

SHALFLEET PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A PLANNING MEETING OF SHALFLEET PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT NEWBRIDGE COMMUNITY CENTRE ON MONDAY 1ST JULY 2019 AT 7.15 PM

Present: Cllrs G Head (Chair), H Hewston, S Stables, I Broad
Clerk: Mrs S Woods
16 members of the public

49/19-20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Cllrs: S Cowley, A Burt

50/19-20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST REGARDING AGENDA ITEMS: Agreed to give as and when necessary.

51/19-20 TO ACCEPT ANY DISPENSATIONS FOR AGENDA ITEMS: None received.

52/19-20 PLANNING:

a. Updates and Decision: None.

b. To Agree comment on applications (for each application 5 minutes are allowed for applicant/objector/supporter etc. to comment):

19/00246/FUL Land rear of Fernlea, Ningwood Hill Shalfleet: continued use of land as an extension to waste transfer station to allow composting of green waste; retention of hardstanding; replacement hedge and bund.

Details of objections received from local residents noted by Cllrs, as well as letter from AONB Planning Officer.

Resident asked PC about the fact the application was for ‘continued use...’ The Chairman explained it was a retrospective planning application. The Clerk gave some background which had been given on the previous application; an Enforcement Notice had been served on the site, then a planning application had been submitted which has subsequently been refused. One of the differences in this application is that it did not mention the access track into Cranmore Avenue.

The Chairman explained that the PC are a local body, with no powers and that the comment they submit to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) counts as one comment, no different from an individual. Sometimes local knowledge is useful. The PC does use a list of material considerations when commenting and can ask the LPA to note past comments and history of a site.

A resident asked it be noted that the previous application had been for ‘Cranmore Park’ and this for ‘Land rear of Fernlea’, which she felt confusing.

The Chairman read the comments submitted by the PC on the previous application and the grounds they objected to this. It was noted that the present application did not mention access via Cranmore Avenue. She proposed the PC support the AONB comments and object to this application on the same grounds as previously – **resolved** – comments as follows:

The site is in an AONB - they agree with the comments made by AONB on this application.

The land in question is closely adjacent to an SSSI.

It is out of scale and character with the rural setting.

It would bring noise and nuisance to residents, especially those living near the site.

Drainage issues - surface drainage in the lower area of Cranmore is a problem. Run off surface water affects a wide complex of ditches and streams - pollution would be a disaster.

Highway safety - increased traffic generation, when visibility on to the main Yarmouth Road is restricted.

Airborne and ground pollution is a major concern.

The Parish Council note that HSE.gov guidelines state a 250m radius should be maintained from composting sites. There are approximately 28 residential properties within this radius, some as close as 10m to the boundary.

Resident pointed out that the site owner/applicant, was present. A resident said when they had a search undertaken on their property in 2015 this site had not come up.

The Chairman asked applicant if he would like to speak and he agreed. Said he had been there 40 years. He had applied to the Environment Agency and obtained a licence for the site and was regulated by them. He recycles green waste which is ploughed back into the fields. He had believed his site came under agricultural and horticultural regulations and did not think he required planning permission.

The Chairman queried how the enforcement notice came about and the applicant said someone had complained to planners so he had put in a retrospective application. He also confirmed he had a license for recycling metal and did this inside with sealed tanks. He has an operating license 8 am to 5 pm Monday to Friday. Has another for use of his lorries 24/7.

The Chairman thanked the applicant for explaining his side of things and said he had been fair.

The Chairman pointed out that noise pollution was not down to the PC but the Environment Agency, who could be asked to visit and record levels.

The applicant said that green waste was shredded 1 – 1 ½ hours every 6 weeks and turned every 2 weeks.

Resident asked the applicant about the road he had started that went through the field and whether he intended to finish it – he replied it depends on whether he gets permission. He said the gateway had been there all his life and he had recently used it to bring the hay in.

The Chairman confirmed that as this roadway/access was not part of the current application this could not be commented on.

Resident mentioned the red boundary line and the fact Natural England was querying this. The Chairman confirmed this was not a material planning consideration.

The applicant said he was happy for people to ask questions. He said it was a retrospective application for the green waste side of the business.

Resident asked if the fact The Island was now an UNESCO site had a bearing on planning applications. Cllr Hewston said at the moment it did not as there was no policy on this yet.

Resident asked the applicant what the tubular building was for – not mentioned in the plans. He said this was so scrap was not in the field, which was full of wildflowers.

The Chairman said she felt residents had been given their chance to comment on the application. Cllrs **resolved** to object to the application on the grounds given above.

The applicant said if anyone wished to come round and see him on site, they were welcome.

The applicant for this application and the members of public left the meeting after thanking the PC.

19/00290/FUL The Dovecote, Clay Lane, Newbridge: Demolition of dwelling and garage; proposed replacement 2 storey dwelling with single storey wing; garage.
Cllr Stables declared a personal interest as she knows the applicant.
After discussion the PC agreed they did not object to the dwelling but believed the construction materials – cedar cladding, was not in keeping with the street scene.

19/00305/HOU 3 Waters Edge, Port La Salle, Bouldnor, Shalfleet: Proposed jetty.
The PC had no objections to this planning application.

19/00319/HOU Rose Cottage, Main Road, Shalfleet: Proposed single storey rear extension.
The PC agreed they had no objection to this application but ask that the planners uphold the comments made by AONB regarding the roof lights.

19/00320/LBC Rose Cottage, Main Road, Shalfleet: Proposed single storey rear extension.
The PC agreed they had no objection to this application but ask that the planners uphold the comments made by AONB regarding the roof lights.

19/00325/19 Westbrook Yard, Main Road, Shalfleet: Proposed conversion and extension to industrial storage building to single dwelling; relocation of vehicular access.
The PC agreed they object to this planning application and ask that the comments made by Island Roads be sustained

The meeting closed at 8.05 pm

Signed.....