



Minutes

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Name of meeting | PLANNING COMMITTEE |
| Date and time | TUESDAY, 22 APRIL 2008 COMMENCING AT 4.00 PM |
| Venue | COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT |
| Present | Cllrs Ivan Bulwer (Chairman), Henry Adams, Wendy Arnold, William Burt, Charles Chapman, Mike Cunningham, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Muriel Miller, Brian Mosdell, Lady Pigot, Susan Scoccia, David Williams |
| Also Present (non voting) | Cllrs George Brown, Ian Ward |
| Officers Present | Steve Cornwell, Keith Jolliffe, John MacKenzie, Julie Martin, Helen Miles, Bill Murphy Andrew Pegram, Phil Salmon, Andrew White |
| Apologies | George Cameron |

1. [Minutes](#)

RESOLVED :

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on [18 March 2008](#) be confirmed subject to Minute 50 (a) (3) – Westridge Golf Centre, Brading Road, Ryde, be amended to include the provision of a bond for the completion of the outer faces of the bund and the provision of the drainage in the event that the work was not completed by the applicant.

2. [Declarations of Interest](#)

Cllr John Hobart declared a personal interest in Minute 3 (2) - Isle of Wight College, Dodnor Lane, Newport, as he sometimes taught at the college.

Cllr Brian Mosdell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 3 (9) - 16 Grafton Street, Sandown, as he knew the applicant and had done business with him. He was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

Cllr Susan Scoccia declared a personal interest in Minute 3 (9) - 16 Grafton Street, Sandown, as person speaking on behalf of Sandown Town Council and herself were members of Ventnor Town Council.

Cllr Bill Burt declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 6 (17) - Lee Top, Warlands Lane, Shalfleet, as he was the applicant. He was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

Mr Andrew Pegram, Development Control Manager declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 6 (19) – 7A Pier Street, Sandown, as he socialised with the leaseholder of the adjacent licensed premises. He was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

Cllr Muriel Miller indicated that she has spoken to the Deputy Monitoring Officer and would be leaving the meeting for Minute 6 (19) – 7A Pier Street, Sandown, as she was in the same political group as the applicant. She was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

3. **Report of the Head of Planning Services**

Planning Applications and Related Matters

Consideration was given to items 1 - 10 of the report of the Head of Planning Services.

RESOLVED :

THAT the applications be determined as detailed below :

The reasons for the resolutions made in accordance with Officer recommendation were given in the Planning report. Where resolutions are made contrary to Officer recommendation the reasons for doing so are contained in the minutes.

A schedule of additional representations received after the printing of the report were submitted at the beginning of the meeting and were drawn to the attention of Members when considering the application. A note is made to that effect in the minutes.

Application: [TCP/05399/P](#)

Details: Southern part of Stonewood Camp, Field Lane, St. Helens.

Residential development comprising 5 x terraces of 3 houses, 2 pairs of semi-detached houses and 1 detached house (total of 20); with associated garages, car ports and parking; alterations to vehicular access.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants: Mr Phillips (Objector)
Mr Glen Hepburn (Agent)

Additional Representations: Two further letters of objection had been received from local residents (one of whom had written previously and had copied the letter to Members) on grounds of the narrowness of Field Lane, excessive potential persons resident and increased traffic, raising concern over water runoff from the site, loss of trees and hedges and loss of habitats.

Comment: None.

Decision: The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

THAT the application be approved.

Conditions: Conditions 12, 14, 15 and 16 to be consolidated.

Additional conditions re :

Street lighting within the development and a photographic survey of the condition of Field Lane for rectification should damage occur during construction.

As per report (Item 1)

Application: [TCP/21378/X](#)

Details: Isle of Wight College, Dodnor Lane, Newport.

Demolition of existing college buildings; outline for two/three storey college building with associated parking, access and landscaping.

Site Visits: None.

Public Participants: Mr Tom Allen (Agent)

Additional Representations: A letter from an Island resident pointed out that the new building would represent a reduction in floor area from the existing; a construction and engineering evaluation of spaces would be less than currently available and that the proposal

required the demolition of newly constructed part of the College.

A letter of objection was received from a Newport resident on grounds of :

- Development represents overdevelopment of a constrained site.
- Inadequate provision made for recreational needs of students.
- Proposal would represent a wasteful use of resources.
- Unsuitable design.
- Location of the campus likely to generate an unavoidable volume of vehicular movement.

Comment:

The current development sought a lesser footprint than the existing and represented a rationalization of the floor area. The application was in outline form and no specific use allocations had yet been established. The location of the College campus was long established; it was central in the Island and probably in the most sustainable location practicable.

Members believed it would have been more beneficial to have had more detail of the proposed plan.

Decision:

The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

- (i) THAT the application be approved.
- (ii) THAT a covering letter be sent with the decision notice to set out the Council's expectations regarding the sustainable qualities of the replacement complex.

Conditions:

Condition to be added :

"The replacement college authorised by this permission shall comprise a site coverage of not exceeding 15000m²

As per report (Item 3)

Application: [TCPL/20583/V and LBC/20583/U](#)

Details: Arreton Barns, Main Road, Arreton.

Alterations to vehicular access and formation of car park; proposed single storey building to form craft shop/reception area to include covered entrance and display area; conversion of farm buildings for craft/display purposes; retention of associated structures, (revised scheme).

and

LBC for alterations to vehicular access and formation of car park; proposed single storey building to form craft shop/reception area to include covered entrance and display area; conversion of farm buildings for craft/display purposes; retention of associated structures, (revised scheme).

Site Visits: The site had previously been visited by members of the Planning Committee.

Public Participants: Mr Paul Airey (Agent)

Additional Representations: The agent had confirmed on behalf of the applicant that it was not proposed to provide any illumination for the proposed permanent car park other than low level bollards at the entrance to the built areas.

The AONB Planning Officer confirmed no objection in principle to the provision of external lighting to the proposed permanent car park, if such lighting was deemed to be necessary. Attention was drawn to a best practice guidance note regarding low level bollard type lighting which was designed to avoid light spillage, and was therefore thought to offer an acceptable solution when having regard to the dark skies initiative.

Comment: Officers drew attention to Condition 15 which required the submission of details relating to external lighting prior to the car park being brought into use.

As a point of clarification, Officers wished to point out that the three wooden buildings known as Farmer Jacks, Woodland Ways and the Craft Cabin were all now being considered for permanent retention. Accordingly, the fourth

bullet pointed paragraph on page 36 of the report should be amended to read as follows:

- Agent has made the following observations in support of the proposal to retain Farmer Jacks, Woodland Ways and the Craft Cabin on a permanent basis:

“It is important to recognise that each of these buildings is occupied by an independent business which leases the building from Arreton Barns. If these buildings had to be removed then the future operation of these businesses would be endangered, as there is no obvious new location for them. The ongoing maintenance and improvement, where necessary, of these buildings therefore needs to be scheduled sensitively and in co-operation with the tenants, which could also be controlled through the imposition of a suitable condition.”

Officers also pointed out that the description of the proposal made reference to the “*retention of associated structures*”.

Decision:

The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved: Conditional permission - covering letter to accompany the decision notice addressing the following issues:

- Drawing attention to conditions where there is an implicit timescale.
- Highlighting the condition of planning permission and Listed Building Consent, which requires certain alterations to the external fabric of the Listed Building to be agreed and carried out again within a specified timescale in addition to a programme of work in the area in and around the former tithe barn to be agreed with the Conservation Officer.
- That, in the circumstances, subject to initial compliance with the timescales contained in the conditions and an undertaking to commence and complete the works, again specified in the condition(s), the Council will

defer any decision in respect of possible enforcement action in respect of the unauthorised use of the land close to Main Road as an overspill car park; a matter that will be reviewed on or before 30 September 2008 depending on progress being made in respect of the parking area and associated access roads.

Conditions: Condition 6 should refer to No 5 and not 4.
As per report (Item 4 and 5)

Application: [TCP/04395/Z](#)

Details: Freshwater Garage, Afton Road, Freshwater.
Retention of jet wash.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants: Mr Glen Hepburn (Agent)

Additional Representations: An email had been received from the occupiers of No 1 Causeway View requesting that the views of the Freshwater Town Centre Manager were put before the Planning Committee. The email indicated that he had already contacted the Planning Department making various points following what he observed during the operation of the jet wash.

Comment: As a point of clarification Members attention was drawn to the fact that the building which was located within the rear garden area of No 1 Causeway View and which was annotated on the submitted plans as a garage was actually a domestic shed.

With regard to the statement from the adjoining property owner indicating that the Freshwater Town Centre Manager had raised a number of concerns with regards to the proposal, Members were advised that the planning officer had spoken with the Town Centre Manager who indicated that he had not raised any objection with the Planning Department and indeed had never intended to. He was simply going to observe the activity and then pass on his notes to planning

The Town Centre Manager indicated he had monitored the site for approximately 3 weeks. During that period, on 2 out of 4 occasions spray from the jet wash had gone onto the highway, but he had not observed it going into the neighbouring property.

In compliance with the Council's Constitution the local member, Cllr Gill Kennett, did not vote.

Decision:

The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

THAT the application be approved.

Officers to consult the neighbour at 1 Causeway View when details of the canopy, required by condition 1, are received.

Conditions:

Condition 4 to read as follows :

The waiting area identified on the plan shall not obscure or obstruct the use of the public footpath.

As per report (Item 6)

Application:

[TCP/25310/B](#)

Details:

Cartreff, 9 Inglewood Park, Ventnor.

Replacement dwelling and garage; alterations to vehicular access (revised plans) (readadvertised application)

Site Visits:

The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants:

Mr David Gay (Objector)

Mr David Benjamin (Applicant)

Additional Representations:

An email had been received from the owners of No 11 Inglewood Park, requesting that a retaining wall be constructed on the boundary of the site to their property to prevent any further erosion of the ground by excavation along the side boundary.

Comment: In compliance with the Council's Constitution the local member, Cllr Susan Scoccia, did not vote.

Decision: The application was refused contrary to officer recommendation.

In compliance with the Council's Constitution a named vote was taken as the decision was contrary to officer recommendation.

For (11)

Cllrs Henry Adams, Wendy Arnold, Ivan Bulwer, Bill Burt, Charles Chapman, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Muriel Miller, Brian Mosdell, Lady Pigot, David Williams

Abstention (1)

Cllr Mike Cunningham

THAT the application be refused.

Reasons: Members believed the information submitted with the application was deficient in respect of the details of the proposed dwelling together with its relationship to the site, the streetscene and the surrounding area to the degree that the Local Planning Authority was unable to assess whether a contemporary design solution, of the type proposed would appear as an attractive and appropriate form of development that would enhance the character of the surrounding area.

Accordingly, the proposal was considered to be contrary to :

Policy D1 (Standards of Design) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.

Policy G4 (General Locational Criteria for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.

Policy H9 (Residential Development Outside the Development Boundaries) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development.

(Item 7)

Application: TCP/15474/F

Details: Caprera Hotel, 9 Melville Street, Sandown.

Conversion of property from 7 bedroom hotel to house in multiple occupancy.

THIS APPLICATION WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT

(Item 8)

(Cllr Brian Mosdell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the room).

Application: [TCP/16748/K](#)

Details: 16 Grafton Street, Sandown.

Use of property as house in multiple occupancy (revised scheme)

Site Visits: The site had previously been visited by members of the Planning Committee.

Public Participants: Mrs Loughran (Objector)

Mrs Val Taylor (On behalf of Sandown Town Council)

Mr Glen Hepburn (Agent)

Additional Representations: A statement from the neighbouring property was read out by the Development Control Manager.

The owner of the adjoining property had requested that Members take into consideration a number of additional points.

Comment: The local member, Cllr Ian Ward, spoke on this item.

Decision: The application was refused contrary to officer recommendation.

In compliance with the Council's Constitution a named vote was taken as the decision was contrary to officer recommendation.

For (10)

Cllrs Henry Adams, Wendy Arnold, Bill Burt, Charles Chapman, Mike Cunningham, Gill Kennett, Muriel Miller, Lady Pigot, Susan Scoccia, David Williams

Against (1)

Cllr Ivan Bulwer

THAT the application be refused.

Reasons: Members believed there was insufficient evidence had been provided of on site management to prevent unacceptable disturbance to neighbouring properties

Contrary to policy :

D1 (h) – do not detract from reasonable use and enjoyment of neighbouring buildings

(Item 9)

Application: [TCP/00769/D](#)

Details: 22A Pallance Road, Cowes.

Retention and completion of dwelling to include chimney, variation to openings and patio (revised description) (readvertised application).

Site Visits: None.

Public Participants: None.

Additional Representations: None.

Comment: None.

Decision: The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation in respect of the retention and completion of the dwelling to include the chimney, variation to openings and patio as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved not to adopt the recommendation put forward but to issue a split decision as follows :

- (i) THAT the retention of the windows, chimney and variation to the openings be approved.
- (ii) THAT the patio area be refused contrary to officer recommendation insofar as it related to the patio.

In compliance with the Council's Constitution a named vote was taken as the decision was contrary to officer recommendation.

For (10)

Cllrs Henry Adams, Ivan Bulwer, Bill Burt, Charles Chapman, Gill Kennett, Muriel Miller, Brian Mosdell, Lady Pigot, Susan Scoccia, David Williams

Against (1)

Cllr Wendy Arnold

Members believed the patio was too high and would be detrimental to the amenity of the adjoining neighbour.

- (iii) THAT a letter be sent to the applicant expressing Member's concern over the changes to the approved scheme, which had resulted in the submission of first an amendment, and now a retrospective application.

Conditions: Condition 1 to be deleted as that referred to the screening associated with the patio which was refused.

Reasons: The patio was refused for the following reasons :

The retention of the elevated patio area would notwithstanding the proposed measures to screen any views into neighbouring properties result in the creation of an oppressive environment to the detriment of the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring properties. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policy D1 (Standards of Design) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.

(Item 10)

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Application: | TCP/18339/H |
| Details: | Field Lane Holiday Park, Field Lane, St. Helens. Replacement of 34 static caravans with 34 holiday chalets. |
| Site Visits: | The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008. |
| Public Participants: | None. |
| Additional Representations: | An additional letter from a local resident concerning additional traffic due to potential occupation all year round and suggesting a solution could be to make Field Lane one way only and exiting through The Diggings which was already one way. A confirmation letter was received from Southern Water to consultant Engineer confirming the adequacy of capacity for foul sewage in an existing system and that surface water should be dealt with by other means such as soakaways etc. A letter of objection was received from a local resident concerning the loss of trees on the southern boundary and expressing the opinion that the dwellings were too large to be called chalets and suggested that they would be used for residential purposes or second homes. Also objected on the grounds of traffic congestion and precedent. |
| Comment: | None. |
| Decision: | The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved: THAT the application be approved. |
| Conditions: | Condition to be added requiring a scheme of surface water disposal to include rainwater harvesting. A comprehensive landscaping scheme would be required in accordance with Conditions 3 and 9. |

Condition relating to lighting to be added.

As per report (Item 2)

4. **Report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services**

Amendment to Minutes

At its meeting on the 29 January 2008 a named vote was taken in relation to P/01288/07 - TCP/11327/G - Land between Boulders and 3 Undercliff Gardens, Ventnor, Minute 44 (e) (9). Due to an administrative error Cllr Brian Mosdell's name had been omitted from the list of those names voting for refusal of the application. Members were asked to agree to the addition of Cllr Brian Mosdell's name being recorded as having voted for refusal of the application. The addition of Cllr Brian Mosdell's name made no difference to the actual decision (which was a unanimous vote).

RESOLVED :

THAT the minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2008 being amended so that Cllr Brian Mosdell is recorded as having voted for refusal of the application relating to P/01288/07 - TCP/11327/G land between Boulders and 3 Undercliff Gardens, Ventnor.

The meeting then adjourned and reconvened on Thursday, 24 April 2008 in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Newport, Isle of Wight, commencing at 4.00 pm when there were present : -

Cllrs Ivan Bulwer (Chairman), Henry Adams, William Burt, Charles Chapman, Mike Cunningham, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Muriel Miller, Brian Mosdell, Lady Pigot, Susan Scoccia

Also Present (non voting) :

Cllrs Barry Abraham, Lora Peacey-Wilcox, Alan Wells

Officers Present :

Steve Cornwell, Keith Jolliffe, John MacKenzie, Julie Martin, Helen Miles, Bill Murphy Andrew Pegram, Phil Salmon, Andrew White, Sarah Wilkinson

Apologies :

Cllrs Wendy Arnold, George Cameron, David Williams

5. **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Ivan Bulwer declared a personal interest in Minute (6) (13) – 50 Palmers Road, Wootton Bridge, as he knew the person speaking on behalf of the Parish Council.

Cllr Ivan Bulwer declared a personal interest in Minute (6) (14) – Brambles, Egypt Hill, Cowes, as the applicants agent was a neighbour

Cllr Lady Pigot declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 6 (15) – 6 Tyne Walk, Bembridge, as she had associations with Bembridge Sailing Club as did the applicant's daughter. She was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

Cllr Bill Burt declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 6 (17) - Lee Top, Warlands Lane, Shalfleet, as he was the applicant. He was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

Mr Andrew Pegram, Development Control Manager declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 3 (19) – 7A Pier Street, Sandown, as he socialised with the leaseholder of the adjacent licensed premises. He was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

Cllr Muriel Miller indicated that she has spoken to the Deputy Monitoring Officer and would be leaving the meeting for Minute 3 (19) – 7A Pier Street, Sandown, as she was in the same political group as the applicant. She was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

6. **Report of the Head of Planning Services**

Planning Applications and Related Matters

Consideration was given to items 11 - 19 of the report of the Head of Planning Services.

RESOLVED :

THAT the applications be determined as detailed below :

The reasons for the resolutions made in accordance with Officer recommendation were given in the Planning report. Where resolutions are made contrary to Officer recommendation the reasons for doing so are contained in the minutes.

A schedule of additional representations received after the printing of the report were submitted at the beginning of the meeting and were drawn to the attention of Members when considering the application. A note is made to that effect in the minutes.

Application: [TCP/02342/E](#)

Details: 50 Palmers Road, Wootton Bridge.

Demolition of bungalow; construction of three dwellings (one detached, one pair of semi-detached); alterations to vehicular access (revised scheme) (readvertised application).

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants: Mrs Tyler (Objector)

Wendy Jacobs (On behalf of Wootton Parish Council).

Mr David Long (Agent)

Additional Representations: Wootton Parish Council objected to the latest revised plans on the following grounds:

- The proposal was inappropriate development and out of keeping with the locality.
- The proposal constituted overdevelopment of the plot. The Wootton Bridge Village Design Statement advised that new buildings should strictly respect the inherent scale of the setting.
- The proposal would set a precedent for similar applications in the future.

Four further letters had been received from local residents stating that the changes shown on the latest revised plans were little more than cosmetic. They wanted to reiterate earlier objections, with particular reference to:

- Out of keeping with the area
- No other semis
- Existing streetscene would be compromised by the modern design solution
- Increase in traffic
- Further roadside parking
- Undesirable precedent
- Totally out of scale, mass and context
- Loss of light
- Style is at odds with the rest of the road

Comment: The local member, Cllr Barry Abraham, spoke on this item.

Decision: The application was refused contrary to officer recommendation.

In compliance with the Council's Constitution a named vote was taken as the decision was contrary to officer recommendation.

For (8)

Cllrs Henry Adams, Bill Burt, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Muriel Miller, Brian Mosdell, Lady Pigot, Susan Scoccia

Against (3)

Cllr Ivan Bulwer, Charles Chapman, Mike Cunningham

Reasons: Style, scale, layout of the development by virtue of the frontage it demonstrates to the road and in particular provision of a semi detached property. Combined with the parking arrangements forward of the line leading would result in over development of the site leading to a cramped and over crowded appearance of the street scene, detrimental to the prevailing pattern and appearance of the housing in the surrounding area. Contrary to policies D1 and G4.

Proposed external materials were inappropriate and out of keeping with the general character of the street scene.

Contrary to policy D4.

(Item 13)

Application: [TCP/12261/C](#)

Details: Brambles, Egypt Hill, Cowes.

Demolition of building; residential development comprising terrace of four houses and detached four storey dwelling with roof deck; garages/parking and vehicular access.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Public Participants: | Mrs Debbie Smith (Objector) Mrs June Bull (Applicant) Mr Mark Dickson (Agent) |
| Additional Representations: | None. |
| Comment: | The local member, Cllr Alan Wells, spoke on this item. |
| Decision: | The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved: THAT the application be refused. |
| Reasons: | The following addition to Reason 1 to read as follows : “The height and massing of the proposed terraced properties and the height of the detached dwelling were out of scale and context with the surrounding development and would have an adverse visual impact within the streetscene to the detriment to the character and appearance of the area. The development would also have an adverse impact on the amenities of the adjoining property, St Eanswythe, by virtue of that property being overlooked. In consequence, the proposed development is contrary to policies G4 (General Locational Criteria for Development) and D1 (Standards of Design) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan as well as Government guidance contained within Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development and Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing. As per report (Item 14) |

(Cllr Lady Pigot declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the room).

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Application: | TCP/11446/B |
| Details: | 6 Tyne Walk, Bembridge. Demolition of garage and part of dwelling; proposed division of bungalow into 2 semi-detached dwellings to include single storey |

extension; detached garage; vehicular access, (revised scheme).

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants: Mrs Liz Murray (On behalf of Bembridge Parish Council).

Additional Representations: Two letters were received from local residents expressing their disappointment that they were unable to attend the Planning Committee when this item was considered but have requested that their concerns were expressed on their behalf. Accordingly, their objections can be summarised in the following terms:

- Very little had changed since the last application for two detached bungalows was refused.
- Approving the application would create a dangerous precedent.
- The site was too small to accommodate two bungalows.
- Would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties.

Members were advised of the submission of a further revised plan showing the deletion of the detached.

Comment: In compliance with the Council's Constitution the local member, Cllr Lady Pigot, did not vote.

Decision: The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

THAT the application be approved.

Conditions: As per report (Item 15)

Application: [TCP/27173/B](#)

Details: Land between 7 and 11A Consort Road, Cowes.

Construction of detached 2 storey block of 5 flats to include accommodation within roofspace, (revised scheme).

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants: Jules Mantle (Objector)
Susan Brown (Objector)

Mr Paul Stack (Applicant)

Additional Representations: A request had been made to provide further information and clarification on the background information, which had resulted in the Local Planning Authority accepting a zero car parking solution to this scheme.

In the absence of a car parking assessment (CPA) the initial presumption for consideration of a nil parking scheme in this area would be to withhold consent. One of the reasons that the scheme was refused in October 2007 related to the absence of a thorough car parking assessment. However, the applicant had sought to address the deficiency in the current planning application with a submission of a CPA that was based on assessment of the use of local streets and a nearby car park. The survey took place at three different times of the day (7am, midday and 7pm) over a period of seven days in November 2007. There were shown to be 329 spaces within the survey area. That included on street spaces (both those requiring a permit and those not covered by a permit) and it also included spaces in the St Mary Street car park. The results were showing on average a 30% vacancy rate although the "worst" figure was a 16% vacancy rate on one of the evening observations. Nevertheless, that equated to approximately 50 vacant parking spaces within the survey area.

The surveys were supported by hundreds of digital photographs taken during the assessment times.

Given this information it was recognised in the Highway Engineers comments that a zero on site parking solution could be accepted.

Comment: The local member, Cllr Lora Peacey-Wilcox, spoke on this item.

Decision: The application was refused contrary to officer recommendation.

In compliance with the Council's Constitution a named vote was taken as the decision was contrary to officer recommendation.

For (7)

Cllrs Henry Adams, Charles Chapman, Mike Cunningham, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Brian Mosdell, Susan Scoccia

Against (4)

Cllr Ivan Bulwer, Bill Burt, Muriel Miller, Lady Pigot

Reasons:

- (i) The proposal would if permitted result in a loss of privacy and amenity to the adjoining property to the north by virtue of the overlooking that will result from the Velux windows in that side of the proposed building, which serve the flat within the roof area. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy D1 (Standards of Design) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.
- (ii) In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the applicant has failed to show how the site can accommodate a building containing five flats with an appropriate level of amenity space for its future occupants and accordingly, the proposal is considered to exhibit the characteristics of overdevelopment to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy D1 (Standards of Design) and with the intentions of Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development and with Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing.

(Item 16)

Application: [TCP/21952/L](#)

Details: J Sainsbury plc, Foxes Road, Newport.

Variation of condition no. 19 on TCP/21952/C to allow extension to store delivery hours.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Site Visits: | None. |
| Public Participants: | Mr David Lowin (Agent) |
| Additional Representations: | <p>One letter of support from a local business pointing out that a refusal would result in more daytime deliveries and affecting freshness of produce.</p> <p>Two further letters of objection on similar grounds to those already expressed.</p> <p>Newport Parish raise objections and considered there should be no variation to the condition.</p> |
| Comment: | None. |
| Decision: | <p>The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:</p> <p>THAT the application be approved.</p> |
| Conditions: | As per report (Item 18) |
| <hr/> | |
| Application: | TCP/09684/E |
| Details: | <p>42 New Street, Newport.</p> <p>Demolition of house, garage and outbuildings; proposed two storey block of 5 flats to include roofspace accommodation (revised scheme).</p> |
| Site Visits: | The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008. |
| Public Participants: | None. |
| Additional Representations: | Additional 3D images had been submitted by the applicant. |
| Comment: | In compliance with the Council's Constitution the local member, Cllr Mike Cunningham, did not vote. |
| Decision: | The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved: |

THAT the application be approved.

Conditions:

Members made a specific request that condition 2 made direct reference to the use of natural slate in terms of the roofing material.

Conditions 10 and 11 to be deleted.

Additional conditions as follows:

Development permitted by this planning permission shall not be initiated by the undertaking of any material operations as defined in Section 56 (4)A-D of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to the development until a planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the said Act relating to the land has been made and lodged with the Local Planning Authority and the Local Planning Authority has notified the persons submitting the same, that it is to be Local Planning Authority's approval. The said planning obligation will require the developer to commit the establishment of procedure under which the outbuildings, communal garden area and other communal spaces within the development shall be maintained.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal does not detract from the character or appearance of the Newport Conservation Area and to comply with Policy D1 (Standards of Design) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan and Government guidance contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment.

“No development shall take place until a detailed scheme including calculations have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority indicating the means of surface water and foul drainage disposal. Any such agreed surface water and foul drainage scheme shall indicate connections at points on the system where adequate capacity exists or shall provide for attenuation measures to ensure that any additional flows do not cause flooding or overloading to the existing system. Where practical surface water should be taken out of the combined system and disposed of via soakaways. Any drainage system involving a pump, rising main or attenuation tank should

include details and calculations of capacity and the future maintenance of those drainage systems. None of the flats hereby permitted shall be occupied until the agreed drainage scheme has been provided and any such scheme shall be retained and maintained hereafter.”

Reason: To ensure an adequate system of storm and foul water drainage is provided for the development and to comply with requirements of Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development.

“Before any of the flats hereby approved are first occupied the existing access into the site from New Street shall be permanently closed and the footpath and kerb line restored to levels reflecting those of the adjoining sections of footway and footpath with full details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work relating to these changes commences on site.”

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policy TR7 (Highway Considerations) of the Isle of Wight Unitary Development Plan.

A covering letter to go with decision notices encouraging the re-use of the slate on the existing building on the new development or possibly the outbuildings. Furthermore given Conservation Area location expectations for use of quality materials.

As per report (Item 11)

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Application: | CAC/09684/F |
| Details: | 42 New Street, Newport. Conservation Area Consent for demolition of house, garage and outbuildings in connection with proposed two storey block of 5 flats to include roofspace accommodation. |
| Site Visits: | The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008. |
| Public Participants: | None. |

Additional Representations: None.

Comment: In compliance with the Council's Constitution the local member, Cllr Mike Cunningham, did not vote.

Decision: The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

THAT the Conservation Area Consent be approved subject to conditions.

Conditions: As per report (Item 12)

(Mr Andrew Pegram, Development Control Manager, declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the room).

(Cllr Muriel Miller left the room for this item, she was not present during the discussion or voting thereon).

Application: [TCP/24498/D](#)

Details: 7A Pier Street, Sandown.

Conservatory on existing balcony.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 21 April 2008.

Public Participants: None.

Additional Representations: None.

Comment: None.

Decision: The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

THAT the application be approved.

Conditions: As per report (Item 19)

(Cllr Bill Burt declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the room).

Application: [TCP/10407/E](#)

Details: Lee Top, Warlands Lane, Shalfleet.

Removal of condition no. 4 on TCP/10407/A which restricts the occupation of the dwelling to persons employed or last employed in agriculture or forestry.

Site Visits: None.

Public Participants: None.

Additional Representations: None.

Comment: None.

Decision: The Committee had taken into consideration and agreed with the reasons for the recommendation as set out under paragraph entitled Justification for Recommendation of the report and resolved:

THAT condition 4 from planning permission TCP/10407/A be removed.

Conditions: As per report (Item 17)

7. **Members' Question Time**

Cllr Susan Scoccia asked if there should be reserve members for the Planning Committee as numbers appeared to very low. She was advised that the Conservative Group lost two seats which would be taken up by other groups, as yet no nominations had been received.

Cllr Brian Mosdell asked a question relating to the enforcement of holiday accommodation. He was advised that one person had been appointed who would be starting on during May 2008.

CHAIRMAN