

East Cowes Town Council



Minutes of the Planning Meeting of East Cowes Town Council held at the Town Hall, East Cowes on Thursday 18th February 2016 commencing at 6.30 pm

Present:

Mayor: Cllr M. Webster
Cllrs: Barton O.B.E. Hendry, Hillard, Hooper, M. Lloyd, P. Lloyd and Rann
Town Clerk: Tina Bailey
In attendance: Mr Glen Hepburn Planning Consultant.
Members of the public and press: 12

Mr Hepburn outlined the changes of the application. The Town Council joined with the public forum and discussion took place on the following.

- Concerns raised included outfall of foul sewage and the need for the provision of storm water storage.
- Compulsory purchase orders process and loss of community pub
- Deep water access
- Car parking
- Petrol separation
- Slipway
- Housing – height
- Traffic issues – roundabout and traffic lights
- Trailer parking
- Public realm

1/16 APOLOGIES

To receive apologies for absence

2/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

- 2.1 To receive any declarations of pecuniary and non pecuniary interests. None
2.2 To receive and consider granting any written requests for dispensations. None

3/16 TO REVIEW THE FOLLOWING APPLICATION.

TCP/32391 - P/01065/15 - Venture Quays/Trinity House Depot and Wharf/Red Funnel Marshalling Yards located in vicinity of Dover Road and Castle Street, East Cowes.

Full planning permission for demolition of Red Funnel ferry terminal industrial buildings commercial buildings at Trinity House and properties on Dover Road closure of Dover Road western end of Church Path (to the rear of properties on Dover Road) and closure of public access to slipway adjacent to existing ferry link span proposed Red Funnel terminal building with associated marshalling facilities with accesses off Castle Street landscaping and fencing Outline consent for redevelopment of a mix of uses comprising of up to 100 dwellings up to 1850m² of non- residential floor space including retail leisure and commercial premises (Use Classes A1A5 B1 and B2) and 60 bed hotel (being treated as a hybrid application)(additional information received 19.1.16)(re advertised)

The Town Council reviewed and commented on the proposed comments drafted by Mr Hepburn. It was noted that the CPO is not a material consideration.

RESOLVED

That the initial letter plus additional comments approved at the meeting are adopted. (Appended to these minutes)

That Mr Hepburn will redraft the letter for submission by the Town Council in response to the above planning application.

Mayor

Date

For the attention of Mike Gildersleeves
Planning Department
Isle of Wight Council
Seaclose
Fairlee Road
Newport
PO30 2QS

Our Ref: 2158
Your Ref: P/01065/15 – TCP/32391

Dear Mr. Gildersleeves,

Re: P/01065/15 – TCP/32391 Venture Quays/Trinity House Depot and Wharf/Red Funnel Marshalling Yards located in vicinity of Dover Road and Castle Street East Cowes PO32

Thank you for the further opportunity to comment on the revised plans for the above application. We wrote to you on 2nd October 2015 and unfortunately, a lot of the issues that were raised have not been tackled in the resubmission. We need to make it quite clear that East Cowes Town Council do not object in principle to something coming forward on this site but we do need to look closely at the details so that the scheme comes forward in an agreeable manner.

For ease of reference, we have used the titles that were used in the previous letter;

1. The Red Line

There appears to be no movement regarding the Red Line. This does not show the application site in full as the Highway issues are outside of this and form a fundamental part of the application. For example; there is a suggested controlled junction at Waitrose but they have not been notified of this proposal and the junction is not shown on the plans.

This raises further concern as all this Highway land should be adopted, giving the control to the Highway Authority and not Red Funnel. That is, Red Funnel should not be able to control the traffic system in East Cowes. Please can you explain why the applicants have been so selective to where the red line is placed?

2. Road Network System

We have looked at the Transport Seeds supplementary information but it is not clear which scheme is actually coming forward. We appreciate that the application, in part, is in outline but these indicative plans do have the habit of cutting the cloth.

It seems there is a realignment of a roundabout but also there is a possibility of traffic exiting onto this roundabout. This needs to be clarified. Town Council members remain concerned regarding the level of traffic that will be directed to the controlled junction opposite Waitrose and how traffic may take alternative routes through Old Road.

3. Loss of Employment

This is still of concern especially with the approach taken by Red Funnel. We are sure that it should be confidentially sensitive regarding the lease arrangements and the rental rates but the fact is there is a loss of Employment Land.

The statement cleverly argues that the loss of land is roughly 0.5 hectare so there is no need for the policy to kick in.

We are not sure that this is correct as by definition, the amount of Employment Land is been removed from one area even though it may be compensated in another.

4. The Size of the Marshalling Yard & Car Parking

It is interesting to note the forecast for 2030 – 2040 and the justification of the Marshalling Yard. A stepped approach may be more appropriate within the first few years when the car parking is not required and then is put to some more agreeable use such as Employment as stated above or even Town Centre car parking. As demand increases then these temporary benefits could be removed.

A phased approach would be more palatable which should be seen as an advantage to Red Funnel and current users of the site. Coupled with this are Red Funnel expected to undertake a Travel Plan? It would seem unfair that their staff are not encouraged to seek other forms of transport when providers of public services such as schools need to reduce staff travelling.

5. Turning their back on the Town

There has been no give with this and the proposal selfishly turns it back on the Town. We have seen the justification for the location of the main reception building and the safety concerns which is accepted. However, there is nothing to stop direct pathways to the Town Centre from this development and that should be encouraged.

It would be positive if people have to wait a considerable amount of time that they have a choice of using the Town rather than simply being captured by internal facilities.

6. Slipway Access & Deep Water

Although concern has been raised regarding the removal of this, we have considered the locations of A, B and C. The preference of Location B is acceptable **but fundamentally important** is that this must be provided before the existing slipway is taken away. It is not good enough to simply say a contribution will be made to the Council. That is, this work needs to be carried out front end.

In addition, how will deep water be accessed? Will users have to pay for the benefit and work around Red Funnel shipping movements?

7. Storage of Cars and Trailers

We repeat the comments made previously in that there should be a limited time for the storage of trailers and this should be fundamentally limited to one area.

This should not be a “ *Holding Bay* ” for the Island but should only be used for those trailers that are actually in transit. That is, trailers that may be there for one day only but anything more than this is unacceptable. Storage for 28 trailers is excessive.

8. Operational Times

Town Council Members will be quite happy for the Operational times to be outside 11pm to 6am i.e. no activity between the hours of 11 o'clock at night to 6 o'clock the next morning.

9. Traffic Issues

I have eluded to the problems regarding the Waitrose roundabout in the second paragraph but simply to reinforce this, it does seem that the traffic is being displaced from the Town Centre more towards the residential area of East Cowes.

10. Housing

A major concern of this application is the height of the proposed buildings which seem to have been maximised to exploit the sea views. 19 metres high is enormous and equates to 6 – 7 storeys in height. This is totally unacceptable for the Town Centre and has no contextual appraisal to justify this.

An attempt to provide more evidence has been made but if I refer you to View 11, the buildings are still incredibly high. Photos have an ability of levelling high buildings and it should not be acceptable by looking from Well Road you can see 1- 2 storeys above other buildings. There needs to be a limit on the height of these proposed residential units to a maximum of 2 – 3 storeys.

A maximum height of 10m must be a planning condition. The average two storey house is 7.5m high including the roof. This will tie in with the aspirations of the East Cowes Town Plan.

11. Affordable Housing

There still remains no indication of how this will be provided and in what form. Is it to be “*Shared Equity Housing*” or “*Houses for Rent*” or is there going to be any “*Local Lettings Plan*” where young people within the Town get first choice? This all needs to be explored further.

12. Education and Other Contributions

This remains silent and also needs to be further expanded. What contributions will be made?

13. Flood Risk Assessment and Waste Management

It remains hard to believe that there is no other land in the surrounding area that makes it essential to develop within the flood plain. It is also noted that all the surface water is going to be channelled into the Public Sewer. Is this correct? If so **the Town Council firmly object to this** and it is essential that this matter is covered by condition.

It seems such a waste of public infrastructure when the sea is right next door to the land for the surface water to be pumped all the way to Sandown.

A condition should be placed, that the surface water must go through interceptors before leaving the site.

Overall

East Cowes Town Council does not object to this scheme in principle but it is important that the concerns raised above are tackled. In particular the slipway, the height of the proposed residential buildings and the disposal of surface water.

I look forward to receiving your response to these matters.

Yours sincerely

Tina Bailey
Town Clerk