



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 21st November 2017 in The Village Hall, Large Hall

Present: Cllr M Sullivan (Chairman), Cllr R Weaver, Cllr S Weedall, Cllr M Donlon, Cllr M Curtis, Cllr A Hopkinson-Woolley, Mrs E Goldring (Clerk) and Mrs J McDade (Assistant Clerk) **Members of the Public:** 5

1. To receive apologies for absence

Apologies received from David Long.

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

Cllr Weaver, Cllr Sullivan and Cllr Weedall declared a personal interest in the 114 Howgate Road application as they know the homeowners.

3. To receive for approval minutes of the meeting held on 7th November 2017

RESOLVED: Approved minutes of the meeting held on 7th November 2017 and duly signed by the Chairman

4. To consider planning applications advertised from the 28th October to 10th November 2017

TCP/24505/A - P/01289/17	114 Howgate Road, Bembridge, Isle Of Wight, PO355QX	Householder Application - Proposed garage
BNDP: D1, D2, EH1		
Flat roof is in keeping with neighbouring properties and replaces previous carport. No concerns with application and fits into space well. ANOB have not raised any concerns. Conforms to the BNDP.		
RESOLVED: Recommend Approval		
TCP/31154/F - P/01269/17	69 High Street, Bembridge, Isle Of Wight, PO355SF	Demolition of existing house; construction of replacement dwelling (revised scheme)
BNDP: D2, GA1		
Changes to roof design. A number of concerns raised by neighbours online. All the houses in the area are of different shapes and styles, and do not believe this will be over dominant on the street scene. Original application was more in keeping, but understands why it has been changed. Volume of the property the same and fits well. Splendid design. Conforms to the BNDP.		
RESOLVED: Recommend Approval		

5. To note planning decisions from Isle of Wight Council for the period 21st October to 3rd November 2017

TCP/02856/J - P/01057/17	Bembridge Outboards, Embankment Road, Bembridge, Isle Of Wight, PO355NS	Proposed alterations	Approved	Granted 3/11/17
--	--	----------------------	----------	-----------------

6. To receive correspondence concerning planning matters

- To agree IWC Island Plan Core Strategy 'Call for Potential Sites' Consultation response

Email from David Long providing a brief update on planning matters

- 1) Government Report – Fixing Our Broken Housing Market
- 2) Government Report – Consultation on the ‘right homes in the right places’
- 3) IOWC – Local Development Scheme for the Island Plan Review.
- 4) Web link for the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) : <http://www.push.gov.uk/work/planning-and-infrastructure.htm>
- 5) IOWC 5 Year Land Supply

To explain:

- 1) You will be aware the new administration has a desire to review the Island Plan. Although not confirmed, I suspect it was required to correlate to the IOWC corporate plan. I also suspect it was due to a desire to reduce housing numbers. Although based on my own assumptions, I highly expected the housing numbers will increase. At present the total quantum per annum is 520 dwellings, however we have seen persistent under delivery. You will see in the attached 5 year land supply the IOWC now need to deliver 663 units per year due to the shortfall from previous. In my experience this problem will increase.
- 2) When combined with the PUSH report, there could well be moves to increase the annual supply to over 700 units per annum to meet current needs (including those falling into a need) and also properties that are in future demand. This includes longer term socio-economic trends such as life expectancy, birth rates, demographic bubbles etc etc. etc. We must also be conscious that the IOW must be employment led, and thus there is a need to attract the correct working audience to compete with the mainland.
- 3) When taking the above on board in relation to the attached government reports we are going to be in a period of change, with housing supply to be on top of many agendas within government, which will alternately transmit to a local level.
- 4) The attached LDS timeline outlines the process for the new Island Plan – in my opinion a very ambitious timeline, but its always good to focus. The PC will have an opportunity to make representations leading up to the hearing and beyond. It is really important that the IOWC stick to the timeline because there may soon be certain delivery tests about housing supply, which if not met could render any plan unsound, which could also render any neighbourhood plan to be unsound. The default position then reverts to the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) which opens up a free range so long as proposals are sustainable (socially, environmentally and economically).

The above is a very crude and short synopsis, and there are many permutations to discuss.

At the meeting I wanted to discuss the land served off Steyne Road and Hillway Road; owned by the Thornycroft Family. Having recently been approached, this is something that hangs in the balance for me because I don't want to get involved with a proposal that sparks rage in the community, but I also see huge merit it fully engaging with the site to ensure its delivered to the merit of the Village.

The last thing I believe everyone would want is a large horrid estate which is something that might happen if housing delivery remains so bad.

I also know residents worked very hard on the Neighbourhood plan, but I see some weakness in that it only secures sites of 9 units and only an obligation to pay financial contributions for affordable housing. However I also see positives, and even agreeing to a larger proposal, albeit still conforming to increments of 9 units per annum, but delivering the rate of 35% affordable housing on site over an agreed period of time.

It could well be within the power of the PC to fully engage and actually deliver the site with a more comprehensive and well integrated design that 1) could be allocated within the NP, 2) would deliver on site affordable housing 3) removes pressure on other land within or adjacent to the settlement boundary and 4) ensures the PC's requirements are fully outlined to a developer from the start so they see the merit of positively engaging. A phasing plan can then be agreed, along with plentiful public open space to ensure it acts as a gateway into the village.

Thus, by accepting development it can be done correctly to enhance. I appreciate this will divide opinion, but I also fear that if we (ie: Bembridge residents) bury our heads in the sand it could lead to something not good.

If there was not a willingness to proceed, I would likely take matters no further myself. It will always be controversial, but if engaging properly the PC can steer the destiny of future development and ensure the village is not hit by proposals which come by default through policy revisions or lack of supply.

Very controversial subject but must be discussed so the village gets what it wants not what it is given. Thornycroft land is the buffer land for the village and the PC must have input into what happens there. SHLAA had already noted both sites as developable, with Mill Road site yield of 114 units and Hillway Road site yield of 69 units. There is a difference between deliverable (within 5 years) and developable (within 10 years). 35% would have to be affordable homes.

PC should look at land available within the boundary settlement area first if sites have to be listed as potential sites such as Bennetts Yard, BT site, Fire Station, all of which could become available for development in the coming years. If the IWC Core Strategy fails the Government will step in and the PC will have no say. Negotiating with developers to get the design the village would accept and maybe have a shopping list of things the area needs e.g. medical centre, pavements etc.

The PC has achieved what was requested in the Housing Needs Survey of 60 properties, and just because the PC is pro-active the village should not be expected to build for the sake of it. Residents voted in a referendum for the BNDP which states that developments should only be of 9 units, but the PC cannot stop phased development.

Applications that have been approved need enforcement if buildings are not completed within a set period, as there are plots of land in the village still to be completed which are an eyesore. Village infrastructure a concern. Bembridge is a desirable area and suffers from its own ability to deliver. Section 106 money does not come down to parishes and is kept by the IWC, if we were to get the 25% CIL we would have received £54,000 from the Silver Sands development but the IWC has not agreed to adopt a CIL policy. Bembridge needs affordable homes for the young either to buy or rent, but do not need any more holiday homes.

The developers need to hold a public meeting/consultation to listen to the community; this should not be down to the PC. Clerk will draft a consultation response and circulate to members for approval.

7. To confirm date of next meeting

5th December 2017 at 6.00pm, The Village Hall

Meeting closed 6.50pm

Signed:

Dated:.....