

NETTLESTONE AND SEAVIEW PARISH COUNCIL

(These Minutes are unconfirmed and are not an official record until signed).

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING
held Online on Thursday 26th November 2020 at 6.00pm

PRESENT: Cllrs Elliott (Chairman), Geernaert-Davies, Colledge, Adams, Ward, Rivlin, Hardie and Tuson.

The Chairman welcomed Members and Residents (12)

EM/20/5: Apologies for Absence:

All members were present.

EM/20/6: Declaration of Interests:

No members declared an interest in either agenda item.

EM/20/7: To Consider Planning Application 20/01733/OUT: Land North Of Woodland Close And Adjacent Cedar Lodge And Thornton Cottage Puckpool Hill Seaview Isle Of Wight Outline for up to 50 residential dwellings (with details of access), creation of a new access off Puckpool Hill, and provision of public open space, landscaping and associated works.

Cllr Elliott began by inviting residents who lived in the vicinity of the proposed development to speak. Two residents described their carefully considered objections. Cllr Elliott then invited the Chair of Planning – Cllr Adams – to lead the discussion of the application. Cllr Adams proposed objecting to the application on the grounds listed below. Cllr(s) Ward, Rivlin and Colledge all added detail to the objection. Cllr Geernaert-Davies seconded the motion to object to the application and a vote was taken.

Resolved:

The members voted (unanimously) to object to the application on the following grounds:

- Lack of Affordable Housing
- Coalescence
- Overdevelopment/Lack of services
- Loss of Green Space/Ecological impact
- Biodiversity
- Lack of Transport Infrastructure.

Affordable Housing – Policy DM4 (Isle of Wight Core Strategy – March 2012) states that a proposed development should provide 35% of the development as on-site affordable housing, based on developments of 15+ units in Key Regeneration Areas and 10+ units elsewhere. This development is proposing to provide 50 houses and

section 8.3 of the applicants final Planning Statement clearly states “To ascertain whether the proposal is viable and ensure that any level of affordable housing is deliverable, the applicant subsequently commissioned Vail Williams to prepare a Report and

Viability Appraisal which will be submitted directly to the LPA under separate cover. The results

of the supporting study demonstrate that **the applicant cannot viably deliver affordable housing**

on the site, assuming all other planning costs / obligations are met.”

Not only is it unacceptable to the Parish Council that the proposed development will not deliver affordable housing, it is of vital importance to the members that the affordable housing that is provided in the parish is of a suitable mix, as per Policies DM3 and DM5. The council’s own research (conducted for its Supplementary Planning Document) showed that the affordable housing need in the parish is for younger people (DM3) and older persons (DM5). Inline with policy DM5, a statement from the Isle of Wight Council planning officer – included as an appendix to the applicants Planning statement – reads “The Council is promoting the provision of Extra Care housing for older people in the form of 1 or 2-bed bungalows or flats and these requirement should be factored into your proposal for this site” and this is clearly being described as not viable in the same report.

Coalescence - In contravention of Objective 9, AAP2 Isle of Wight Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Ryde Key Regeneration Area, the proposed development will cause settlement coalescence.

The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Ryde and in fact lies within the Parish of Nettlestone and Seaview which is designated as a Wider Rural Area and as per section 5.17 of SP1 “Generally, development is not expected to occur in the wider rural areas unless, as set out in SP1, a local need for development can be demonstrated, or it is tourism related development.” To date, the Isle of Wight Council has been unable to provide the parish council with a justifiable set of requirements for major developments in the parish.

Overdevelopment – This development would be an overdevelopment of the area on its own – lack of infrastructure, increased demand on services e.g. medical practices, schools etc. but when taken in conjunction with the 120+ dwelling development across the road at Harcourt Sands, the proposed 400+ houses at the top of the hill at West Acre Farm and Pennyfeathers within a mile, this would be a gross overdevelopment of the area.

Ecological impact – Far from being an area of ‘scrubland’, the site was a thriving outdoor recreational area with football and other pursuits taking place on a well-maintained recreation ground. There are trees on site with preservation areas and building on this site would result in the loss of another invaluable green space on the Island.

Biodiversity Report – The application refers to recommendations from an “Ecological Appraisal prepared by Arc Consulting”, yet the appraisal is not available to view on the application site.

Lack of Transport Infrastructure – There is a lack of transport infrastructure to safely support the additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic that would be attracted by a development of this size.

The Parish Council recommends that no further major planning applications are considered for the parish until the existing development at Harcourt Sands has been developed, the parish’s Neighbourhood Plan is produced and the Island Core Planning Strategy is updated.

EM/20/8: To consider the Planning Application that references the creation of a pathway through Cothey Bottom Copse.

The Clerk explained that this item had been added to the agenda whilst clarification of which planning application this was being sought from the Isle of Wight Council. During the week it had become apparent that this was in fact the application for West Acre Farm 20/01061/FUL and had been considered at the parish Planning Committee meeting held on the 19th August 2020. The Committee had strongly objected to the application already and so was not considered further.

There being no further business, the meeting was declared closed at 6.46pm.

.....
Chairman
14th December 2020