

## **SHALFLEET PARISH COUNCIL**

### **MINUTES OF A PLANNING MEETING OF SHALFLEET PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT PARISH OFFICE, NEWBRIDGE ON WEDNESDAY, 30<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2015 AT 7.15 PM**

**Present:** Cllrs H Hewston (Chair), P Myles, S French, J McGuirk, B Baxandall

Clerk: Mrs S Woods

15 members of the public

IW County Press Reporter

After the Clerk had ascertained that all members of the public were present to object to the planning application for West Wight Alpacas, she referred to the PC Standing Orders where it stated that if a group of members of public wished to make representation they would be required to nominate a representative from among themselves to speak and the total time allowed for this was to not exceed 30 minutes. The Clerk asked members of the public to speak amongst themselves, appoint one or two representatives and collate their objections and the Parish Council would then hear these.

The Clerk pointed out that Mr Payne had invited residents of Thorley and Wellow (along with members of Shalfleet PC and Cllr Hutchinson) to a public meeting at West Wight Alpacas on Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2015 from 4 – 5 pm: offering a farm walk and talk about the animals, which will last about 30 minutes, followed by a 30 minute question and answer session about the business. Free tea or coffee.

Those present noted that the planning application for the variation of condition for the West Wight Alpacas had been withdrawn until after the Public meeting, confirmation of this had been received from the IWC, therefore this application would not be discussed tonight and was taken off the Agenda. A new consultation period would commence when the application was re-submitted, although it was noted that the 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2015 deadline was still on the IWC website.

**79/15-16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Cllr P Broadhead, County Cllr S Hutchinson

**80/15-16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**81/15-16 TO ACCEPT ANY DISPENSATIONS FOR AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**82/15-16 PLANNING: a) To Agree comments on application (for each application 5 minutes are allowed for applicant/objector etc. to comment up to a maximum of 30 minutes):**

**P/01051/15 – West Wight Alpacas, land access off, Main Road, Wellow:** Formation of vehicular access.

It was noted that as of this morning, there were nine letters of objection on the IWC website for this application and some Cllrs had looked at these.

The Chairman asked the members of public for their comments and these were given by several residents of Wellow, as follows:

- Applicants state they envisage 10,000 visitors to WW Alpacas each year – concern over volume of traffic
- Constant flow of vehicles in the village causing a traffic hazard in narrow roads
- Ancient hamlet – second entrance from commercial/tourist attraction will destroy the natural rural environment
- Applicant already has an existing gated vehicular access to the land
- Visual impact – lack of technical information in the planning application is misleading – impact on land – resident had brought this to the attention of the planning officer
- Resident happy for Cllrs to visit their property to look at proposals
- Planning application implies a simple opening but it is not – there is a 1.5 m high embankment for which a ramp would need creating to access into the field and to achieve the required gradient this would have to go back into the field by some 15 – 20 m and the sides would need to be graded
- Concern over the width of the access – query made of it being 11 m
- Safety issues a concern – vehicles do not stick to 30 mph speed limit, with narrow road, no footpath and buses using the road
- One resident had a convex mirror which would be compromised if access went ahead
- Drainage issues could be a problem with water run off into a road to properties opposite which were susceptible to flooding, with no gullies in place
- Application not felt to be in accordance with policy DM2
- Not a natural break in the hedge – it had not been there until earlier in the year, about the time Wellow Green hedge was removed and replanted
- Original entrance was also raised up above the road and this went ahead and had been widened with water run off implications
- Concern over width of access/highway – 4.8m width allows for service vehicle and car to pass – actual width planned was 6m – enough for two way traffic
- Ask PC to bear in mind people are greatly concerned as the access would change the environment of the village and also the fact there was no support for it
- Mention of certain rumours circulating regarding the site and future plans

The Chairman thanked everyone for their comments and said the Cllrs would now be discussion the application and agreeing their comments for it and she asked for no interruptions and if it got out of hand she would have to adjourn the meeting but hoped it would not come to that.

Cllr Baxandall commented there used to be a vehicular access to this field but it had been sealed off, fenced and sold. She queried having a gateway in the middle of a field (in the hedge) where livestock were concerned and said they must be tame as sometimes animals difficult to round up. Asked why need for a second access when there was already access on land which joins up behind cottages along the road – she did not feel there was a proved need for a second access.

Cllr Myles said she did think someone was trying to run a viable business, creating jobs. She took on board the objections but queried if they wanted to build up the business if there was a need for an agricultural access, as planned. She had listened to the objections and felt it a shame problems were raised in the village from the application.

Cllr French said he was looking forward to Saturday to find out more about the site. Aware once upon a time there had been mention of module buildings going on the site. He queried the reason for the access for general agricultural purposes but did not really understand what it was for and felt there was insufficient data. He had taken on board the comments made about height, angle and possible run off of water but said he lived in an area which was worse, in terms of a narrow road and not a lot happens. Noted there was an existing access across fields and queried the necessity for another.

Cllr McGuirk said strong comments and objections had to be balanced against agricultural need for Mr & Mrs Payne's business. Already an existing access and aware residents felt amenity a disturbance. He felt technical/road issues were up to the IWC to look into. Mentioned character of the village being altered with another hedge being taken out, right to have lawful activities and continued disturbance to residents.

Cllr Myles commented it was not a very good hedgerow, with a lot of elm in it. The Chairman said when the existing access had been applied for a check had been made on the quality of that hedge and 'not a leg to stand on'.

The Chairman did not think other access points had been looked into, said there is an access round the back and queried drainage – felt more explanation of need could have been given.

The Chairman pointed out the PC did not make the final decision on the planning application but purely sent comments on it to the IWC Planning Department. She asked for a show of hands from Cllrs and it was unanimous that the PC vote to object to the planning application on the ground of:

- Change to the amenity – proposed access would mean further change to the village (an ancient hamlet) and disturbance to residents
- Visual Amenity – proposal would affect the character of the road and village
- Noise/disturbance resulting from use
- Traffic generation/Highway safety – added traffic in a narrow road could cause problems
- Drainage – run off from the field would be channelled down the proposed access into the road and nearby houses and this not thought to be acceptable
- Risk of flooding – ramped access up and over an embankment, with a change in the slope causing water runoff would increase the flooding risk to nearby properties
- Cllrs also felt insufficient data had been given and questioned the need for the second access.

The meeting closed at 7.50 pm

Signed.....