



MINUTES OF A PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

VENTNOR CENTRAL

6PM

15 JANUARY 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Jim Toogood (Chair), Councillors Tony Marvin, Ed Gouge and Brian Lucas.

ITEM SUBJECT

1) APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence as all Members were present.

2) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest received.

3) PUBLIC FORUM

There were 45 members of the public present.

The meeting started at 6 pm.

- a) The Chair opened the meeting by introducing the Members of the Planning Committee and drawing attention to the draft resolution made available to the public at the start of the meeting. He explained that the application is only concerned with the on-shore element of the Perpetuus project.
- b) Over 20 members of the public expressed strong objections to and concerns about the proposed development; only a few gave their names so the following is a list of those expressed objections and concerns:
 - the application proposes to use the wrong site and should be away from the houses and certainly not on the Flowersbrook site;
 - the public consultation was seriously inadequate;
 - the proposed change of use is contrary to D1 5/29;
 - the visual impact study is only in two dimensions, using incomplete information and illustrated from carefully selected view points;
 - Flowersbrook field itself an important element of Ventnor's landscape and must be preserved;
 - the application is too open-ended leaving the field open to further and future industrial development;
 - for genuine consultation information must be presented in a comprehensible form and within an adequate time frame; neither applies with this application;
 - this must not be allowed to happen: its continuing use by families and children is essential;
 - other options have not been properly considered;
 - it is unlikely that the geology of the area can support the development;
 - this would amount to desecration of a wonderful site;
 - Perpetuus wants to use Flowersbrook because it's the cheapest option whereas the Industrial Estate would be a much more suitable site;
 - does the Isle of Wight Council have a conflict of interest as a shareholder in Perpetuus Energy?
 - this is a kite flying exercise;
 - most of the development will be on red squirrel land and is much too close to residential properties;
 - the report mentions piling for the foundations – is piling acceptable on that site?
 - this is ill-thought-out, desktop planning not in touch with the realities of local life.

4) MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The Minutes of the Meeting of 8 January 2015 were unanimously agreed as a correct record by those who were present at the meeting.

5) PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- a) P/01485/14: FLOWERSBROOK, STEEPHILL ROAD
- b) The Chair opened the Committee's consideration of the application by reminding members of the matters under consideration.
- c) Councillor Ed Gouge said: the original consultation had made no mention of the five options and these needed to be properly assessed and considered. He agreed with the desk top application comment and with the many concerns about the absence of consultation. More details on the impact of the transformer and related technical discussions are necessary. Consequently, the current application needs to be withdrawn.
- d) Councillor Tony Marvin said: clearly more and more detailed consultation is essential.
- e) Councillor Brian Lucas said: planning works by considering the actual applications as they stand and the question is whether further industrialisation of this site is acceptable on any terms at all or could a revised version of Option 2 be acceptable? The applicants must justify to us why they are choosing this pretty site rather than others. I am keen that the problem is solved as both tidal energy and this project have value – but why on this site?
- f) Councillor Jim Toogood said: if it has to go there it should be possible to address most of the concerns expressed at this meeting. There are many issues to be considered and a long way to go before an acceptable application is before us.

It was proposed by Councillor Ed Gouge, seconded by Councillor Jim Toogood and unanimously resolved that:

the Planning Committee of Ventnor Town Council has considered the planning application P/10485/14 and recommends that it be withdrawn by the applicant for the following reasons:-

- 1) The Environmental Impact Statement provides insufficient detail on the evaluation of the five possible options for the onshore element of the Perpetuus application and the reasons for the choice of Flowersbrook as the preferred option.
- 2) The public exhibition of the project essentially dealt with the offshore aspects of the main tidal energy project and gave no information on the five options and very limited information on the current proposed development.
- 3) As Flowersbrook is a sensitive site environmentally and is important for both recreation and tourism, the siting and design of any development in this area needs very careful consideration.

Neither Option 1 nor Option 2 in the planning application is acceptable to the Committee:-

- Option 1 would have a significant visual effect when viewed from the Flowersbrook area both because of the size of the building and because of the industrial character of the fencing. Any tree planting would not have any mitigating effect until over halfway through the lifetime of the development.
 - The building in Option 2 is unnecessarily high and, in this position, does not need to mirror the size of the existing Water Authority building. The Committee considers that, should the applicant be able to demonstrate that the Flowersbrook site is the only suitable option, then a redesigned building located nearer to the Water Authority building would be more effectively shielded from views from the
-

road and the surrounding area. The open substation plant also needs to be shielded both visually and acoustically from nearby residential property.

Should the Isle of Wight Council be minded to approve the current proposal, despite the Town Council's recommendation, then it is essential that a planning condition is attached requiring the development to be demolished after 20 years and the land returned to its previous state.

PUBLIC FORUM

The Chair re-opened the Public Forum:

- a) A member of the public said that we don't know whether the development will stop at an already intrusive development or be added to by further development in the future.
 - b) Another member of the public asked whether it was possible to have the Flowersbrook field included in the Conservation Area.
 - c) A member of the public, experiences in electrical engineering, stated that it was not a practical consideration to be sound deadening the proposed substation and transformer sufficiently to prevent nuisance to surrounding areas.
-

The Meeting closed at 7pm

SIGNED BY THE CHAIR:

DATE:
