



Minutes

Name of meeting	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Date and time	THURSDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2009 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM
Venue	THE MAIN HALL, CARISBROOKE HIGH SCHOOL, WELLINGTON ROAD, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT
Present	Cllrs Ivan Bulwer (Chairman), Reg Barry, Stuart Dyer, Paul Fuller, John Hobart, Richard Hollis, David Knowles, Susan Scoccia, Jerry White, David Williams
Also Present (non voting)	Cllr David Pugh
Officers Present	Julie Martin, Helen Miles, Bill Murphy, Wendy Perera, Phil Salmon, Alan White, Simon Wiggins, Sarah Wilkinson

28. **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Susan Scoccia declared a personal interest in Minute 30 (1) - Land at Cheverton Down, Cheverton Shute, Shorwell, Newport, as she knew one of the objectors registered on the public speaking list.

Cllr Jerry White declared a personal interest in Minute 30 (1) - Land at Cheverton Down, Cheverton Shute, Shorwell, Newport, as one of the speakers on behalf of the applicant had previously worked for him.

Cllr John Hobart declared a personal interest in Minute 30 (1) – Land at Cheverton Down, Cheverton Shute, Shorwell, Newport, as one of the speakers on behalf of the applicant had previously worked for him.

Cllr Paul Fuller declared a personal interest in Minute 30 (1) - Land at Cheverton Down, Cheverton Shute, Shorwell, Newport, as he was the Isle of Wight Council nominated member for the Footprint Trust and the Isle of Wight AONB Partnership.

Cllr Stuart Dyer declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 30 (1) - Land at Cheverton Down, Cheverton Shute, Shorwell, Newport, relating to North Court Farm, and his families connection with the owners. He was not present during the discussion or voting thereon.

29. **Public Question Time**

The Chairman stated that this item was to be deferred to the following meeting of the Planning Committee.

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

Planning Applications and Related Matters

Consideration was given to 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.

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

Application: TCP/21144/E ([Part 1](#) & [2](#))

Details: Three wind turbine generators with hub height of 80m and rotor diameter of 90m (tip height 125m); control building, access tracks, underground electrical cables and temporary construction compound (additional information received)(revised application).

Land at Cheverton Down, Cheverton Shute, Shorwell, Newport, Isle of Wight.

Site Visits: The site was visited by members of the Planning Committee on Monday, 30 November 2009.

Public Participants: Mr John Gallimore (Objector)
Mr Malcolm Peplow (Objector)
Mr Don Prescott (Objector)
Mrs Ignarski (Objector)
Mr Terry Hack (Objector)
Mrs Wendy Rust (Objector)

Kerri Tricky (Supporter)
Mr Arbuthnott (Supporter)
Karena Barton (Supporter)
Mr Christopher Dodd (Supporter)
Mr David Moorse (Supporter)
Mr Hugh Walding (Supporter)

Cllr Peter Bingham (On behalf of Shorwell and Brighstone Parish Councils)

Mr Rob Sauven (On behalf of applicant)
Mr Glen Hepburn (On behalf of applicant)
Mr Paddy Hodgson (On behalf of applicant)

Mr Steve Allen (Applicant)

Additional Representations:

LDA Design who had undertaken the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment for the applicants had responded to the evaluation of their work by the Council's consultants. They were concerned that there were inaccuracies in the Capita Symonds report and had responded to each item cited in turn.

THWART had submitted a further letter of representation following the publication of the Officer's report. They raised three issues. Firstly, they raised concerns that Natural England's assumptions contained in the withdrawal of their objection on the grounds of risk to bat population had not been met in that data from the automated detector for the autumn months were not yet available.

The second issue raised by THWART concerned the potential for unacceptable impact of the proposals on amenity, namely, upon public rights of way and bridleways. THWART were concerned that one of the turbines could be sited within 175 metres from the bridleway which would be within the 200 metre limit suggested by the British Horse Society as outlined in PPS22.

Thirdly, THWART considered that there would be a negative effect on tourism and, as such, this would have an overall negative impact, further demonstrating non-compliance of PPS22 and as such should be a further refusal ground in its own right.

An additional 35 pro-forma letters of support had been received. A petition with 252 signatures had been received in support of the application making reference to the eco-Island concept and supporting wind energy.

An additional 6 letters of objection had been received which raised the following issues:

- The Island was too small and too populated for wind turbines.
- Impact on tourism due to loss of views and noise.
- They would be a blight on the horizon.
- They were ineffective.
- Over-reliance on 'desk-top' high-tech methods of assessment.

- The precise location of the viewpoints was unclear, if it was taken at ground level, then it would give a misleading picture.
- Turbines blades would be visible through gaps in trees.
- Photomontages had not been submitted from the setting of the registered parks and gardens.
- Noise emitted would hit the south side of the valley and be reflected back to the north side, affecting the amenities of the dwellings.
- Noise is sufficient intrusive so as to have a detrimental affect on the tranquillity and quietness of the parkland.

One letter had been received removing a previous objection.

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 but with the following amendments and additions:

1. Due to their scale and prominent position, the proposed wind turbines would have a significant landscape and visual impact upon the settlements of Shorwell, Limerstone and Brighstone and on the route of the B3323 from Shorwell to Rowborough Farm and to the setting of the Registered Park and Garden at Northcourt and was therefore contrary to Policy NRM15 of the South East Regional Spatial Strategy and Policies G5 and B10 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
2. The proposal would cause substantial visual harm to the landscape character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and parts of the Heritage Coast within a zone of up to 12km from the site, including the settlements and scattered residential properties within this zone, due to the scale of the turbines and the sensitive nature of the surrounding landscape which did not have the capacity to accommodate this scale of development without significant impact upon their character thereby compromising the objectives for designation of the Isle of Wight AONB and Heritage Coast and was therefore contrary to PPS22 and Policies MRN15 and C3 of the South East Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy U18 of the UDP.
3. Due to the scale and location of the proposed turbines it was not possible to undertake mitigation in terms of

landscaping works, either on-site or off-site and the application contained insufficient information to demonstrate whether any off-site mitigation works would be acceptable given the known geomorphological character of the surrounding area without resulting in a potential detrimental impact to the landscape character, particularly within the AONB. This is particularly due to the open aspects and relatively treeless down-like character of the AONB south western section upon which the development was proposed. The proposal was therefore contrary to PPS22 and Policies NRM15 and C3 of the South East Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy U18 of the UDP.

4. The application presented insufficient information to demonstrate that there were any overriding socio economic benefits provided by the proposal, sufficient to outweigh the detrimental impact upon the designated AONB and Heritage Coast and was therefore contrary to PPS22 and Policy NRM15 of the South East Regional Spatial Strategy.
5. The application presented insufficient information on bat population data to demonstrate that there would not be a detrimental impact on bat species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981 (as amended) and under the Conservation (Natural Habitats and c) Regulations 1994 (The Habitats Regulations) and as such was contrary to PPS 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation).

(Item 1)

CHAIRMAN