



# Minutes

Name of meeting	<b><u>PLANNING COMMITTEE</u></b>
Date and time	<b>TUESDAY, 2 JUNE 2020 COMMENCING AT 4.00 PM</b>
Venue	<b>TEAMS MEETING</b>
Present	Cllrs Chris Quirk (Chairman), Michael Beston, George Cameron, Richard Hollis, Julie Jones-Evans, John Kilpatrick, Matthew Price, Brian Tyndall, Shirley Smart
Officers Present	Marie Bartlett, Ollie Boulter, Russell Chick, Ben Gard, Alan White (on behalf of Island Roads) Sarah Wilkinson
Apologies	John Howe

---

**1. Minutes**

**RESOLVED :**

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on [21 January 2020](#) be confirmed.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Jones-Evans declared a non pecuniary interest in minute 4 (1) Branstone Farm Studies Centre, Hale Common, Arreton as she was a commercial brewer.

**3. Public Question Time**

Questions were put to the Chairman as follows :

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Mr Edwards	Planning Ref 19/01426/FUL and 19/01415/OUT regarding sewer Capacity issues	The Chairman provided a written response which was available on the following link ( <a href="#">PQ 15/20</a> )
Mrs J Wade on behalf of Ryde Society	1. Delegated powers 2. Ownership within Pennyfeathers proposed development 3. How did applications affect Environmental	The Chairman provided a written response which was available on the following link ( <a href="#">PQ 16/20</a> )

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Dr Lloyd	Impact Assessment section 106 agreements Seeking assurance regarding off-road parking regarding a proposed development	The Chairman provided a written response which was available on the following link ( <a href="#">PQ 17/20</a> )
Ms Cook	Planning Ref 19/01426/FUL and 19/01415/OUT regarding parking, safety and mental health of the resident community	The Chairman provided a written response which was available on the following link ( <a href="#">PQ 18/20</a> )

#### 4. **Report of the Head of Place**

##### **Planning Applications and Related Matters**

Consideration was given to items 1 - 3 of the report of the Head of Place.

##### **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:**

19/00634/FUL

##### **Details:**

Proposed brewery and bottling facility with associated office, retail, storage and visitors experience; formation of vehicular access (revised plans) showing changes to roof lines, fenestration detailing and additional forklift access on north elevation (additional information) landscape and visual impact assessment (readvertised application)

Branstone Farm Studies Centre, Hale Common, Arreton.

##### **Public Participants:**

Mr Simon Mogford – Supporter

##### **Additional Representations:**

A Third party comment had been received regarding a survey of the field to establish if there were protected species of vole or mouse present, Officers advised that if approved further surveys would be required prior to development.

**Comment:**

Councillor Clare Mosdell spoke as Local Member on this item.

Questions were raised regarding the layout and if it conformed to health regulations, officers advised that the layout of facilities would be dealt with through Building Control and Environmental Health, this may require internal changes to be made via an amendment.

**Decision:**

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

**RESOLVED:**

THAT the application be approved subject to the below informative.

**Informative:**

The applicant/agent to liaise with Environmental health regarding other legislation such as health and Safety.

As per report (Item 1)

---

**Application:**

19/01227/FUL

**Details:**

Proposed glamping pods, reception and ablution block, amenity ponds and associated parking (revised scheme)(revised plans)

Land South of Newclose Cricket Grounds, Blackwater Road, Newport.

**Public Participants:**

Dr Simon Fordaham – Objector (Statement read out)

Mr David Long – Agent

**Additional Representations:**

Paragraph 5.14 included comments in support of the application theses had been made on a previously withdrawn application and did not relate to the application presented to the Planning Committee.

A further comment had been received from residents who had made previous comments.

**Comment:**

Councillor Clare Mosdell spoke as Local Member to this item.

The Committee asked for clarification regarding parking on the site, there didn't appear to be staff parking allocated, they also asked if it would be possible to prevent cars being driven on the site, it was assumed that people would drive to the glamping pods and then return their cars to the allocated spaces. It was confirmed that the scheme included a new footpath, a bridge to link to the existing Sandown-Newport cycle track and two new bus stops outside of the site, within Blackwater Road.

Concerns were raised that people would not want to walk along the cycle track at night, from the town, they may therefore walk in the main road, which would be very dangerous.

Questions were raised as to whether the faculties block was of sufficient size for the scale of the development and where the foul water would go.

Members questioned the safety of the proposed ponds and what lighting would be available on site and if it would comply with the dark skies policy, they were advised that a condition was proposed to ensure appropriate fencing was erected around the pond areas and that any lighting would not impact on ecology and would therefore be low impact., It was also confirmed that there was not a dark skies policy currently in place and the application did not fall within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Members discussed the possible pollution impact the proposal would have on the environment and CO2 emissions, as people would be using Barbeques and wood burning stoves which had been discouraged by government.

Concern was raised regarding the noise that could be generated by people using the site and the impact on the quality of life of neighbouring residents, and believed the proposal failed to enhance the local area.

**Decision:**

A proposal to approve the application in accordance with the officer's report was made and seconded, a vote was then taken, and the proposal fell, a further proposal to refuse the application was made and seconded, in accordance with the Council's Constitution a named vote was taken.

For (5)

Councillors George Cameron, Richard Hollis, John Kilpatrick, Brian Tyndall, Shirley Smart

Against (4)

Councillors Michael Beston, Julie Jones-Evans, Matthew Price, Chris Quirk

**RESOLVED:**

THAT the application be refused

**Reason:**

The proposed development fails to preserve and enhance the context and character of the local area as well as having a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, which would in turn impact upon their quality of life contrary to policies SP1 and DM2

As per report (Item 2)

---

**Application:**

20/00183/FUL

**Details:**

Partial demolition, alterations and extension to form 1 retail unit and a cafe; new public toilet facilities

Ocean Bay Beach Shop and Public Conveniences, Pier Street, Sandown.

**Public Participants:**

Mr Paul Coueslant – Supporter (statement read out)

Mr Chris Ashman – on behalf of the applicant

Mr Guy Eades – Objector (Statement read out)

**Comment:**

Councillor Ian Ward spoke as Local Member on this item.

Questions were raised regarding the proposed highway works included as part of the application when it was originally submitted and why this had been removed from the scheme , they were advised that Island Roads had reviewed the original submission and found significant highway safety concerns regarding the pedestrian area and turning of large delivery vehicles. Revised plans were therefore submitted removing this element of this scheme.

Members were also informed that if the committee approved the proposal, future highway works could still be implemented in the area following a separate application process.

**Decision:**

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

**RESOLVED:**

THAT the application be approved

As per report (Item 3)

---

CHAIRMAN