

St Helens Parish Council

Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council held on the 29th July 2015 at St Helens Sports Pavilion.

In attendance: 26 Members of the public

Chair: Cllr J Earnshaw **Councillors:** Cllr A Campbell, Cllr C Parker, Cllr J Robertson and Cllr N Ryan.

Apologies received from: Cllr I Thomson, Cllr J Bacon and Cllr P Yates.

98/2015 Public Forum: Mr Thorpe is unable to attend the meeting.

Mr J Gully owns a houseboat. Mr Thorpe has improved the visitors sailing experience which is evident. The application is contrary to identified needs listed in adopted policies. Justification seeks to breach these policies is inadequate, mis-directional and provides more housing than what is needed. There is far more provision here than what is needed financially to improve the toilets, showers and harbour office. Where are the profits going? The beneficiaries of this application are not made clear. Clearly works are needed and there is already a financial obligation on Mr Thorpe to dredge the harbour. No meaningful guarantees of delivery. Needs a transparent legal agreement which is not apparent. Dangerous gamble of all the harbours assets at once. Development is located outside the settlement boundary, in a flood plain and fails to justify this exception to the rules.

Mr F Hetherington email circulated to Councillors prior to the meeting. Complex application trying to absorb the contents. Will focus on the simple points of the residential development and enabling developments. This committee twice before has considered this application. Once in the summer of 2014 and again in February 2015 which resulted in differing decisions. Provision of housing is set by Government targets and improved tourism ticks a number of boxes. None of the sites are defined for development and would not receive consent. Need to balance the issues of provision of housing against the environmental factors and others. To simply ignore the zoning for development needs to be considered. Providing improved facilities requires income. Enabling development is clarified within the Planning Policy Statement 23 which was read aloud.

13 houses support the provision of a new office at the Duver which is not inadequate for the purposes of the harbour. Bembridge Marina office is not fit for an office. What are the existing toilets being demolished to make way for a floating toilet? Why can he not fund the improvement required for the office, toilets and changing facilities without the need for development. This is complicated by land being owned by the Bembridge Harbour Improvements Ltd. What secures the development? Is a section 106 agreement required?

Mr D Biddle is a regular user of Bembridge Marina and feels that the divorce of the parking area will see a sad future. People will not cart their sailing gear across the road which is already a dangerous speed and not likely to get better in future years. The old harbour office is an attractive building and has lots to offer in terms of local employment. Adequate existing washing facilities why knock these down just refurbish. Reducing services of the marina and likely consequence of Selwyn marina is the future development of the gaps in between which will be filled up. This is already being demonstrated by the recent application submission from Mr Norris of 20 Yachtsmans lodges on Bembridge Boatyard.

Mr R Wilby speaks for BASHHA. What has been said reiterates the constructive criticism. Justify it is a fact that any direct response or viability should be put into harbour operations but into housing is not what the harbour is for.

Mr W Squibb development over the Duver side is semi contaminated. In the winter of 2014 it flooded 300m which shut the road to anything other than a 4x4. Should it be allowed in an area that floods? Industrial units are under the marine market will create employment for an extra 30 people. The

harbour currently employs around 26 at most 30. So where is all this work coming for the extra 30 or will it dilute what is already there? There are no other yards. It is an industrial site until he got hold of it and increased the rent to a unacceptable level. Claim £8million income per annum for tourism however data from IOW Visitor last year states 3% of that. Number of permanent people keeping boats in the harbour is dropping. Why drive the local area down?

Mr J Bond lives on Selwyn Court; development is excessive for a classified flood plane. Support the comments made that the car park the other side of the road is a no no. Marina will die. Would not risk crossing the road. Boats would go full stop. I Live with James stayed up until 1.30am last year to see the tidal surge which covered the whole marina area, the angling club and car park if only for a few seconds. This is unacceptable for housing.

Mr C Attrill if houses are allowed on the Duver is there any reason I couldn't develop my boatyard as housing? It opens the gate. I don't want to but could.

Mr W Squibb the predicated tidal heights by 2072 is a possibility that if it continues to rise it would be under water with every spring tide.

Mr J Attrill the road down there is private and the locals have spent a lot of money to make the tarmac safe and this would increase the traffic.

Mr K Hicks detrimental to the environment both visually and financially. Over 30 years there has been a steady erosion of the strategic gap. Proposal to build on land illegally dumped to the east of pilot boat which IWC did not enforce. Encroachment is continuous and spreading temporary structure. Many that stand today should only have been in position for 3 years. The present harbour company has a legal and future obligation to dredge the harbour and t challenge the affordability is irrelevant. The old boathouse is low lying and if it were erected on stilts would be overbearing on the corner. The corner is dangerous with many cars ending up off the road. Interested to see an annual audit of what goes into the harbour. Embankment Road in high spring tides floods in two places in particular the entrance to harbour farm which will all know will rise in future. 6 industrial units are likely to be unprofitable which has already been stated and encroaches on the strategic gap therefore why develop them. No evidence found to back up the claims that the old Boathouse gained planning permission as an office. It is surrounded by stagnant water and would be a danger to the health of those living there.

Mrs H Jarvis lives on Duver Road see some support online from the visiting yachtsman however the attraction of Bembridge Harbour is not the new toilets and changing rooms it's the coastal beauty that attracts people to visit. Flooding is a concern. Housing would not meet the local needs. If residential properties are developed next to industrial uses there will be noise complaints and then it would require restrictions on the local businesses.

99/2015 To consider planning application: TCP/11822/Y, P/00637/14 Sites at the Duver Marina, The Duver, St Helens, PO33 1YB. Bembridge Marina, Embankment Road, Bembridge, PO35

Selwyn Boatyard and the Old Boathouse, Embankment Road, Bembridge, Isle of Wight PO35.

Selwyn Boatyard and the Old Boathouse: Demolition of Boathouse, outline for detached dwelling, 6 industrial units with associated parking (Additional information relating to ecological impacts revised vehicle access and parking/ turning arrangements additional information relating to contaminated land and flood risk revised red line area relating to Selwyn Boatyard parking area).

Bembridge Marina: Demolition of harbour office, outline for terrace of 5 houses, terrace of 3 houses, floating shower and toilet facilities and associated parking (Additional information relating to ecological impacts flood risk and requirement for floating shower and toilet block revised access arrangements revised ownership plans relating to Embankment Road ecological mitigation area).

Duver Marina: Demolition of harbour office and toilet facilities, removal of septic tank, outline for terrace of 5 houses, new harbour office with shower and toilet facilities, sewerage treatment plant and associated parking (Additional information relating to ecological impacts revised plans relating to the footprint for proposed houses revised vehicle parking and turning areas) (further re-advertised application).

Cllr N Ryan concerned about the flooding comments and building on a flood plane. Concerned about houses being built by industrial units and the potential noise complaints. Maintenance of the harbour wall and dredging has not been accounted for only what they have to do anyway.

Cllr C Parker concerned about the access to Duver Road. Who owns the road? National Trust. Has permission been given? Island Roads have stated in their report that a condition would have to be imposed to ensure permission and use of the land with provision of 27 parking places on the Duver site. Other side hell of a bind for people to carry their gear across the busy Embankment Road to the car park. Understand traffic controls such as traffic lights would need installing. Concerned about the floating toilets on pontoons don't see the point knocking down serviceable buildings. Don't build the houses and build the toilets and showers on dry land.

Cllr A Campbell Access road on the Duver is a concern. Parking needs 27 spaces can't see how it would fit that many. Houses do not meet the local needs survey. Dustbin corner has bad access for turning down there. Can't see the point of having industrial units if they are not needed.

Cllr J Robertson loss of facilities for harbour users. Loss of parking spaces with the relocation at Bembridge Marina. Removal of serviceable facilities to stick on a pontoon is lavish. Industrial units currently in existence next to Murphy's yard are not full so why build more? The benefits are not worth the loss of facilities.

Cllr J Earnshaw published housing doesn't meet the local needs. Comment read on the report provided by HRD of the old boathouse high value single residential property is a grand design build saving grace is the location of the harbour where wealthy individuals can meet their needs.

It was clarified that one decision would be taken to cover all aspects of this planning application.

RESOLVED-Recommend Refusal

Meeting closed at 7.25pm

Signed.....

Dated.....