



Minutes

Name of meeting	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Date and Time	TUESDAY 27 JULY 2021 COMMENCING AT 4.00 PM
Venue	COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT
Present	Cllrs G Brodie (Vice-Chairman), P Brading, C Critchison, W Drew, C Jarman, J Medland, M Oliver, M Price and C Quirk
Also Present (Non voting)	Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing: Cllr Paul Fuller (non voting)
Officers Present	Marie Bartlett, Oliver Boulter, Russell Chick, Ben Gard, Alan White and Sarah Wilkinson
Apologies	Cllrs D Adams, M Beston and R Downer

12. **Minutes**

RESOLVED:

THAT the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2021 be confirmed as a true record.

13. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations received at this stage.

14. **Public Question Time**

There were no public questions.

15. **Report of the Strategic Manager for Planning and Infrastructure**

Consideration was given to item 1 of the report of the Strategic Manager for Planning and Infrastructure Delivery.

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:

20/01061/FUL

Details:

Demolition of agricultural buildings and the garage to No 125 Marlborough Road; Proposed development consisting of 473 new dwellings (single and two storey dwellings (inclusive of 35% affordable housing) and inclusive of the conversion of the Coach House into pair of semi-detached dwellings; (leading to a net gain of 472 dwellings), single storey café and two storey doctors surgery and B1 office space with associated site infrastructure (inclusive of roads, parking, photovoltaic pergolas, garages, bin and bikes stores, below ground foul waste pump, electric substations, surface water detention basins and swales, landscape and ecological mitigations and net biodiversity enhancements); Proposed vehicular accesses off Bullen Road and Appley Road; Proposed public open spaces, Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and Allotments; Proposed three public rights of way; Proposed access, parking and turning for No 125 Marlborough Road and associated highways improvements (Revised plans, revised drainage strategy and flood risk, additional highway technical note and updated appendix S to highway chapter of environmental statement)(readvertised application)

Land South of Appley Road North of Bullen Road and East of Hope Road (West Acre Park), Ryde, Isle of Wight.

Site Visits:

The site was carried out on Friday, 23 July 2021.

Public Participants:

Mr Mark Gaskin (objector)
Mrs Amy Holliday (Objector)
Mr Simon Cooke (Ryde Town Council)
Mr David Long (Agent)
Mr Iain Delaney (Applicant)

Additional Representations:

Updates had been made to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) since the report had been published, Officers provided updates where the NPPF had been referenced in the report.

A further representation from Cycle Wight had been received confirming their support for the proposal. A late representation had been received on behalf of the Pennyfeathers, expressing concerns on highway grounds, and seven emails had been received by the Leader and four additional representation had been received by the Local Planning Authority objecting to the application.

Comment:

Councillor Matthew Price had not attended the full site visit with the Planning Committee and therefore, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, he did not take part in the debate or vote.

Following advice from the Monitoring Officer, Oliver Boulter Strategic Manager for Planning and Infrastructure read out a statement from Councillor Michael Lilley as Local Member for the application.

The Chairman of the meeting advised that a comprehensive update paper had been circulated and asked whether the Committee had, had enough time to read it. Members of the Committee agreed that they had all read the document provided.

Concerns regarding road safety were raised by the Committee. Officers confirmed that Island Roads had not objected to the application, subject to officers being satisfied that a contribution to assist with the upgrading of the junction at Westridge cross could be secured. The development would create an alternative route for residents and could have the potential to take traffic away from the current road network and spread the level of traffic in the area.

The Committee were advised that Human Rights were a material consideration which they were required to have regard to in reaching their decision.

Clarity was requested regarding the doctors' surgery as the report stated 'space for a doctors surgery, should it be required'. Officers advised that there was currently no GP on board to take this forward, however it was understood that surgeries in the area may wish to relocate., The decision whether the doctors surgery was required was one which was a matter for the NHS Trust.

Sustainability for utilities, notably foul drainage, was questioned. Officers stated that the application had confirmed that the proposal would discharge to the mains and this was considered to be adequate detail for the application to be determined. It would be a matter for the utility companies and developer to agree any necessary contribution towards improved capacity, if required, if permission was granted.

Questions were asked regarding the affordable housing and about the company named as managing that aspect of the proposed development as the company is not a registered provider. Assurance was given that affordable housing would have to be provided by a provider of affordable housing, which would need to be agreed with the council. This would be managed through the Section 106 agreement, which would also agree the phasing of delivery and tenure of these units. There was also an opportunity for the Planning Committee to request a percentage of affordable rented accommodation.

Councillor Chris Jarman advised that he had in the past expressed disappointment about the loss of greenfield sites and about properties that local people could not afford. However, he stated that he had not predetermined this application and was would listen to all comments and would weigh the merits of the application with a clear mind before voting.

Concern was raised that future climate change policies had not been recognised within the application, with no alternative to gas central heating. Yet gas central heating is being phased out. Councillors were advised that the development was proposing to meet current standards relating to the build quality and such things as insulation. As the development progressed through the phases and legislation was updated around building control, 'retro-fitted' features could be required to be installed. It was unreasonable, however, to restrict developers to use those alternatives, based on current policy until it was a legislative requirement.

A proposal to approve the application subject to the inclusion of 70% of the affordable housing proposed in the development being required to be affordable rented accommodation was made and duly seconded, the vote was taken.

The motion fell

The Chairman of the meeting advised that if a proposal to refuse the application was moved, the Committee would need to provide reasons why they wanted to refuse the application.

A number of concerns were raised these were in summary:

- Living conditions for resultant residents and amenity to neighbourhood if the development would be used as a rat run,
- Human rights
- Calculations relating to traffic generation
- High density
- Affordable housing is not social housing
- Impact on tourism
- Infrastructure and accessibility
- No definite decision regarding the doctors' surgery
- Utilities issue
- No mention of sustainable build features e.g. Solar panels etc
- Loss of heritage
- Consideration of the policies of the Draft Island Planning Strategy

The Committee were advised by officers that some of the concerns could be overcome by planning conditions. Cllr Chris Jarman thought great weight ought to be given to the Draft Island Planning Strategy. The Strategic Manager for Planning and Infrastructure Delivery referred to paragraphs 47 and 48 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework and stated that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans but because of the very early stage of its production he advised against any weight being attached to it in those circumstances. The Draft Island Planning Strategy was due to go out to consultation on 30 July 2021.

A short adjournment was taken to allow officers time to consider the

concerns and formulate a sustainable reason for refusal of the application, based on these.

Following the adjournment officers asked the Committee to read paragraphs 6.193, 6.192 and 6.189 through to 6.195. Officers confirmed that the Council's archaeology officer had confirmed there would not be any unacceptable impacts on above and below ground heritage assets. There would, however, be an impact on the historic landscape, although the significance of this landscape had not been qualified. The impact on heritage and culture on Ryde and the Island as a whole could be incorporated.

A proposal to refuse the proposed development as the application didn't go far enough to mitigate the impact on the historic landscape was made and duly seconded.

In accordance with the Council Constitution a named vote was taken the result follows:

For (4)

Cllrs Claire Critchison, Warren Drew, Chris Jarman, John Medland

Against (4)

Cllrs Paul Brading, Geoff Brodie, Martin Oliver, Chris Quirk

As the vote was tied, in accordance with the Council's Constitution the Chairman gets a casting vote, the Chairman voted against the motion which duly fell.

Prior to the three hour point in the meeting, a proposal to extend the meeting by up to 30 minutes under Part 4B paragraph 6 (Duration of meetings) and paragraph 10 (Voting) of the Council's Constitution was put to the meeting by the Chairman.

RESOLVED BY AFFIRMATION WITHOUT DISSENT:

THAT the meeting be extended by up to 30 minutes.

After the meeting had been extended, Cllr Claire Critchison addressed the Chairman about a prior engagement, and was advised by the Chairman that if she wanted to vote she would have to remain.

A proposal was made to grant conditional approval in line with the officer's recommendation subject to the inclusion of 71% of the affordable housing proposed in the development being required to be affordable rented accommodation was made and duly seconded.

A vote was taken and the result was:

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, in line with the officer's recommendation, the application be conditionally approved subject to the inclusion of 71% affordable rented accommodation being provided within the development.

As per report (Item 1)

16. **Members' Question Time**

There were no members questions submitted.

CHAIRMAN