

MINUTES OF RYDE TOWN COUNCIL'S PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 8 FEBRUARY 2021 AT 4.00PM VIA THE ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE MEETING FACILITY STREAMED LIVE VIA YOUTUBE

Members Present: Cllr Diana Conyers (Chair), Cllr Henry Adams, Cllr Adrian Axford, Cllr

Charles Chapman, Cllr Michael Lilley, Cllr Phil Jordan, Cllr Malcolm

Ross and Cllr Ian Stephens

Also in Attendance: Jon Baker (Committees Coordinator) and Chris Turvey (Planning Clerk)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No questions were received.

20/21 APOLOGIES

None received.

21/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

22/21 REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS

None requested.

23/21 MINUTES

The minutes to the previous meetings held on 13 January 2021 (extra-ordinary meeting) and 19 January 2021 (ordinary meeting) were reviewed.

RESOLVED:

THAT the minutes held on 13 January 2021 and 19 January 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record and would be signed off by the Chair following the meeting

24/21 MEMBER QUESTIONS

Cllr Jordan asked for clarification on whether any submission sent to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should be confined to material considerations. Members were advised that whilst Ryde Town Council could submit anything they wished, the LPA would have to base its decision on material considerations.

Cllr Lilley asked in light of the numerous road works that were being carried out in Ryde by various agencies and was a cause of much consternation with residents and visitors to the town alike, who was responsible for authorising them and what was their rationale on coordinating the works that were causing so much disruption in the town.

Members were advised that Island Roads, contracted by the Highways Authority (the Isle of Wight Council - IWC) were the body responsible for permitting any works, although any emergency works such as gas or water, could be decided by the relevant utility companies. Clarity on the issues of responsibility would be sought by officers and reported back to members as soon as possible.

25/21 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following Planning Applications were then considered by all members of the committee:

i. Application No: 20/02159/ARM

Parish(es): Ryde Ward(s): Ryde East

Location: Land Known As Pennyfeathers Land To The South Of Smallbrook

Lane And To The West Of Brading Road, Ryde

Proposal: Reserved Matters Application relating to P/01456/14:

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

Following a recent consultation meeting with invited members of the public on 4 February 2021, where the application was discussed in detail and concerns were raised by the public and elected members of Ryde Town Council (RTC), the Reserved Matters application was formally considered by the committee.

Four members of the public, all from the Ryde Society attended the consultation meeting and their concerns included the following:

- Continued lack of an adopted Infrastructure Plan
- The new Pennyfeathers Master Plan dated 21 November 2020 contains numerous alterations to the plan approved in September 2015.
- A reduction in the amount of green space within the development.
- The relocation of the proposed school to a less suitable site with regards transport links and the quality of the land with regards land drainage
- The large attenuation ponds presented a threat to child safety
- There was no report dealing with the implications of the IWC being bestowed Biosphere Status and what it may have on the development.

Many concerns were raised by committee members and these would all be included in the submissions to the IWC (the Local Planning Authority - LPA), as detailed in the resolution to this application.

One of the main areas that continued to raise concerns with RTC was the continued lack of an Infrastructure Plan. This had been promised for submission many times by the IWC, but as yet it had still not been released.

Members also raised concerns around the proposed school. Along with its relocation, which did not appear to be aligned to any public transport links, members questioned whether a primary school was a suitable option as opposed to catering for the possible need for more secondary places in Ryde.

It was therefore noted that the current head teacher of Ryde Academy should be included as a consultee to evaluate what educational needs were required for the additional children generated as a result of the Pennyfeathers development.

There was also some concerns raised that the roads within the development might not form part of the managed highways network and as such would be defined as unadopted with residents of Pennyfeathers responsible for any maintenance and management costs.

Members also agreed that the Covid 19 Global Pandemic and any subsequent implications of it, should be taken into account with this and any future major developments.

Following a lengthy debate where many aspects of the application was discussed, it was:

RESOLVED:

THAT the Council's Planning Clerk would, in consultation with the Chair, formulate and submit a response to the IWC that took account of all points discussed by the committee.

Subsequent to the meeting, the following response was submitted to the IWC:

Ryde Town Council (RTC) welcomes the submission of a Reserved Matters Application for this development. However, the Council is unable to support the application in its current form and objects on the following grounds:

1. General Concerns

- a) There were three general concerns regarding the proposals as a whole:
 - I. Inadequate information makes it difficult to comment in detail on many of the proposals.
 - II. The proposals take insufficient account of changes in the external environment since the submission of the original outline application. RTC is particularly concerned that they fail to take account of issues related to the environment and climate change and the lessons learned from the Covid-19 pandemic for the design of future settlements.

- III. It is not possible to consider these proposals in isolation from related developments in the Ryde East area. RTC maintains that the Isle of Wight Council (IWC) should, in consultation with RTC, prepare an integrated plan for the development of the area, as indicated para. 3.62 of the *Draft Island Planning Strategy*, before making decisions about this development.
- b) Examples of the specific impact of the above, together with other concerns, were as follows.

2. <u>Highway Infrastructure</u>

- I. There are no details of traffic movements and highway capacity either prior to or after the highway improvements are in place.
- II. RTC shares Island Roads' concerns about lack of coordination, and in some cases contradiction, with highway proposals related to other developments in the area. RTC maintains that no decision should be made on these proposals until the results of Island Roads' study of all the junctions in the area available
- III. The improvements proposed for Westridge Cross should not be delayed to Phase 7. RTC maintains that they should be brought forward to Phase 2, since development in phases 1 and 2 will have an impact on this junction.
- IV. There is insufficient information on the relocation of the garage at Westridge Cross, given the refusal of an earlier application to relocate it. This could jeopardise the feasibility of the proposals for the improvement of this junction.

3. Community Infrastructure

- I. The new site proposed for the school and community centre would be less accessible than the previous one, particularly for people from neighbouring areas.
- II. There is insufficient information regarding the geophysical suitability of the new site, particularly the possible need for measures to address surface water drainage issues given its proximity to the stream.
- III. There is no information about the size and type of school that will be required, or even if a school is actually needed. RTC maintains that there should be a comprehensive survey of future educational need in the area, taking account of both existing and possible future housing development, before a decision is made.

4. Housing Design

I. RTC is concerned about the small size of gardens in some parts of the development. The Covid-19 pandemic has emphasised the importance of private outdoor space. II. RTC is also concerned that, although the proposals meet minimum standards in terms of parking spaces, the relatively high densities in some parts of the development may result in undesirable street parking.

5. Affordable Housing

- I. There is no information on the distribution of affordable housing between phases. RTC maintains that each phase should include the required 35% of affordable housing, including the required proportion of social housing for rent.
- II. The definition of affordable housing is based on the standard 80% figure. However, according to the 2018 *Housing Needs Assessment*, the actual affordable level in the Ryde area is only
 - 60%. This has now been accepted by the government, in that housing associations are now eligible for the Social Housing Grant.
- III. There is no information on the proposed management of the social rented housing. RTC is not aware of any approaches that have been made to existing housing associations.

6. Environmental Concerns

- I. It is still proposed that the Energy Centre be powered by gas, despite the recent government announcement that from 2025 all new houses will be banned from installing gas-powered heating.
- II. There is no mention of the Island's new status as a Biosphere Reserve and the possible implications of this for the development.
- III. There is no mention of the implications of the development on light pollution and possible mitigating measures.
- IV. It is not clear whether the area of public open space in the western part of the development will be open to the general public or just to residents of the development. RTC maintains that it should be open to the general public and that adequate facilities for visitors (e.g. parking spaces) should be provided.
- V. RTC has concerns about access to bus stops and cycling / walking infrastructure, particularly for those without their own vehicles. The relocation of the school to what is considered a less suitable site would also have a negative impact in terms of poor transport links.

7. Management Responsibility and Costs

I. There is insufficient information about the future management of the development, including the maintenance of roads and public green space and the possible implications of this in terms of service charges. RTC is concerned that residents may have to pay high service charges, which would have a negative impact on occupants of social rented housing. II. RTC insist that, should the development be approved, all new roads within the development be adopted into the highways network as they form a major part of the necessary highway infrastructure work required to accommodate the extra pressure placed on the local road network.

8. Section 106 Agreement

- I. RTC considers that Section 106 monies raised from the development to mitigate its effects should be spent in the local Ryde area.
- II. In particular, RTC maintains that, if the education needs assessment proposed above indicates that a school is not needed on this site, any monies identified for the provision of primary education in the legal agreement should be ring fenced for education facilities elsewhere in Ryde.

ii. Application No: 20/02180/RVC

Parish(es): Nettlestone and Seaview

Ryde Ward(s): Nettlestone and Seaview, Ryde East

Location: Former Harcourt Sands Holiday Park, Puckpool Hill, PO33 1PJ

Proposal: Variation of condition 3 on P/00573/15 to allow alterations to road and plot layout

Members initially welcomed the fact that the site which had been in a dormant state for some time was now being progressed.

However, there were some concerns raised over the suitability of the proposed dwellings as well as their effect on the seascape. Members also raised apprehension over any possible negative implications the development may have on the public use of the seafront and beach.

With regard to the application being described as a variation, members were of the opinion that it differed significantly from the original application and as such it should have been treated as a new submission.

Whilst there was no provision of affordable housing on site, the Committee agreed that a contribution should be made by the developer for such housing and that the money should be ring-fenced to ensure it was allocated for the benefit of Ryde residents.

It was also noted that since the loss of the holiday parks that originally occupied the site, Ryde had lost a large amount of footfall which provided much needed tourism and income for the town.

RESOLVED:

THAT Ryde Town Council whilst appreciating the need for the site to be developed, objects to the application on the following grounds:

- a) Concerns over the appropriateness of the design of the proposed buildings and their effect on the seascape.
- b) The possible implications of the use of the adjacent seafront
- c) There is no onsite provision for affordable housing but a contribution is being made by the developer to affordable housing elsewhere. RTC believe that this money should be ringfenced for affordable housing provision in the Ryde area.
- d) RTC have concerns about the amount of deviation this proposal has from the approved plans and suggest that this proposal will need a fresh application.
- iii. Application No: 21/00124/FUL

Parish(es): Ryde Ward(s): Havenstreet, Ashey And Haylands

Location: Part OS Parcels 1238, 0135 And 0952 Land Between Weeks Road

and Ashey Road, Ryde

Proposal: Three/four/five storey building to provide retirement apartments with associated communal facilities and parking; proposed mixture of bungalows and houses with parking (176 units in total) (amendments to previously approved scheme under P/01529/12 and P/01529/12 and P/01529/12 and P/01529/12 and P/01529/12

Members noted that the application was for the lower part of the development, the rest of which had already been approved and developed as affordable housing. Whilst the site was welcomed in the way it had addressed affordable housing needs in Ryde, there was some concern over the entrance to the north east part from Pig Leg Lane. At present much work was needed to clear the area of mud and make it suitable for pedestrian access.

Members also noted that Island Roads had, through their report, requested that a revised plan should be provided to ensure that the proposals were reflective of the existing highway layout. They also made various other requests in order to improve highway safety and site user access.

RESOLVED:

THAT Ryde Town Council has no objection to the application, subject to the requests and comments in the Island Roads report being observed and that access to the site from Pig Leg Lane is made fully suitable for pedestrian use.

The following applications were considered under delegated powers by the Chair and Planning Clerk and they proposed no objections:

i. Application No: 20/02009/HOU

Parish(es): Rvde Ward(s): Rvde East

Location: 112 Great Preston Road, Ryde, PO33 1DD

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension; proposed raised patio (revised

plans)(readvertised application)

ii. Application No: 21/00081/FUL

Parish(es): Ryde Ward(s): Ryde North East Location:51 George Street, Ryde, PO33 2EW

Proposal: Demolition of chimney stack

iii. Application No: 21/00101/FUL

Parish(es): Ryde Ward(s): Ryde North West

Location: Abingdon Lodge, 19 - 20 West Street, Ryde, PO33 2QQ

Proposal: Proposed balconies on West Street and Green Street elevations

iv. Application No: 21/00102/HOU

Parish(es): Ryde Ward(s): Ryde East

Location: 46 St Johns Wood Road, Ryde, PO33 1HL

Proposal: Demolition of conservatory; proposed two storey rear extension

v. Application No: 21/00109/HOU

Parish(es): Ryde Ward(s): Havenstreet, Ashey And Haylands

Location: 2 Ashey Place, Ryde, PO33 2WA

Proposal: Proposed single storey flat roofed extension; replacement garden

outbuilding (revised scheme)

RESOLVED:

THAT the above five applications were agreed with no objections.

26/21 DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNCIL

Members noted the following decisions taken by the Isle of Wight Council's Planning Department.

PLANNING DECISIONS

1. APPLICATIONS APPROVED

i. Application No: 20/01270/FUL

Location: Walled Garden Bullen Road, Ryde

Proposal: Extension, alterations and conversion of agricultural building to

form a single residential dwelling Parish: Ryde Ward: Ryde East Decision Date: 11/01/2021

Ryde Town Council objected to the application on the following grounds:

a) The site has an existing Class Q permission for a smaller development occupying the footprint of the existing farm buildings. This scheme seeks to enlarge that building footprint and height by around a third. This will not be covered by Class Q. The developer believes that because he has an existing residential approval on the original site as his fallback position this larger development should be allowed. When evaluating Class Q applications it is not necessary to consider such things as settlement boundaries and other normal material planning considerations.

b) It is just a case of whether the proposal meets the criteria for Class Q or not. For comparison, 2 applications to replace the adjacent greenhouse with residential have failed because they were outside of the settlement boundary.

ii. Application No: 20/02161/LBC

Location: Ryde Pier Head Railway Station, Ryde Pier, Ryde, PO33 2HF Proposal: Listed Building Consent for installation of lightweight platform overlay of No.1 Road platform only for level access boarding to class 484 and installation of a barrier/handrail at the back edge of overlay.

Parish: Ryde Ward: Ryde North East

Decision Date: 20/01/2021

Ryde Town Council raised no objection to this application

iii. Application No: 20/02182/LBC

Location: Ryde Esplanade Railway Station, Esplanade, Ryde, PO33 2HE Proposal: Listed Building Consent for installation of lightweight platform overlay of No.1 platform only for level access boarding and associated works

Parish: Ryde Ward: Ryde North East

Decision Date: 20/01/2021

Ryde Town Council raised no objection to this application

iv. Application No: 21/00082/TW

Location: 142 Binstead Lodge Road, Binstead, Ryde, PO33 3UP

Proposal: The ash tree situated as detailed in the application is to be felled to

near ground level.

Parish: Ryde Ward: Binstead And Fishbourne

Decision Date: 21/01/2021

Tree Decision

v. Application No: 20/00805/FUL

Location: Corneila Heights, 93 George Street, Ryde, PO33 2JE

Proposal: Change of use from care home to serviced short-term visitor accommodation (use class C1)(revised plans)(revised description)

Parish: Ryde Ward: Ryde North East

Decision Date: 18/01/2021

Ryde Town Council raised no objection to this application

vi. Application No: 20/01892/HOU

Location: Barsby Lodge, St Georges Road, Ryde, PO33 3AS

Proposal: Alterations/upgrade to rear extension and veranda to include terrace over; extension to ground floor decking; proposed external spiral staircase to form access to 1st floor terrace; alterations to include replacement windows and air conditioning unit on north façade; replacement porch (revised description and revised plane for parth and seet elevations)

description and revised plans for north and east elevations)

Parish: Ryde Ward: Ryde North West

Decision Date: 22/01/2021

Ryde Town Council raised no objection to this application

vii. Application No: 20/02138/FUL

Location: Land Adjacent Barnsley Cottage, Brading Road, Ryde

Proposal: Proposed Agricultural Barn

Parish: Ryde Ward: Ryde East Decision Date: 26/01/2021

Ryde Town Council raises no objection to the application, subject to the conditions raised by Island Roads being observed

viii. Application No: 19/00564/HOU

Location: Beachwood, Quarr Road, Binstead, Ryde, PO33 4EL

Proposal: Single storey side extension to provide additional living space and

bedroom accommodation. (revised plans)(readvertised application)

Parish: Ryde Ward: Binstead And Fishbourne

Decision Date: 28/01/2021

Ryde Town Council objected to the application, due to the findings of the Tree Officer. However, should the tree officer later be satisfied that a solution to their concerns are identified, then Ryde Town Council would subsequently support the application.

2. <u>APPLICATIONS REFUSED</u>

None taken.

RESOLVED:

THAT the decisions taken by the Isle of Wight Council since the last meeting be noted.

27/21 HIGH STREET HERITAGE ACTION ZONE (HSHAZ) UPDATE

The Chair of the HSHAZ advised on various issues which included the following:

i. Shop Front Design Code

Work was ongoing although it was anticipated that the Design Code work would be completed by June / July 2021

ii. High Street Pedestrianisation Zone - Road Barrier / Road Surfacing

Members were advised that in order to establish the road barrier and prevent any unauthorized traffic using the pedestrian zone, there were various legal issues which needed addressing before a decision could be taken as to what type of barrier would be installed. A further update on the installation would be provided as soon as possible.

With regard to resurfacing the road, the committee was advised that a contractor had not yet been identified, but the process could take up to 18 months.

iii. New HSHAZ Website

This had been created and tested and was awaiting its launch.

iv. HSHAZ Shop

This was still being finalised and an update would be provided when there was more information available.

v. Visitor Insight Report

A report looking at footfall in Ryde in November and December 2020 was presented at the Steering Group Meeting on 20 January 2021 with some interesting and surprising results revealed.

vi. St Thomas's Church

The Historic England (HE) assisted grant from the Architectural Heritage Fund was supporting the roof repairs, security measures and possible fencing on the site

vii. Ryde Town Hall / Theatre

HE was also funding through grants the securing of the building such as boarding up windows as well as creating reports that would assist in establishing suitable insurance.

viii. Former Packs Building - Cross Street

The former shop would be eligible for a shop-front improvement grant, prior to the Design Code being completed and subject to conservation input from the IWC. A dialogue with Shademakers, a lessee of the former Packs store had also been opened.

28/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED:

THAT the next meeting of the Planning, Regeneration and Environment Committee will be held on Tuesday, 2 March 2021 via the Zoom Video Conference Meeting facility, at 4.00pm.