



RYDE

TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 22nd JANUARY 2015 AT RYDE METHODIST CHURCH, GARFIELD ROAD, RYDE

Present: Councillors, Roi Milburn, David Moore, Jill Moore, Gary Taylor, Tim Wakeley (chair), Phil Warren (vice chair) and David Woodward.

In attendance: Tracy Reynolds, Clerk to the committee.

1. APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Moore declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Pennyfeathers planning application. Councillor Jill Moore also declared a non-pecuniary interest.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 13th January 2015 were approved as a true record of the meeting and signed by the vice chairman.

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

P/01456/14 - TCP/31352/A. Land known as Pennyfeathers, land to the south of Smallbrook Lane, and to the west of, Brading Road, Ryde, Isle Of Wight, PO33. All Ryde Wards. Outline for maximum of 904 residential units, school; community centre; commercial buildings; relocation of Westridge Garage; community energy centre; sports building and changing rooms; structural landscaping; play areas and associated highway improvements (revised scheme)

<http://www.iwight.com/planning/DirectToAppDetails2.aspx?P/01456/14>

Mr Hepburn gave a presentation to the committee, during which he made the following key points:

- At the adoption of the Core Strategy 2100 houses were identified as needed in Ryde.
- Pennyfeathers development would supply 904 of these.
- This was a revised application based on the reasons for refusal given by the Isle of Wight Council's Planning Committee.

Mr Hepburn then went on to note the reasons The IW Council had given for refusal and to outline how these had been addressed in the revised application.

- Special Protection Area. – Being addressed in two ways. A financial contribution and improving the 24.5 hectares of green space.
- Hedgerows. - The amount of hedgerow retained had increased from 61% to 83%. It was stated that Natural England are now happy with the mitigation.
- Transport. - Mr Hepburn outlined that a wrong calculation had been made based on a different trajectory. They have revised the geometry at Westridge junction. The proposed roundabout will now be on Pannyfeather's land, changing the bridge and the cycle track.

Mr Hepburn finished his presentation by stating that the IW Council cannot now introduce new reasons for refusal and he is confident that the reasons for refusal in the initial application had now been addressed.

Councillor David Moore left the Planning Committee Table, standing separately to the committee and spoke in opposition to the plan as the chairman of the Ryde Flood Action Group.

He outlined the previous objections made by Ryde Town Council which were:

- Flood risk
- Traffic
- Ecology
- Sustainability
- Infrastructure

He said that the Flood Action Group had been informed by the Environment Agency that the figures quoted regarding the amount of water entering Monkton mead Brook and the flow rate were incorrect and an understatement meaning that the problems are worse than first thought.

Mr Moore then concluded by asking Mr Hepburn two questions:

1. How was he going to reduce the current 'run off rate' into Monkton mead Brook?
2. What are your proposals for addressing sewage and waste water?

The public were invited to ask questions or to make comments. The following questions and comments were raised:

Flooding.

- Many residents had experienced flooding and were concerned about any increase in water into Monkton Mead brook or sewage into the system.
- The Environment Agency had been using incorrect water flow figures, which underestimated the volumes of water in Monkton Mead Brook.
- Comments were made that the existing sewer did not have adequate capacity to cope with the current level of waste. And that the pipe under the town was a limiting factor to capacity.
- The proposed grey water harvesting scheme was unproven.

Infrastructure.

- Development outside of Ryde is problematic.
- The hospital is already on 'black alert' and could not cope with an increase.
- 904 houses would result in 2,500 residents.
- There would be an increase of 1,800 new cars, plus the ancillary vehicles to feed the commercial, social and education side of the development.
- The significant increase in traffic would create problems in the immediate and wider road network.
- No proper plan in place to show phasing and affects.

Conservation / ecology.

- Tree bats have been found on site.
- The development would destroy the beauty.
- Green space is not the same as countryside.
- A bell well had recently been found.
- The SPA cannot be evaluated until too late.
- Allotments or football pitches could be created.
- Important to have sympathetic design.

Housing need/location.

- The quota for housing need could be met using smaller sites.
- The development should be used to improve the tourism offer.
- The housing should be allocated to key workers.

Section 106 / CIL.

- Other developments paid £8,000 per house.
- Asda paid £20million for infrastructure improvements.
- The IW Council need to maximise benefits for the community.
- When planning application approved cease money at this opportunity.

Mr Hepburn, planning consultant for the applicant, responded as follows:

Flooding.

- The Pennyfeathers site contributed 5% of water into the Brook.
- The existing sewer had capacity and it would be connected to the industrial estate.
- There would be sustainable drainage principles on site.
- Water butts and recycling would harvest the rain water.
- Ponds and attenuation tanks would store water and act as a buffer.
- The rate of water entering the Brook would be controlled by a large pipe feeding the pond but a smaller pipe leaving it.
- A reduction in the 'run off' rate would not be achieved.

Infrastructure.

- Cannot control an increase in population.
- A wrong calculation regarding the level of traffic had been performed based on an incorrect trajectory.
- A roundabout will now be on Pennyfeathers land.
- The roundabout will have a calming effect.
- The bridge and cycle track have been changed and improved.
- Cannot improve the wider highway. Ultra Vires and outside the developers control.
- There is just under £2.443 million available for a new school, but it is questionable why the council are selling off one but asking for money for a new one.
- The development would be phased and will equate to one building site per year.

Conservation / ecology.

- The bell well was previously unknown.
- Tree bats reside in Havenstreet and only visit the Pennyfeathers site.
- The percentage of hedgerow being retained has increased from 62% to 83%.
- There will be 24.5 hectares of open green space.
- Would be managed by a £200 levy per property.
- A contribution of £172 per 904 properties would be given.

Housing need.

- The other identified sites had issues with them making development less likely.
- The housing target is based on existing need.
- £1,230 are currently on the housing register for Ryde.
- 35% of the housing would be affordable housing.
- Population growing by 0.7% annually.

Section 106 / CIL.

- The IW Council do not use the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- The developer is giving nearly £2.5 m towards a school and £155k for mitigation for the Special protection Area.
- That is all that has been asked for.

Mr Hepburn also reiterated that he believed he had addressed the previous reasons for refusal and that the Isle of Wight Council cannot now come up with additional reasons for refusal.

The planning committee thanked the public for their questions and comments and Mr Hepburn for his responses and moved to discuss the application.

The Vice Chairman of the planning committee, Councillor Phil Warren spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that the comments were good and relevant and showed local knowledge. Any development should be sympathetic of local needs. He stated that in Ryde Town Council's AAP submission it has stated that no single development should have more than 200 homes. He had concerns about the route of the sewage, the increase in flooding and the appropriateness of a large development.

Councillor Gary Taylor also spoke in opposition to the application. He reiterated the concerns expressed in relation to the size of the development and how this can integrate into the existing infrastructure. Although he was pleased to see an increase in the green space he remained unconvinced of how this will reduce the use of Ryde sands. Evaluation of the SPA cannot be undertaken until it is too late. The traffic generated would result in a significant increase to the highways and the applicant's agent did not provide evidence of how this could be mitigated. Although he recognised the need to build new houses, he felt that large developments would struggle to integrate. He concluded by saying that in his view there were not enough material changes made. He would like to see new houses but as part of the community.

Councillor David Woodward also spoke in opposition to the application. He stated that the committee considered many new builds at their three weekly meetings, and that the 500 that have been approved have not had any significant impact as they are not large developments. However to have 904 in one place would dramatically alter the town. He believed that if we continue as we are we would meet the target without the need for the Pennyfeathers development. In terms of flooding he was of the view that development would make the situation worse and was not convinced by the methods the developer intended to use. As the scheme would be gradually built he said that the affects would be increased annually and that in the future it could become intolerable for residents. He concluded by stating that he was very much against the development and said that it would be vandalism on an epic scale and would wreck the town forever.

Councillor David Moore stated that he had listened to and heard all the arguments for and against. He felt that the committee should be consistent with the AAP and in conclusion must oppose the application.

Councillor Roi Milburn, Ryde Mayor and attending the planning committee in his exofficio capacity said that he had not heard anything to change the way that the committee voted previously. The phasing of the development does not make it acceptable and the numbers involved are frightening. He had concerns about the flooding and potential integration and reminded the committee that last time their vote was unanimous.

The chairman of the planning committee, Councillor Tim Wakeley, stated that the development was huge and on the edge of the town. He felt that due to it's location it does not connect to the town and had a separate identity. He had concerns regarding traffic flow both through the development but also through smallbrook. This traffic flow could compromise options for Ryde and have a detrimental affect on the historic carnival and in the event of an accident. He stated that the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Special protection Area (SPA) should not be understated and had national significance. Having a potential additional 3000 people in close proximity to the SPA was against advice. He had listened to assurances regarding the swails and tanks but felt that the estate was just too large to effectively manage the surface and waste water and would inevitably increase the risk of flooding. He also commented that the means by which the affordable housing was allocated could help address problems with a lack of key workers. Incentives could be provided to attract staff and support the services. Regarding the Community infrastructure levy (CIL) Councillor Wakeley felt that the IOW Council had missed a trick and he would ask them to seek a greater contribution from the developer for infrastructure improvements. He said that the Town Council would take the opportunity to speak to the IW Council planning Committee when they decide the application and explained that members of the public could also speak.

It was proposed by the chairman that the application is objected to on the grounds already stated.

This was seconded by the Vice Chairman, Phil Warren, and the vote was unanimous.

The committee RESOLVED to object to the planning application.

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next planning committee meeting is the 3rd February 2015