

Minutes

Name of meeting	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Date and time	TUESDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 2008 COMMENCING AT 4.00 PM
Venue	COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT
Present	Cllrs Susan Scoccia (Vice Chairman in the Chair), Henry Adams, Wendy Arnold, William Burt, Mike Cunningham, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Brian Mosdell, Lady Pigot, Arthur Taylor, David Williams
Officers Present	Steve Cornwell, Keith Jolliffe, John MacKenzie, Julie Martin, Bill Murphy, Andrew Pegram, Phil Salmon, Justin Thorne, Andrew White, Sarah Wilkinson
Apologies	Ivan Bulwer, George Cameron, Charles Chapman, Muriel Miller

45. [Minutes](#)

RESOLVED :

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on [29 January 2008](#) be confirmed.

46. [Declarations of Interest](#)

Cllr David Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 47 (a) 4 – Ashley Park, Ashley Road, Ryde - as he had previously worked for the applicant's architect – he was not present during the discussion and voting thereon.

Cllr David Williams declared a personal interest in Minute 47 (a) (5) - Westridge Golf Centre, Brading Road, Ryde – as he knew the applicant.

Cllr Mike Cunningham declared a personal interest in Minute 47 (a) (5) - Westridge Golf Centre, Brading Road, Ryde – as occasionally used the facilities.

Cllr John Hobart declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 47 (a) 7 – Mountain Ash, Newnham Road, Ryde – as he knew the developer – he was not present during the discussion and voting thereon.

Cllr David Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 47 (b) (Paper C) - 62 Trinity Road, Ventnor – as he had previously worked for the applicant's architect – he was not present during the discussion and voting thereon.

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

(a) **Planning Applications and Related Matters**

Consideration was given to items 1 - 7 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:	P/02850/07 - TCP/0927/M
Details:	Berkeley Court Hotel, 2 Culver Road, Shanklin. Demolition of hotel; outline for residential development comprising 14 flats in 2 three storey blocks, parking and alterations to vehicular access.
Site Visits:	The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 25 February 2008.
Public Participants:	(Mr Glen Hepburn (On behalf of the agent))
Additional Representations:	Members were advised of a correction to the report. It was an Outline application with matters of access and layout to be considered at this time. Scale, landscaping and appearance were reserved for future consideration.
Comment:	The Committee asked for Condition 7 to be amended to include a requirement to incorporate water harvesting within the scheme.

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 1 to be substituted for appropriately worded outline conditions AO1, AO2 and AO3.

Condition 7 to be amended to include a requirement to incorporate water harvesting within the scheme.

As per report (Item 1)

Application: [P/02956/07 - TCPL/28803/A](#)
[P/02957/07 - LBC/28803](#)

Details: Heath Cottage, Main Road, Brighstone.

Residential development comprising 12 dwellings with parking/garages and access off Upper Lane; detached garage for Heath Cottage.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 25 February 2008.

Public Participants: Mr Phil Salmon, Development Team Manager, read out the objections submitted by Mrs Susan Blake as she had been unable to attend the meeting due to a family emergency.

Mr Henry Murray-Smith (Agent)

Additional Representations: Conservation and Design had been extensively involved in the discussions with regards to the application and were satisfied that the amended plans had sufficiently overcome their concerns. They do still highlight that the units along the boundary with Upper Lane were more in context with those properties on the opposite side of the road but the change in materials had alleviated some of those concerns.

The amendments to units 7-10 resulted in their appearance being less like bungalows, due to the change in materials and porches and therefore were more in keeping with the character of the site.

They raised concerns with regards to the proximity between units 9-10 and the terrace of cottages. Officers believed however that the distance helped to create a more rural character to the site and therefore had not sought to see those units moved back.

Issues raised with regards to landscaping and boundary treatments were covered by conditions as requested.

Conservation and Design were therefore not objecting to the application.

Comment:

The Committee was advised that although the application was a joint application for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent (LBC) it was confirmed after the report had been published that LBC was not required for the works that were being applied. The LBC element was withdrawn and would be submitted at a later date when the works to Heath Cottage were to be undertaken.

The application was therefore, solely for the Planning Permission.

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:

The condition to reviewed relating to members concern with regard to the erection of a barrier at the end of the footpath where it opened onto the main road and the lighting for the development.

As per report (Items 2 and 3)

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

Application:

[P/00820/07 - TCP/25496/H](#)

Details:

Ashey Park, Ashey Road, Ryde.

Outline for six units of holiday accommodation with associated parking and landscaping (revised scheme).

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 25 February 2008.

Public Participants: Mr Terry Green (Objector)
Mr Ian Woodfield (Objector)

(Mr Glen Hepburn (On behalf of the agent))

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 refused.

Reasons: As per report (Item 4)

Application: [P/01082/07 - TCP/22221/G](#)

Details: Westridge Golf Centre, Brading Road, Ryde.

Variation of condition no. 2 on TCP/22221/E which states that the flood lighting shall be for a limited period expiring on 31 July 2007; proposed earthworks.

Comment: Members were advised that, with the agreement of the agent, consideration of the application would be deferred to the next meeting of the committee.

(Item 5)

Application: [P/02754/07 - TCP/05699/E](#)

Details: Land adjacent and rear of 276 and 278 Park Road, Cowes.

Demolition of double garage; residential development comprising three detached houses, detached double garage and alterations to vehicular access.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 25 February 2008.

**Public
Participants:**

Mrs P Cook (Objector)

Miss Sally Kaberry (Agent)

**Additional
Representations:**

A letter from agent advising that whilst Southern Water indicated a 6" water main running through the site a trial hole dug across the land did not reveal any pipe run. Accordingly, it appeared that Southern Water records were in error.

Officers were aware that the agent had circulated to Members a letter dated 19 February 2008. The agent advised the letter was not being considered as a late representation and would not be reported at the meeting beyond simply noting its existence.

Since the report had been written clarification had been sought from the Tree Officer who had advised that the Poplar tree in question had not been managed in the past and that it would over time weaken the structural integrity of the tree. However, he estimated the tree to have a useful life expectancy of around ten years.

The Parks and Countryside Manager had been seeking a contribution of £350 for a replacement on the understanding that the tree needed immediate felling and on the basis that he had now been advised that it had a ten year useful life, indicated that a charge of £1,500 to allow the planting and maintenance of one or more trees plus other works within the park would not be unreasonable.

Comment:

The Local member, Cllr John Effemey, 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:

Contrary to the advice in PPS 3 which emphasised that the development should respect the character and context of the area, the layout of the development and how it picked up the local pattern of development in the locality. The drive into the rear of the site conflicted with the existing

layout in that part of Cowes.

As per report (Item 6)

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

Application: [P/02901/07 - TCP/09013/G](#)

Details: Mountain Ash, Newnham Road, Ryde.

Demolition of house and outbuildings; residential development comprising two houses and six flats with parking; alterations to vehicular access and construction of new vehicular access.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 24 September 2007.

Public Participants: None

Additional Representations: It had been brought to the Council's attention that certain clearance works were underway, which in the complainant's opinion undermined the requirements of the reason attached to proposed condition 12 where it referred to the 'wooded southern boundary.'

In addition to visiting the site, Officers had also contacted the applicant's agent and advised that clearance works should stop. The applicant complied with the Council's advice and his agent had lodged the following explanation for undertaking the said clearance work:

- The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods had written to the applicant on 8 February 2008 requesting that work be carried out to cut back the vegetation overhanging the footpaths and carriageways within 14 days.
- Whilst undertaking the work to comply with the request, the opportunity was also taken to clear the clusters of Bay trees entwined with heavy bramble/ivy that were not considered to be worthy of retention.
- It was also decided to clear part of the eastern boundary which comprised partly of a retaining wall that had become

enveloped in natural growth. It had been necessary to uncover the wall in order to carry out an appraisal of its structural integrity.

- The area along the southern boundary had been found to be infested with rats and the applicant had therefore arranged for this area to be cleared at the same time.

Comment: Officers recommended that the reason to condition 12 should be amended in order to delete reference to the southern boundary. In order to create and arguably enhance upon the previous situation, Officers were also recommending that conditions 9 and 10 be amended in order to make specific reference to the formation of a wildlife corridor along the southern boundary.

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 7 to be amended regarding the drainage - to include detailed calculations in respect of capacity.

As per report (Item 7)

(b) **To Consider any Items Deferred from the Last Meeting of the Committee**

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

Application: [P/02702/07 - TCP/28755/A](#)
[P/02707/07 – CAC/28755](#)

Details: 62 Trinity Road, Ventnor.

Demolition of bungalow; construction of terrace of four houses with parking and alterations to vehicular access.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 28 January 2008.

Public Participants: None.

Additional Representations: Two letters had been received asking that the application be refused.

Comment: Members were reminded that the application had been considered at the Planning Committee held on 29 January 2008 at which time Members deferred the application with a request that Officers engage in discussions with the applicant to achieve a reduction in the number of dwellings from four to three and also to seek an assurance that the rear elevation would be constructed in stone rather than brick.

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, Wendy Arnold, Bill Burt, John Hobart, Gill Kennett, Lady Pigot, Susan Scoccia

(Against (2)

Cllrs Mike Cunningham, Arthur Taylor

Abstention (1)

Cllr Brian Mosdell

The Conservation Area Consent was refused as there was not an appropriate development scheme available for the site.

Reasons: Scale and dimensions of the proposed dwellings and the associated need for the parking to go with that level of development, both the parking and the access to the parking areas would lead to a cramped appearance which does not respond to local context of the area and enforce local distinctiveness contrary to PPS 1 and therefore would be unacceptable as it fails to preserve and

enhance the character of the conservation area.

(Paper C)

CHAIRMAN