



19th March 2015
CHARTERED SURVEYORS, & DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

Mr Peter Griffiths
Principal Officer
Housing Policy
Isle of Wight Council
Seaclose Offices
Fairlee Road
Newport
Isle of Wight
PO30 2QS

Dear Mr Griffiths

Re: Land known as the Football Field, the Farmers Field and the Donkey Field, Seaview

I refer to the above named fields which were subject to a representation report on behalf of our clients in 2008 (the names of our clients are listed at the end of the report). I enclose a copy for your attention.

Obviously as the Island Plan is now progressing, our clients are concerned to ensure that the fields retain their designation as a rural site and are not considered suitable for development. In that regard, we have been instructed to confirm to you that the representations contained in our 2008 report remain valid.

Our conclusion as set out in the 2008 report was as follows:

1. Strategically, allocation of the land, or any of the three parcels, for housing development would be contrary to the objectives and direction of the Island Plan and the aspirations of central government within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. There are fundamental issues in relation to deliverability of any development, particularly around access. There are likely to be significant issues in relation to site stability and drainage.
3. Development is highly likely to have an adverse effect on the habitat of protected species and the environment.
4. There are more sustainable, less contentious and deliverable sites around the Island.



We are of the opinion that no development could take place in this area, broadly for the reasons stated in the 2008 report. The site cannot deliver a sustainable product both in terms of direction of Central Government Planning Policy, and those contained within the Island Plan and its Core Strategy. The site cannot be found to be deliverable because of reasons of access, geology, drainage, land ownership, and obviously very importantly on the trees.

In our view, the site cannot be brought forward as a suitable site, either individually or collectively because of these constraints.

The position is that Seaview is not a Rural Service Centre so therefore we believe this is not applicable for development. Insofar as there may be a local need for affordable housing there are far more appropriate sites in the area.

Could you please confirm by return that you have received this letter, and it will remain on the file. In the meantime we would be obliged if any person makes any representation on this land that we could be informed.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Scott'.

Christopher Scott, MRICS

11