

**PRE-PLANNING APPLICATION ADVICE - RESPONSE FROM PLANNING**



**Application Reference**    **G.0038.19**

**Please note:** There are limits to the pre-application advice that can be given by officers. The pre-application advice service is not a passport to getting permission for unsuitable planning proposals. The final decision on planning applications is made by council members or senior officers. It can only be taken once a formal planning application has been received and consultations have been carried out with adjoining occupiers, those bodies which the council has a statutory requirement to consult and other interested parties. You should therefore be aware the council's officers are unable to give any guarantees about the decision that will be made on an application.

The pre-application advice provided is based on the information that you submitted. Formal planning permission will be the subject of publicity and consultation in accordance with the council's procedures. These and other matters which may subsequently come to light could result in additional issues being raised that are relevant to the outcome of the application.

<b>Agent Details</b>	
Title	Mr
Forename	Phil
Surname	Salmon
Building/house name/number	143
Street Address	Staplers Road
Town Name	Newport
County	Isle Of Wight
Postcode	PO30 2DJ
Email	phil.salmon@planningdevelopmenthub.co.uk

<b>Application Site Address</b>	
Building/house name/number	Land at
Street Address	Seagrove Farm Lane
Town Name	Seaview
County	Isle of Wight
Postcode	

## Description of the Proposal

x8 dwellings.

List of Documents Uploaded by the Applicant:

- Document Name: Pre-app Statement.docx
- 2122-PL010Location and Site Plan Rev B.pdf
- 2122-PL02 Type A Unit Plans.pdf
- 2122-PL03 Type B1 Unit Plans.pdf
- 2122-PL06 Type C Semi.pdf
- Street Scene 1.jpg
- Street Scene 2.jpg
- Type A Front.jpg
- Type A Rear.jpg
- Type B front.jpg
- Type B Rear.jpg

These show 8 dwellings located in a staggered row towards the southern part of the overall field, accessed by a drive leading from Seagrove Lane which runs along the northern part of the site. The dwellings would be a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey buildings of a contemporary design.

## Pre-Application Advice (Please note the amount of advice will likely relate to the scale of the proposal)

Planning Officer's name	Holmes, Richard
-------------------------	-----------------

General comments:

Our site meeting on 24/06/2019 it was seen that the site is an undeveloped field stretching between two parts of Seaview – properties along Seagrove Manor Rd to the north and Solent View Rd to the south but that the site is part of a longer 'swathe' of greenfield land which stretches from the football ground to the north-west to near the coast to the south-east (the land slopes down from the site to the south-east). This site is just a smaller part of this land and is bounded by trees/vegetation to the south (the boundary with Solent View Road and there are close boarded fences at this boundary too) and trees/vegetation along the western boundary with the football pitch. There are also mature trees/vegetation along the southern part of the eastern boundary where a public footpath extends from the development at Solent View Rd to the public right of way along the northern section of the site (with lower vegetation along much of the boundary of this path).

Relevant policies:

### National Policy

#### **National Planning Policy Framework.**

- Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places.
- Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

### Development Plan Policy

#### **Island Plan Core Strategy**

SP1	Spatial Strategy
SP2	Housing
SP5	Environment
SP7	Travel
DM2	Design Criteria for New Development
DM12	Landscape, Seascape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity

DM14 Flood Risk  
DM13 Green Infrastructure  
DM17 Sustainable Travel

#### Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments SPD

The Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted by the Isle of Wight Council at its Executive meeting on 12 January 2017 and came into force on 23 January 2017.

#### Refuse and Recycling

The Guidelines for Recycling and Refuse Storage in New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted by the Isle of Wight Council at its Executive meeting on 12 January 2017 and came into force on 23 January 2017.

#### Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership Financial Contribution

The application site is located within the identified Solent Special Protection Area buffer zone. As of 1 April 2018 the full Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy is being used by the Isle of Wight Council, in terms of requiring mitigation for impacts on the Solent Special Protection Area, as a result of increased recreational pressure from certain types of residential development that are located within 5.6km of the designated Solent Special Protection Areas.

<http://www.birdaware.org/strategy> (page 16 of the Bird Aware Solent Strategy document specifically sets out information regarding developer contributions)

#### Affordable Housing Contributions SPD

The Affordable Housing Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted by the Isle of Wight Council at its Executive meeting on 15 September 2015 and came into force on 24 September 2015 with a revised Affordable Housing SPD setting out the LPA's updated proposed approach towards the collection of financial contributions for affordable housing through the planning process adopted in March 2017.

Further information can be found on the Council's website through the following links:

<https://www.iwight.com/Residents/Environment-Planning-and-Waste/Planning-Policy-new/Supplementary-Planning-Documents/Contributions-Related-SPDs>

#### Constraints:

- Wider Rural Area
- Undeveloped/greenfield site
- Trees
- Adjacent to designated Open Space (to the west/north-west – land which includes the football pitch)
- SPA Buffer Zone

#### Principle:

The NPPF supports the development of new housing in the context of sustainable development and states that in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The Core Strategy reflects the guidance contained within the NPPF and states that new development should take place within, or immediately adjacent to, the defined settlement boundaries. Policy SP1 of The Core Strategy sets three Key Regeneration Areas (The Medina Valley, Ryde and the Bay), two Smaller Regeneration Areas (Freshwater and Ventnor) and a further eleven Rural Service Centres within which new development will be expected to be directed. Areas outside of the identified regeneration areas and service centres are considered to be the Wider Rural Area where unless local need is identified, new development will not be supported. The application site is not situated within one of these designations – Seaview does not have a defined settlement boundary and therefore the site is within the Wider Rural Area.

However, I do acknowledge that Seaview and Nettlestone does have some facilities – shops, schools, pubs, restaurants etc. and that the site is situated between two built up areas of Seaview and therefore I do consider the site to be within a relatively sustainable location.

I also note the site has been put forward as a site within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment November 2018 (SHLAA) and is included within the trajectory of deliverable and developable sites (Table 3 in

Appendix 1) for a yield of 13 (SHLAA ref IPS125, although noting that the SHLAA also puts forward land to the south-east which does not form part of your site. Whilst only limited weight would be given to this as the identification of potential housing sites, in the SHLAA does not state or imply that the council would necessarily grant planning permission for residential development. Nor does identification in the SHLAA automatically qualify the site for allocation for residential or any other type of development. All planning applications will continue to be determined against the development plan and other relevant material considerations.

However, the site is greenfield land and not previously developed. Furthermore, when I was on site I did note that this site and the fields to the south-east and the football pitch to the north-west are an important 'green'/undeveloped space between the two parts of Seaview – and that there are views up from Seagrove Bay – and noting that the football ground is designated Open Space in the Core Strategy. Concerns have previously been raised over the development of this green space eroding the 'gap' between the built forms – and with the designated open space to the NW (the football pitch) reiterating this need to retain the open space. However, this proposal differs significantly from the previous schemes I have seen in that it proposes development to the southern part of the field, retaining the open green space to the northern part (apart from the proposed access road). With the grouping of trees along the southern part of the eastern boundary (and effectively three sides of the site bounded by mature trees), this layout would effectively retain the green gap between the two developed parts of Seaview (often referred to as the 'green lung') – and when viewed from the south-east (nearer the coast and on a lower ground level) it is not considered there would be any significant views of this development, and, that green gap would be retained.

Policy SP1 highlights that in all cases development on non-previously developed land will need to clearly demonstrate how it will enhance the character and context of the local area – and therefore the layout, retention of the green gap and high quality design of the dwellings would be essential, along with providing benefits such as the financial contributions/improvements to the rights of way etc., and also demonstrating a local need (which I note you have referred to in your submission) and also that there are no other previously developed sites within Seaview (you briefly mentioned on site that you have undertaken such an exercise).

Therefore, based on the above and the layout keeping the land to the north free of development (notwithstanding the access road) and addressing other constraints of the site as discussed further below (such as access, rights of way, trees etc.), then the principle of the dwellings as shown could be acceptable.

#### Impact on the character of the area/street scene/design:

The proposal is for a row of contemporary style dwellings within green field land. It is considered the undeveloped land that runs up from near to the coast to the south-east of the pre-application site and continues north-west (includes the football pitch) provides an important green space and divide between the residential development to the south (part of Nettlestone) and Seaview to the north. However, it is acknowledged that this pre-application site is not designated as Open Space within the Core Strategy. It is also acknowledged that the development would be to the southern part of this land with the northern part remaining undeveloped aside from the access road. As such, with the development restricted to this part of the site along with the retention of trees/vegetation and an appropriate landscaping scheme, it is considered there is potential for such a development not resulting in an adverse impact on the wider landscape. The images provided indicate a high-quality design – this would be essential in terms of ensuring the development does not result in an adverse impact on the landscape (and as per the principle and meeting Policy SP1 as discussed above).

I do note the turning head extends into the open land to the north – it is considered this part of the land should have minimal/no development within to retain the 'green lung' and therefore suggest you review this element, although do acknowledge there are space constraints on this.

However, I do raise a concern over the dwellings to the west – plots 1 and 2 – and their close proximity to the trees here and would advise reviewing this element of the proposal (i.e. may be a need to revise and potentially remove plot 1 and plot 2 from the proposal). I would extend concern to the whole development as the trees along the southern and western boundaries are of high amenity, provide important screening with the existing dwellings and their retention would provide significant mitigation for such a development in this location.

In terms of the design of the dwellings, I do not raise a concern over a contemporary design in this location, noting the varied and more modern style of dwellings within the Nettlestone development to the south/west. The design would seem to be appropriate in also minimising the bulk with first floor accommodation utilising the roofspace. The use of the material suggested would also seem appropriate, also noting there are examples of more modern/contemporary designs nearby. However, I do raise a concern over the design of the garages – these seem overly prominent and detract from the overall design and would advise this element is reviewed.

#### Impact on neighbouring properties/uses:

The plans submitted indicate appropriate spacing between proposed dwellings as well as to existing dwellings so as not to have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties. Any application would need to ensure that fenestration is appropriately placed so as not to impact on occupiers of the proposed dwellings.

See policy DM2 of the CS and the NPPF which require development proposals to be of a high quality of design and to ensure a good level of amenity would be maintained for all existing and future occupants of land.

#### Highway considerations:

Any proposal would need to demonstrate that the proposal would provide safe access to service the development from the public highway and that the site is well related to the existing road network, facilities/amenities, and existing public transport services in line with the objectives of Policies DM2, and DM17 of the Island Plan Core Strategy.

I note you refer to advice you have obtained from a highways consultant who has concluded that Seagrove Farm Lane would be an acceptable means of access. I do raise some concerns of this relatively narrow lane both in terms of providing suitable passing places and also with regards its intensification and access onto Seagrove Manor Road. As such, I would suggest pre-application advice is sought from Island Roads to establish if they have any objection to the proposal and which would include an intensification of the existing access from the business park.

I also note that previous pre-application advice was sought from Island Roads and whilst this was several years ago, I do consider it is still relevant. I have pasted their main points below (but still advise you seek their advice now):

They don't seem to have undertaken a site visit at that stage but their desktop assessment indicated that whilst there wouldn't be any capacity issues with the junctions leading to the site there are concerns over the suitability of Seagrove Farm Road to serve a development of 9 units. They then state that typically, the following criteria would need to be met:

- The junction between Seagrove Farm Road and Seagrove Manor Road should benefit from visibility splays of 43m in either direction when taken from a 2.4m. This is based on a 30mph speed limit – it may be that due to local constraints that speeds in the area may be more reflective of 20/25mph in which case the visibility splays may be reduced to 25/33m.
- All access roads (from Seagrove Manor Road) should be a minimum of 4.8m wide in order to accommodate the passage of a service vehicle and a car. In the absence of adequate width, suitable passing bays should be available coupled with adequate inter-visibility between passing places which may be suitable to accommodate the additional traffic.
- If the above criteria cannot satisfactorily be met, then the applicant would need to evidence that they will not be introducing a significant increase (typically 5%) of traffic generation along Seagrove Farm Road.
- It is worth noting that Seagrove Farm Road is not an adopted highway; however, it is a public bridleway and therefore I suggest you seek advice from the IWC Rights of Way Team.
- The on-site layout should comply with Manual for Streets / Manual for Streets 2 guidance.
- All parking spaces should comply with minimum size requirements i.e. 2.4m x 4.8m.
- The on-site layout should allow for turning to enable a fire appliance to turn.

#### *Parking*

With regards to parking provision, the Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments SPD identifies that the site would fall within Zone 2 'Outside of identified Town Centre Boundaries', therefore the guidelines outlined within Appendix 1 for provision of parking and cycle spaces should be sought to be provided for.

You also refer to the potential to provide community parking/parking for the football ground – however, in terms of this site I would raise concerns of providing it within the site because there is limited space to provide it without resulting in development of the northern part of the site and visual impacts. However, there may be further financial contributions towards improvement off-site?

#### Public Right of Way

As stated above, I was approached for pre-application advice a few years ago for a similar development on this site. I still have feedback from the Rights of Way Section of the Council who raised concerns of the use of the access which is a public right of way (bridleway). I have included their previous response which I consider to be relevant to this proposal but would advise you contact the Rights of Way team directly to discuss your proposal:

“The first point to make is that it is an offence pursuant to s34 of the Road Traffic Act to drive a motor vehicle

along a Public Bridleway without lawful authority. Accordingly, unless it could be demonstrated to Rights of Way that the development land benefits from a right of way with vehicles over and along Seagrove Farm Road then we could not support an application.

In any event I tend to agree with Island Roads with regard to their concerns as to the width of the public right of way. Walkers, horse riders and cyclists are entitled to use a Public Bridleway and the additional traffic generated by the development would cause a potential nuisance and safety issues to/for users, particularly equestrians.

In the event that the concerns of Rights of Way are not considered to be valid, then any planning permission granted must contain a condition requiring the developer to make all necessary improvements to the public right of way e.g. surfacing, drainage, traffic calming, passing places and signage to our specification in order to ensure the road is brought up to an acceptable standard to safely accommodate the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed development and allow continued safe and convenient use for walkers, cyclist and equestrians. Further, any recommendations of Island Roads would need to be satisfied e.g. visibility at the Seagrove Manor Road and Seagrove Farm Road junction.”

#### Refuse and Recycling

The Guidelines for Recycling and Refuse Storage in New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted by the Isle of Wight Council at its Executive meeting on 12 January 2017 and came into force on 23 January 2017. Any application will need to conform with these guidelines – see:

<https://www.iwight.com/azservices/documents/2779-Guidelines-for-Recycling-and-Refuse-Storage-SPD-v1.pdf>

#### Public consultations:

You may wish to discuss the proposed development with the groups listed below should you decide to move towards an application. Please do note that they are not the decision makers for planning applications and therefore, their role at this stage would be simply for you to gain their input and initial thoughts/ concerns over proposals.

- Parish Council
- Island Roads
- Neighbouring property/land owners/users
- Council's Rights of Way Team

#### Financial contributions:

Contributions would be required from the proposed dwelling development in line with the Council's Solent SPA and Affordable Housing Contributions SPDs (see links above).

There may also be a requirement to upgrade and/or for a financial contribution towards upkeep/maintenance/improvements to the Rights of Way that extend very close to the site – you may wish to discuss this with them.

I note your client would consider a contribution to open space/play park facilities – given the emphasis on the retention of this green space, I consider this would be appropriate/required.

Any planning application for the proposed dwelling would need to be accompanied by written confirmation that the applicant is willing to enter into a planning obligation to secure these contributions and the Council's legal fee (currently £150) for the preparation and completion of this obligation.

#### Documentation or information requirements:

I suggest the following information, plans and documents be submitted:

- Location plan;
- Block/site plan and visibility splays;
- Details of the access road such as improvements, passing bays and rights to access (with reference to Rights of Way comments above);
- Floor plans and elevations;
- Contamination report;

- Landscaping scheme – suggested it is included with any application to show retained and proposed landscaping/ boundary treatments;
- Tree/hedge surveys/reports;
- Parking spaces (as per the SPD);
- Details of open space/public amenity and communal car parking for the football ground;
- Refuse/recycling provision (as per the recent SPD);
- Justification with local need and Sequential Testing of other sites/previously developed land;
- Confirmation to enter into a legal agreement (as set out above).

Further guidance on submitting a planning application can be found on the [Planning Portal](#) website which offers step-by-step help and advice.