacted by the proposal.
- The Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site (WHS).
 - The Verne Citadel including the East Weare batteries on the north-east face of Portland, scheduled monument, grade II* and grade II
 - Portland Port and Harbour listed structures – grade II listed
 - Portland Castle - scheduled monument, listed grade I
 - Sandsfoot Castle – scheduled monument
 - Listed buildings within Castletown on the route to the Port – listed grade II
 - Underhill Conservation Area

Further to a review of the character of Portland and its historic environment, I have extend the list of heritage assets, both designated and non-designated that would have their significance harmed by the proposal's impact upon their setting to include:

- Nothe Fort, scheduled monument
- Dorset AONB
- All conservation areas on the Isle of Portland
- Unlisted historic features along the east coast that are a key part of the stone working history of the isle
- The general experience of arrival on the historic Isle of Portland; a place with a very strong sense of history

2.4 The level of harm caused to the significance of heritage assets by the proposal is found to vary from a high to a low level of less than substantial harm. The most serious impact of the proposal is considered to be the following:

- A **high level of less than substantial harm** to the significance of the highly grade grouping of The Verne Citadel and the associated defences on East Weare along with the Portland Harbour grouping of listed buildings as The Verne and associated defences that were constructed to defend Portland Harbour, the largest manmade harbour in the world in the mid C19, where there are individually important structures and buildings but cumulatively they are a remarkable, well preserved and globally unique and important grouping.
- A **moderate level of less than substantial harm** to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site because, even though the site is outside the WHS, Portland is an extremely important part of the WHS by virtue of the all-pervading influence of the isle's geology and geomorphology on the evolution and character of the isle and because of the impact of the proposal upon the experiential setting of the WHS.

2.5 The Appellant has offered mitigation works to balance the harm caused to the significance of heritage assets. It is concluded that what the Appellant describes as mitigation would not provide any direct heritage benefit, could harm a Scheduled Monument/listed building but does provide a small public benefit through enhancing the isle's footpath network.

2.6 In accordance with the policies of the NPPF it is for others to demonstrate whether the harm caused to designated heritage assets has clear and convincing justification and whether public benefits of the proposal outweigh the high level of less than substantial harm to highly graded heritage assets where policy requires great weight to be given to the conservation of heritage assets, with the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

HERITAGE VISION

Nichola Burley, Dip Cons Arch, MRTPI, IHBC
www.heritagevision.co.uk
01297 625866