



# BEMBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

The Clerk to the Council,  
5 Foreland Road, Bembridge, Isle of Wight, PO35 5XN  
Tel: 01983 874160 Email: clerk@bembridgepc.org.uk



## Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held at 6pm on 3rd November 2015 in The Village Hall, small hall

**PRESENT:** Cllr D Grannum (Chairman), Cllr M Tarrant, Cllr G Kendall, Cllr B Dyer, Cllr S Pigot, Cllr C Doe, Mrs E Goldring (Clerk) and Mrs J McDade (Assistant Clerk) **PUBLIC:** 6 members

### PUBLIC FORUM:

Chris Sandell - Primary objection in May 2015 was AONB. We believe that this application meets the Bembridge Housing Needs Survey. Keeping the hedge in place alleviates the concerns on previous application and provides a place for wildlife. Advice sort from Andrew White (ex IWC planning officer), Peter Griffiths (ex IWC housing policy officer) and Ian Boyde with regards the application, and we believe this application meets the BNDP, Island Plan and AONB Report.

Andrew White – have reviewed the scheme and believe it meets requirements in the Housing Needs Survey, enhances the area and is adjacent to the settlement boundary. The application meets the BNDP policy OL1 and IP DM4. With 4 of the 9 properties to be affordable, this is 44% of the scheme and so meets a local need. Detailed ecological reports have resulted in the hedge being retained and new hedging with buffer zones to protect wildlife. A 106 condition will be made if necessary on the areas. Low level bungalows will weave into the view. AONB does not preclude development. We believe that there are no other available sites within Bembridge to provide affordable homes.

Why keep the hedge?

Hedge is to be kept due to complaints on previous application that the hedge should be kept and was a habitat for wildlife.

2 metre hedge around perimeter will be a large cost for the homeowners?

Small shrubs/hedges to be planted for wildlife and to put the area back to how it looked originally, prior to air lands on the fields. £100 maintenance charge per house per year will be conditioned for the maintenance of the hedges. The back area will be gifted to residents/local authority or parish conditioned that no building will be allowed. This area is .07 hectares given to improvement of the area.

Who owns the seaward side land?

This is not owned by Mr Trapp. The buffer zones are part of the .07 hectares to be gifted.

Where will the entrance be if the hedge not going?

The existing gateway will be extended slightly for better visibility onto the highway and more hedging planted.

**1. To receive apologies for absence.**

None

**2. To receive any pecuniary or other interests relating to items on the agenda.**

Personal interest Cllr Grannum and Cllr Pigot - The Elms Residential Home

**3. To receive for approval minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2015.**

**RESOLVED:** Approved minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2015 and duly signed by the Chairman.

**4. To consider planning applications advertised from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2015.**

<a href="#">TCP/14623/Y - P/00909/15</a>	The Elms Residential Home Swains Road Bembridge Isle Of Wight PO355XS	Construction of 7 assisted living dwellings conversion of detached garage to refuse store and laundry associated parking and landscaping (revised plans) (readvertised application)
--	---	---

<p>This application was approved previously but concerns with the access road if neighbour blocks passing bay on his land as no other passing point available. Highways have been informed and are looking into.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> Defer decision until new Highways Report is available</p>		
<p><a href="#">TCP/16055/C - P/01016/15</a></p>	<p>53a Howgate Road Bembridge Isle Of Wight PO355QN</p>	<p>Householder Application Retention and completion of single storey extension to provide kitchen and porch</p>
<p>Problem with flat roof, blocky design and does not improve the look of the property. This is retrospective planning permission. Flat roof against the BNDP D2 and the circular window out of character D1.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> Recommend Refusal as contrary to BNDP D2 and D1</p>		
<p><a href="#">TCP/18475/B - P/01015/15</a></p>	<p>98 Howgate Road Bembridge Isle Of Wight PO355QX</p>	<p>Householder Application Extension at 1st floor level to form bedroom with balcony over</p>
<p>Flat roof and balcony against BNDP. Application drawings not up to standard. Large balcony on the second floor overlooking from/to the neighbours private garden space which cannot be screened off. Clearly visible from the AONB and coastal path.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> Recommend Refusal as contrary to BNDP D4 and D2</p>		
<p><a href="#">TCP/30594/C - P/01198/15</a></p>	<p>land rear of Paddock View and 132 Howgate Road on western side of Foreland Fields Road Bembridge Isle Of Wight PO35</p>	<p>Outline for 9 dwellings (revised scheme)</p>
<p>Believe this is the last area where affordable homes could be built within the village after the old Primary School site.</p> <p>Regularly say no to development, but we do need some. This is the only road with homes on one side in the village and we should not refuse because of AONB alone. Shame the 2m hedge is to stay, not an attractive hedge and also would be expensive for the homeowners to maintain in future. Well thought out application.</p> <p>Plan acceptable but speaking from the heart Bembridge's infrastructure cannot cope with any more houses and building on green land offends.</p> <p>Planning Inspector's previous report needs consideration.</p> <p>The applicant's Housing and Sequential Testing Statement (HSTS) in its desire to justify the need for this proposed development appears to have led to a regrettable denigration of both the Bembridge Housing Needs Survey (BHNS) and the BNDP. Giving local residents and communities the powers to guide the type and nature of development in their locality was and is a core strategy of the central government planning agenda. Neighbourhood planning policies are not second-rate policies which can be simply derided and dismissed by developers in pursuit of profit. Also, I consider it unnecessary and improper at paragraph 4.15 of the applicant's HSTS to quote the opinion of the Bembridge Parish Clerk. The application hinges on two key points, namely 'Housing Need' and 'change to the character of the area'.</p> <p>Firstly, the HSTS goes to great lengths to try and discredit the BHNS starting with the semantics of "primarily". Policy H1 of BNDP supports in principle new housing adjacent to the Settlement Boundary, subject to meeting the criteria of OL1 by demonstrating a "local need" and the local need is "primarily" identified in the BHNS. The BHNS remains the primary definition of housing need in Bembridge, whatever meaning the applicant tries to give to the word "primarily" it does not release the applicant from the requirement to demonstrate a local need for the development as defined in the Policy H1 BHNS/BNDP. Paragraph 3.25 of the HSTS disparagingly describes the HN Survey as "tick-box exercises" without any evidence to justify such a statement. Ignoring the housing type detail of the BHNS, the unambiguous housing need identified in Bembridge is for "affordable" units and they make-up 78% of the total nearly double the 44% being proposed. It was clear throughout the Housing Needs Survey that the community's declared need was for predominantly "affordable" types and for smaller units. The BHNS formed a key part of the BNDP which was agreed by an independent Examiner, resoundingly endorsed by the community in a Referendum and formally 'made' by the Isle of Wight Council. Mention is made in the HSTS of Inspectors dismissing need as defined in HN Surveys, but there is no mention of the 'land mark' decisions by both Inspectors and the former Secretary of State supporting Neighbourhood Plans in refusing major development schemes. The applicant's own analysis in their HSTS indicates that the need for 3 bedroom market housing in Bembridge has already been met.</p>		

Secondly, the residents of Bembridge have been fighting for many years (long before the Core Strategy, BNDP or the BHNS) to protect the open and sweeping coastal AONB landscape from inappropriate development. With such sites as this, great weight is given to the protection of the rural landscape and scenic beauty and National Planning Policy Framework 115 confirms this. In dismissing an appeal on this site in 2013, the Inspector stated: *“The presence of new houses along the western side frontage of the road would change the character and appearance of the area... and foreclose the views that exist. In my judgement this change to the character of the area would not be a positive one and I cannot conclude that it would conserve and/or enhance the special landscape of this designated area as required by Core Strategy Policy DM12”* Such a policy reason for refusal cannot be easily overcome as it relates to the setting of the site in the landscape, which has not changed. The Inspector acknowledged it was not a high quality landscape, but considered the open views to the coast were of AONB landscape significance. Two additional points: firstly the two “buffer” zones at either end of the proposed development are not currently conditioned in any way and if this application goes ahead could be used either as access to the areas of land to the west and/or as further housing plots. The applicant suggests conditioning the paddock immediately behind the site, but not the other area of land to the seaward side. Secondly, on its final page Annex 2 Heads of Terms paragraph 2 of the applicant’s HSTS only partially quotes BNDP Policy H3 by missing-off the requirement to limit marketing to Brading and St Helens for an additional three month period if unsuccessful in the first three months in Bembridge.

**RESOLVED:** Recommend Refusal in light of the policy and other considerations stated above.

4 For Cllr Kendall, Cllr Tarrant, Cllr Doe, Cllr Pigot                      2 Against Cllr Grannum, Cllr Dyer

**5. To note planning decisions from Isle of Wight Council for the period 2<sup>nd</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> October 2015.**

<a href="#">TCP/22851/C</a> <a href="#">- P/00961/15</a>	Clock Cottage Ducie Avenue Bembridge Isle Of Wight PO355NE	Householder Application Proposed single storey extension to chalet to form conservatory	Approved	Granted 9/10/2015
---	---	---	----------	----------------------

**6. To receive correspondence concerning planning matters**

- Discuss formal complaint regarding enforcement at TCP/17577/S – P/00274/15 The Point, Embankment Road  
 The Clerk appreciates apology made in an email to Cllr Kendall from Sarah Thorne. The response though is based on a number of inaccuracies. Enforcement previously told Bennetts to remove machinery from outside the compound and keep within his allotted compound. This is being flouted and should be re-enforced by IWC.

**RESOLVED:** to make a formal complaint to IW Planning Enforcement with regards TCP/17577/S – P/00274/15 The Point, Embankment Road

**7. To confirm date of next meeting – 17<sup>th</sup> November 2015 at 6.30pm, the Cloisters**

**Meeting closed: 6.45pm**

**Signed:**

**Dated:**