



EAST COWES TOWN COUNCIL

Town Hall, York Avenue, East Cowes, Isle of Wight, PO32 6RU
Tel: (01983) 299082 Email: clerk@eastcowestowncouncil.co.uk

Minutes of a meeting of **East Cowes Town Council** held at East Cowes Town Hall, York Avenue, East Cowes **Thursday 31st March 2022 at 6pm**

Present

Chair: Cllr Reardon (Mayor)

Councillors: Packham, Palin, Hendry, Love, Lake

Clerk: S Chilton

Also present: Martha James (MJ), Principal Consultant, Plan Research

52 members of the public

Public Forum

30 minutes were allocated for members of the public to comment and ask questions prior to the start of the meeting in respect of the planning item on the agenda. Members of the public made the following points:

- The application gave inaccurate information regarding levels of traffic
- Construction traffic using the Esplanade and other roads in the area that were not fit to take the level or weight of this traffic. Concern was expressed about the utilities on site, lack of infrastructure including health services in East Cowes
- The heritage of the site was important and how the company had changed several times. Concern was also expressed regarding amount of traffic, unsuitable access, less green space, more dangerous roads, and that East Cowes would turn into a way station for traffic.
- The seafront was on reclaimed land. Currently, pedestrians can use this area safely. When development occurs this will not be the case. The numbers of cars and ancillary vehicles anticipated has not been made clear in the application
- Traffic issues in New Barn Rd and access to the seafront. It was estimated that there could be 400 cars together with many delivery and service vehicles all exiting onto seafront exits. It was stated that this was a flood plain and unsuitable. It would divide two areas of green space and ruin it. It could also affect use of the public slipway. Pollution levels would rise, and the land was known to be blue slipper which was unstable. Concerns were reiterated about the lack of infrastructure and sewage. The development was felt to be too big and in the wrong place.

The meeting was suspended at this point owing to disruption by member of the public. The police were called to attend. Cllrs Love, Hendry and Palin were absent from the meeting at this point discussing matters with the police.

Meeting resumed at 18.54 p.m. Cllrs Love, Hendry and Palin returned

Public Forum resumed and comments made by the public were:

- The Esplanade was gifted to the people of East Cowes

- Serious concerns about the constant traffic this would generate on the Esplanade and the safety of the children using the area. There is also a caravan park in close proximity, and it was not felt that this was the right location for a new development
- A housing development near a caravan park business was not wanted
- There would be a detrimental impact on the flora and fauna in the area and the unsuitability of the access onto the Esplanade
- The developers were portraying themselves as the saviour of Norris Castle and that there was no one else who could save the castle. But this should not be done at the expense of wrecking the town
- Old Rd traffic issues and the ferry traffic already stopping access. This development would only make the situation worse.
- Traffic on Old Rd would mean children were at risk and could be killed
- Developers traffic assessment states traffic going eastward would go up Old Rd and westward use the floating bridge - so in fact all would go up Old Rd.
- Would the council agree that the development would harm the fabric and setting of a listed building and Spring Hill field could be used for enabling development
- Is company going to provide any affordable housing?
- No guarantees that the money from the sale of the houses will be spent on Norris Castle
- Traffic on the seafront, if two articulated lorries met on that road how could that work – a child could be killed. Safety of children on esplanade should be a priority, this location is not the right place for this development
- Don't need to build on Grade1 listed land

42/22 APOLOGIES

Apologies were given and accepted from Cllrs Webster and Walker who were unwell.

43/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Declarations of non-pecuniary interests were given by Cllr Packham who lives on a neighbouring estate

2.2 No written requests for dispensations were received

44/22 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th March 2022 were agreed and signed

Resolved: To agree the minutes of the 17th March 2022

45/22 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4.1 Application No: 21/02437/FUL Parish(es): East Cowes Ward(s): East Cowes

Location: Norris Castle Estate with Springhill Estate, New Barn Road, East Cowes, Isle of Wight, PO32 6AZ

Proposal: Hybrid Application to include Full Application: Restoration & conversion of: Grade I Norris Castle to luxury hotel (C1); Grade I Norris Castle Farm, bailiffs house, cottage & walled kitchen garden to spa & wellness centre providing spa residences, treatment rooms, associated retail, restaurant & cafe facilities (sui generis); Grade II Pump House to clubhouse (E(f)); Grade II Cattle Shelters to a resort residence (sui generis), gatehouse & security building (E(g)(i)). Restoration of Grade I Registered Park & Garden including preservation of the grotto & ponds; 4 Grade II stone watering ponds. Construction of: spa residences within walled garden (sui generis); two linked buildings to accommodate hotel services, amenities, swimming pool & additional hotel suites (sui generis); 4 seawall sentinel buildings containing resort residences (sui generis); resort residences (sui generis), boathouse & slipway at harbourside; resort residences within Norris Castle Estate walls (sui generis); dwellings in South West Field (C3); parking areas,

ancillary services, utilities, drainage works, SUDS & substations for resort. Repair and restoration of Seawall including Grade II elements to stabilise the Norris Castle Estate. Consolidation of Grade II Bathing House ruin & construction of associated restaurant (E(b)). Demolition of Modern Barn & change of use of existing barn for resort storage. Creation of resort access road from the Esplanade across Springhill Estate & demolition of section of Norris Castle Estate boundary wall to provide new entrance to resort. Hard & soft landscaping & all enabling & associated works. Outline Application: Construction on Springhill Estate of: senior living units with associated communal facilities (C2); dwellings (C3) including retention & conversion of existing buildings; associated drainage, services, utilities & SUDS; restoration of landscape; resort overflow car park & all enabling & associated works (all matters save for access reserved).

<https://publicaccess.iow.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>

4.2 Application No: 21/02438/LBC Parish(es): East Cowes Ward(s): East Cowes

Location: Norris Castle Estate with Springhill Estate, New Barn Road, East Cowes, Isle of Wight, PO32 6AZ
Listed Building Consent for: internal and external works to restore and convert the Grade I Norris Castle to a luxury hotel and the construction of two linked buildings to accommodate hotel services, amenities, swimming pool and additional hotel suites; internal and external works to restore and convert the Grade I Norris Castle Farm, bailiff's house, cottage and walled kitchen garden to a spa and wellness centre to include the conversion of existing buildings and structures to spa residences, treatment rooms and associated retail, restaurant and cafe facilities and the construction of further spa residences within the walled kitchen garden; internal and external works to restore one Grade II cattle shelter to a gatehouse and security building for the resort; internal and external works to restore, extend and convert the second Grade II cattle shelter to a resort residence; external works to consolidate and make safe the Grade II Bathing House ruin and the construction of an associated restaurant building; the construction of four sentinel buildings on the seawall with resort apartments; external repair and restoration works to convert the Grade II Pump House to a clubhouse; the restoration of the Grade II listed seawall and repair of the remaining seawall; the repair and restoration of the four Grade II stone watering ponds; the repair and conservation of the grotto and the restoration of the man-made ponds; and the demolition of a section of the Norris Castle Estate boundary wall to allow for a new entrance to the resort.

<https://publicaccess.iow.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>

It was proposed and agreed that both applications would be considered at the same time.

Resolved: To deal with both applications together

Martha James (MJ), who was employed to advise the council on both applications began by explaining that the application site is unique on the Island, in terms of the range of protected heritage assets all in one place:

- Norris Castle (Grade I park and garden; NHLE 1000927)
- Norris Castle (Grade I listed building; NHLE 1267468)
- The Farmstead: Norris Castle Farm, the bailiff's house, cottage, and walled kitchen garden (Grade I listed building; NHLE 1223182)
- Pump House at Norris Castle (Grade II listed building; NHLE 1438954)
- Bathing House and a 50m length of raised sea wall at Norris Castle (Grade II listed building; NHLE 1438948)
- 2 x Cattle Shelter at Norris Castle (Grade II listed buildings; NHLE 1438962 and NHLE 1438966)
- 4 x Stone-lined watering pond at Norris Castle Grade II listed buildings; NHLE 1438968, 1438970, 1438971, 1438975)

MJ stated that the applicant is not claiming within this application that the proposals are enabling development to protect Norris Castle or the other designated heritage assets on the estate but claims that these works are required, or the buildings will never be repaired and will fall into further decline.

She explained that enabling development is development that would not be in compliance with local and/or national planning policies, and not normally be given planning permission, except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset.

National Planning Policy "208. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies."

"Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. When considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification." *Enabling Development and Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4, page 2:*

"The case for enabling development rests on there being a conservation deficit. Simply put, this is the amount by which the cost of repair (and conversion to optimum viable use if appropriate) of a heritage asset exceeds its market value on completion of repair or conversion, allowing for appropriate development costs." *Enabling Development and Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4, page 3*

"Under the enabling development mechanism, decision-makers will usually require market testing to explore the possibility of different owners or different uses providing an alternative to enabling development, thereby reducing the scale of enabling development needed" *Enabling Development and Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4, page 4*

MJ believes the reason the applicant is insisting this isn't enabling development is because they haven't market tested the site and the documents are confused on whether it is enabling development or not.

Within the Norris Castle Market report, it states "The Norris Estate Resort, so specified, would be a viable operation. Without the creation of this resort as specified, the value of the Castle and Farmstead conversions on completion would be too low to justify the substantial investment from Norris Castle Estate (Group) Ltd. that is needed to repair, restore and convert the Estate's two Grade I buildings and conserve all of the other designated heritage assets that make up the exceptional group in which much of its historic interest lies." paragraph 1.8 Within the planning statement "1.16 Although the Proposal is not advanced as enabling development – as this Planning Statement shows, the Proposal accords with planning policy overall – the conservation deficit concept is nonetheless helpful here: in considering what the OVU of the Norris Castle Estate's heritage assets is, which is expressly relevant to the balancing exercise required by NPPF paragraph 202; in understanding the benefits that arise from cross-funding the repairs and restoration of the assets that are at risk; and considering the overall quantum of development and the justification for it."

Why does this matter? If it is enabling development, then the decision makers would look at wider considerations than the material considerations and the local plan. They would consider protecting the heritage asset, and that consideration might override the local plan policies. Norris Castle is on the 'at risk' register, and the records currently say: Condition: Generally unsatisfactory with major localised problems; Vulnerability: High; Trend: Declining

The reason the building is at risk is the lack of repairs and investment for a significant amount of time.

MJ went on to say, if this isn't enabling development, is it acceptable in planning terms?

The relevant planning policies for this application are:

SP1 Spatial Strategy - the Council does not have a 5-year housing supply, so any housing within the scheme must be assessed against National Planning Policy: would it harm the heritage assets, and whether it is in a sustainable location.

SP2 Housing: SP3 Economy: SP4 Tourism: SP5 Environment - seeks to support and protect heritage assets: SP7 Travel: DM2 Design Quality for New Development: DM4 Locally Affordable Housing - if this is not enabling development, there is no justification to not include affordable housing within the scheme DM5 Housing for Older People: DM11 Historic and Built Environment: DM12 Landscape, Seascape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity: DM14 Flood Risk: DM15 Coastal Management

MJ said that this is a difficult site, and there might have to be some compromises to find a use that is acceptable and provides some stability for its long-term protection, but this scheme has development in every space. There is not enough detail of the harm that each aspect of the development would cause, and why that harm is justified. The lack of detail means that this application is deficient.

MJ then went on to summarise her findings on each element within the planning application.

1 Norris Castle

MJ explained that East Cowes was unique in that it both a Grade 1 listed building and Grade 1 listed parkland are included in this application. It was felt to be a highly complicated application to comment on and a great deal to understand. She had found that there were conflicting things in the application.

The application stated that the houses had to be built in order to save a listed building and she could not understand why the developer states it is not enabling development. Under the enabling development mechanism, decision-makers will usually require market testing to explore the possibility of different owners or different uses providing an alternative to enabling development, thereby reducing the scale of enabling development needed. She felt that the reason the developers were insisting that this was not enabling development was because they have not market tested the site. The documentation is confused on whether it is enabling or not.

MJ felt that it was clear that Councillors and East Cowes people want to protect Norris Castle and the historic landscape and accept that there might need to be change to secure its long term protection, but this should not be at any cost.

She was not convinced that it is possible to have a 5-star hotel in the size of rooms seen during the site visit and if this scheme were approved, there could be challenges to increase the size of the rooms, which would significantly affect the building. Norris Castle is unusual in that Grade I listed buildings are not normally domestic in scale, another unique aspect of the building that would be lost if this hotel were approved.

It is claimed, by the applicant, that the castle is moving owing to the geology of the site. Historic England confirmed that there is no evidence that the Castle is moving, or that there is subsidence. They have confirmed that they have had structural reports carried out, with no evidence that within 100 years the Castle will be in the sea. There was no evidence of damp in the building and the real gem of the property was the kitchen which was original 30's and appeared to be intact. There is no mention in the plans about this, so we would assume that it would be lost. This would be a loss to the Listed Building that should not be supported. MJ felt that the plans provide insufficient detail to properly assess which aspects of the building will remain, which needs to be repaired, or why there are no detailed plans of the windows, or other important design features. Without this detail, it is hard to assess the impact. The carriage entrance area to the Castle is large and very imposing. If a mezzanine was constructed in this area it would detract from this original space. MJ stated that the changes proposed in the application do not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or local plan policies SP5, DM2 or DM11.

Bathing House

MJ said there is no justification as to why a restaurant is necessary in this location, as the stabilising works required for this building are much smaller in scale than would justify the need to have a restaurant there. The plans state that the restaurant's design makes it subservient to the Bathing House, when in fact the restaurant would be the dominant use in this location, and the bathing house walls would simply be retained as a facade. The additional materials required for the restaurant would detract from the bathing house and would create an odd mix of the previous use and the new use.

It is unclear as to what the materials are to be used. On the plans it looks industrial and out of keeping with the area. On the master plan a footpath route is shown to the bathing house, but the impacts of the route on the protected trees in the area is not clear. No materials for the route are shown and such details are important when considering the gradient of the land and the landscape.

There are no lighting details which would be necessary for safety. The lighting on the footpath could impact naturalised visual appearance of the land to the north of Norris Castle, leading down to the bathing hut. It is not clear if the ecologist considered the impact of the footpath through the woodland area. Again, lack of detail results in inability to fully assess this aspect.

On the illustrative plans there are retaining walls to the rear of the restaurant. It is not clear what the impact of the walls would have on the woodland to the rear but visually they would break the natural setting of the Norris Castle Estate, as they are incongruous.

Island Roads has raised concerns about internal roadways; "The access roads serving Sentinel 1, the Eastern and Western Lodges and the Bathing House Restaurant (drawing no. RE1654-Z1-P-L113 Rev 02) fails to provide for two-way traffic movements at the junction with the spine road, along their length with the layouts also failing to provide adequate space for the turning of service vehicles / fire appliance access."

Island Roads have also said, "Inadequate Layout - Sentinel 1, the Eastern and Western Lodges and the Bathing House Restaurant. The access and on-site highway layout as detailed on drawing no. drawing no. RE1654-Z1-P-L113 Rev 02 is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable width, layout, service vehicle access and turning and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

MJ noted the comments by the Environment Agency in relation to flooding: "The proposed development would restrict essential maintenance and emergency access to the sea wall. The permanent retention of a continuous unobstructed area is an essential requirement for future maintenance and improvement work. The proposed development is likely to adversely affect the construction and stability of the sea wall which will compromise its function. The proposal will therefore increase the risk of flooding to the local community." The Environment Agency stated "The submitted FRA does not comply with the requirements for site specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance."

MJ stated that this element does not comply with Core Strategy policy DM2 in terms of highway safety, and in terms of design and impact on the protected landscape. The Town Council should object in terms of the flood risks of this structure, and deficient information supplied with the application.

West Field

MJ stated that within the West Field the listed structures are retained, but there are additional structures proposed described as houses sculpted into the landform. At the site visit the developer and architect referred to the holiday units as housing which was questioned. Although housing and holiday homes are in the same Use Class (Use Class Order) they are used differently, and the impact differently on the community.

MJ felt the units would be in an unsustainable location and were unnecessarily subterranean, which added to the cost of the overall build of the site. The application does not make it clear how these units would fit into the surroundings and footpaths and roadways created to service these buildings would be visible.

Sentinels

MJ stated that these structures would appear completely incongruous in the overall design of the site. There appear to be new walls behind them which are not shown on the plans, and it is unclear how these walls would fit in the site, in relation to the protected trees. Without this additional information, it is hard to determine the harm they might cause.

There are Island Roads comments shown above that raises concerns about the internal road access for these buildings. Island Roads also said "Inadequate Layout - Sentinel 4, Coastal Cottages. The access and on-site highway layout as detailed on drawing no. drawing no. RE1654-Z1-P-L111 Rev 02 is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable width, layout, service vehicle access and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

Comments from the Environment Agency about flooding also apply to these buildings where there is a sea wall, which will not be maintained beyond 2025 by the local authority.

MJ stated that the Sentinels buildings do not accord with Island Plan Policies DM2, SP5 or DM11.

Castle Crescent

MJ stated that although this is not visually appealing, she did not feel that this would cause as much visual harm as other aspects, due to the subterranean aspect of this structure.

Concern was raised about light leakage from the windows above ground and regarding whether the ventilation chimneys would look incongruous when viewed across the wider landscape. More information on light leakage is required and until then the application does not accord with Island Plan Policy DM12.

Castle Terrace

MJ stated that Historic England (HE) have confirmed that this aspect is damaging to the setting of Norris Castle. MJ agreed with HE as it would break up the setting of the undulating natural appearance of the land beneath the Castle towards the sea. In addition, the terrace would cost a lot of money, and doesn't protect the Castle itself.

The roof light to the corridor might create light leakage, within the AONB setting. This aspect of the scheme, as it does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, or policies DM2, DM11 or DM12.

Coastal Cottages

MJ stated that the comments from Island Roads about the sentinel building also apply to the coastal cottages. These cottages are viewed in a cluster of buildings which includes sentinel 4. MJ felt that the coastal cottages and the fourth sentinel building would bring a large number of bulky buildings to a section of the coast where there are currently none and would create an urbanising cluster of buildings which would detract from the Castle and the surrounding landscape setting.

MJ stated that these buildings did not accord with the NPPF or policies DM2 or DM11 of the Island Plan.

Farmstead and walled garden

MJ stated that the setting, the structures, and the walled garden were special and should be protected as a very high priority. The applicant claims that the wall of the walled garden is collapsing as there are no foundations, and the only way to stabilise it is to build holiday homes on the inside. The other alternative they mentioned on site were buttresses, that they claimed would be ugly.

MJ stated that many historic structures have buttresses, and the harm caused by the holiday homes might be greater than buttresses. Without information as to where the buttresses would be, or how many, it is difficult to comment on whether buttresses would look worse. There is no evidence as to whether other options had been considered, such as underpinning; and without this information, it is not possible to make a meaningful comment on whether the cottages would be the best structural solution for the protection of the walled garden.

MJ believed they would not enhance the setting; due to the number and the appearance and they would significantly affect the setting of the walled garden. Within the plans RE1654-Z1-P-L518, there is a note to say that the holiday units would be separated from the wall, so it is questionable that these units are there for stabilising the wall.

MJ stated that it is clear in the plans that there is a drive to build in absolutely every part of the site, to maximise all the buildings possible. The heritage assets appear to be a secondary consideration within this application. There is a question whether the subterranean aspects proposed within the walled garden would cause additional destabilising of the wall. This aspect risks could cause great harm both structurally and visually to the walled garden.

The additional structures proposed for holiday accommodation, called spa residences, are cramped in terms of space that they offer, and are not the high-quality accommodation that the applicant claimed on site.

MJ did not believe that these should be supported, as they would create clutter in the Grade I Listed walled garden and model farm. In addition, within the walled garden, the accommodation is two storeys, and only the top of the wall can be seen. MJ felt that these structures were also visually incongruous in the setting and detract from walled garden.

Within the plans, the land is shown as flat. It is hard to see within the walled garden whether the level is the same inside as outside, but on the outside of the walled garden, it is clear the land slopes away. This might mean that the proposed units in fact protrude above the wall of the walled garden.

These proposals do not accord with the NPPF, or Core Strategy policies SP5, DM2 or DM11.

Modern Barn residences

MJ stated that the modern barn residences do not cause harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings, and is the least damaging aspect of the proposals within this application. In her view the proposed units appear suburban and are not high quality, but as they would replace a large modern barn building, the proposed units do not cause harm in visual terms.

Island Roads say "Inadequate Layout - Modern Barn Residences and Farmworkers Cottages (Spa / Resort Residences)

The access and on-site highway layout as detailed on drawing no. drawing no. RE1654-Z1-P-L108 Rev 02 is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable parking layout and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

Farmworkers Cottages

MJ was unable to find the elevations of these cottages and so was unable to comment about the design of these structures. It is unclear whether these are existing buildings, or new structures. The description of the application simply calls all the holiday units, outside of specified areas, resort residences. They are listed on the planning list for the master plan, but as there are no elevations, it is confusing.

If these are new build dwellings, it appears that these cottages are close to English Oaks. One of the trees listed in the tree report as 1144, is described in the report as "Large dominant specimen; member of a group of trees that together form a significant feature in the landscape; of particular visual importance; of significant conservation or other cultural value; essential component of the group within which it stands; of high quality, high landscape and significant cultural value, and of long-term potential." It appears that the farmworkers cottages would be within the root protection area of this tree.

South West Field - 15 houses using New Barn access

MJ stated that the Island Roads comment is: "The access and on-site highway layout attributable to the South West Field as detailed on drawing no. RE1654-Z1-P-L110 Rev 02 is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable width, layout, parking provision and service vehicle access and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

MJ was very concerned that this access will be used for an additional 15 houses when New Barn Road is narrow for some of the route. It should be noted that the route is illuminated, but as the route is tarmac, drivers wouldn't necessarily realise that this is a shared access route. This access would require a pavement along the road to ensure pedestrian safety. In addition, at the New Barn Road junction with Old Road, Island Roads raises concerns about whether this is a pedestrian safe crossing route.

MJ raised concerns in terms of visibility.

Island Roads states "Inadequate Access Visibility / Width – New Barn Road. The access detailed to serve the site from New Barn Road is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable visibility, width and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy." and "Inadequate Pedestrian Connectivity – New Barn Road.

The proposal fails to provide suitable pedestrian facilities within New Barn Road, at the junction of New Barn Road with Old Road and onward to the local footway network and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

The layout of the houses as shown on the plans is quite poor, with all the houses cramped to the outer space, resulting in properties which have an urban, side to side distance. MJ noted the large green area within the centre and stated that it is unclear whether this is publicly accessible, or simply for the residents. If it is for the residents, the costs of maintaining this land would fall to them, and this might make the ground rent high.

MJ assumed that the owner is thinking of a gated community development, creating a premium for the housing. The location of the units in MJ's opinion results in housing which doesn't really bear any relationship with the setting. The design of the houses features very large footprints, but quite poor quality.

As the Isle of Wight Council does not currently have a five-year housing supply, the site must be assessed against the NPPF, which means the site for these houses must be sustainable.

Anyone living in these units would have to walk along a road with no pavement to access the bus stop which is some considerable distance from the application site. MJ did not believe the site was sustainable in terms of public transport access.

MJ noted that the housing proposed does not meet the identified housing need for the area. As this housing is not enabling development for the Listed Buildings, the applicant should be required to provide affordable housing in line with Island Plan Policy DM4.

Finally, MJ noted that the housing proposed within this cluster is not balanced in terms of the size of the units, or the number of bedrooms. This does not accord with Island Plan Policy DM3. It conflicts with Island Plan Policy DM2, due to the highway risks and the overall design of the houses.

Also, there is no affordable housing, and there is no balanced housing provision proposed, so it does not accord with Island Plan policies DM3 or DM4.

Springhill Housing - including senior living accommodation, and housing OUTLINE

MJ stated that it is important to note that this aspect of the scheme is **outline**, which means that the location and design of the housing shown could change. The application description doesn't include the number of the units as an upper limit.

The outline application considers the scheme in principle, and the access. All other reserved matters are not part of this application, which includes appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale.

It is noted that there is no affordable housing proposed within any of the housing aspects, and this does not accord with Island Plan Policy DM4.

As this scheme is not enabling development for the Listed Building, there is no justification for not including affordable housing.

With this in mind, MJ concentrated on the highway aspect, as that is more certain. It is clear from the Island Roads comments that this aspect raises serious concerns. Within the Island Roads comments, there is a serious shortfall in the parking provision on the site. When compared against the Council's parking SPD, there are 241 parking spaces proposed against a requirement for 365 within the SPD.

It is noted that the applicant has supplied a document Travel Plan Framework, which indicates that staff will use alternative means to travel to work. There is proposed an overflow car park, but within the documentation, it is clear that this will be used by staff and others, and so is not really an overflow car park.

In light of this, if the Isle of Wight Council is minded to approve the scheme, there would have to be suitable conditions that would enforce the provisions outlined in the Travel Plan Framework. MJ noted that the overflow car park is in the outline application. That means it is likely there would have to be a Grampian style condition, as the requirement for the overflow car park is for both the outline and full planning uses.

The Esplanade is the proposed as the access route for all development on the site, apart from the SW Field. This would result in a significant amount of additional traffic into this area, which is a popular area for children and families.

Island Roads have raised concerns about a reduction in the Practical Reserve Capacity on the Castle Street / Red Funnel Access / Waitrose. As the applicant hasn't provided mitigation, then the application doesn't comply with local plan policy SP7.

MJ was concerned that all construction traffic into the site would have to come through the Esplanade direction, and whilst the applicant can demonstrate that mud won't be deposited on the road, the scale of development proposed within this application would result in a significant amount of HGV's in this location, resulting in potential impact on the highway network at Cambridge Road / Maresfield Road.

If this scheme were approved, the comments by Island Roads should be fully supported in that a scheme implementing a "One Way system utilising Columbine Road in addition to Maresfield Road to minimise the risk of two HGV's meeting on the local residential network" (Island Roads comment page 25 construction impact).

Island Roads recommends refusal in relation to: "Generation of Traffic – substandard junction Cambridge Road / Old Road. The proposed development would be likely to lead to increased use of the junction of Cambridge Road with Old Road which is limited in respect to junction visibility and would add unduly to the hazards of highway users and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy." "Inadequate Junction Intervisibility Visibility / Width /

Footway Width – Esplanade. The proposed signalised junction detailed to serve the site from Esplanade is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable intervisibility, width and footway width and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

"Inadequate Layout Outline Parcel 2 The access and onsite highway layout attributable to development Parcel 2 is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable width, layout, parking provision, pedestrian connectivity and service vehicle loading, unloading parking and turning facilities and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy." Island Roads also stated;

"Inadequate Layout Outline Parcel 3 & 4. The access and onsite highway layout attributable to development Parcel 3 & 4 is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of unacceptable width, layout, parking provision, and service vehicle access and would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy."

This conflicts with Island Plan Policy DM2 for highway safety risks. There is also a lack of affordable housing provision, which is contrary to Island Plan Policy DM4.

In summary, MJ stated that she would not recommend the Town Council supporting either of these applications for the reasons stated in her conclusions.

Town Councillors collectively agreed that they could not support the applications based on the reasons identified in MJ's report and that the applications did not accord with the Island Plan Policies or the National Planning Policy Framework as identified in MJ's report. A comprehensive letter, detailing the reasons for objections, would be prepared by MJ and be sent to the Planning Authority to support the Council's objections.

Resolved: To object to both applications

46/22 PLATINUM JUBILEE

The Council considered purchasing jubilee mementos and paper crowns for East Cowes schoolchildren

Resolved: To purchase card crowns and jubilee coins for the pre-school and schoolchildren of East Cowes

Meeting closed at 8.45pm