



Newsletter to Supporters of savethedonkeyfield.co.uk

Dear Supporter

ONLY ONE WEEK LEFT IN WHICH TO OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE DONKEY FIELD

****Please bear in mind that this application is *NOT* the same as the application on the
Farmers' Field and needs to be *commented on separately* not relying on any
comments you may have made on the Farmers' Field application but reiterating
the same points again****

We have asked the Council that the applications on the Farmer's Field and Donkey Field be considered together given their interdependence but unless and until that happens separate comments on both applications are required.

The objections from Island Roads and the Rights of Way Officer are now posted on our web site

Following up on our e-mail to you last week we have set out below both how to object to the planning application on the Donkey Field and what we believe are the [most relevant grounds for objection](#) from the perspective of the planning process. It is critical that objections are made to the planning application (**21/01776/FUL**) before the deadline of **Friday 22 October 2021**.

You can best object by going to the Isle of Wight Council's planning section of its website: go to "Planning Development" and select "Application search, view and comment" – press on the link "planning register" and search on 21/01776/FUL. You will need to register and login to comment in this way.

You can also object by email to development@iow.gov.uk or by letter to Planning Services, Seaclose Offices, Fairlee Road, Newport, Isle of Wight PO30 2QS citing 21/01776/FUL. Your email or letter will be posted on the public website with all the other comments, but your objections will be posted more quickly if the website is used.

In addition to the above, we would also ask you to email our local councillor, Dave Adams david.adams@iow.gov.uk, to say that you object to the application. We want Dave to be able to say that he has had 100s of objections made to him personally. It is important to make objections which are relevant and ones to which the Planning Committee will have regard.

In order to assist in that task, we have set out below a list of questions which we believe, if addressed, will result in objections that the Council cannot ignore. They are not exhaustive and please do not feel constrained by them. It is not necessary to address them all and you can give such weight to them as you see fit. The idea is that the objections should be in your own words and accord with your own views or particular concerns. The key message to get across is that the adverse impact of the proposed development significantly and demonstrably outweighs



any benefit it may bring. We have provided references to the Island's Strategic Policies (on the planning website) and one National Planning Policy which might help you frame your objections. Do use the policy references where applicable.

As we suspected Eton College have piggy-back their application on the Farmers' Field planning application and seek to extend the access road in that application to enable development of the Donkey Field yet seek to have their application, and that of the Farmers' Field treated as separate applications. Given their interdependence this is clearly inappropriate in respect of the Donkey Field application.

The threat of development on both fields is real. Access is remains a key issue. In this regard, do please read the Transport Statement that forms part of the application and the report from Island Roads which recommends the application be refused because of the constraints and unsuitable features of Seagrove Farm Road, Seagrove Manor Road and Old Seaview Lane. The Donkey Field application, if approved, would double the additional traffic, including construction traffic, on this wholly unsuitable access route.

In reading the Planning Statement from Fowler Architecture and Planning Ltd you may find the extensive representations and documentation relating to the 2019 Draft island Plan in which both the Farmers' Field and Donkey Field were potentially designated for development (as site HA073) misleading, as do we. We have made representation to Fowler Architecture about this as the Council have been very clear in stating that the 2021 Draft Island Plan, which now excludes HA073, as follows *The Isle of Wight Council is consulting on a new draft Island Planning Strategy (IPS). This replaces the draft IPS that was consulted on in 2018/19*

Fowler Architecture's justification for this lack of balance, the 2021 plan only receiving one passing mention in clause 5.6 of their Planning Statement, was as follows. *"The Planning Statement references the planning policy history and the evidence-base underpinning the emerging plan as material considerations relevant to the determination of this planning application by the local planning authority."*

We leave you to judge whether the Planning Statement achieves such objectives and highlights their relevance. Regardless, neither this or the fact that the two application should be considered together are in themselves grounds for objection to the Council but they are factors you may care to include in your comments.

Finally we must stress the need to make stand alone representations to the Council in respect of the Donkey Field application even if you have made representations concerning the Farmers' Field. There is no need to 'reinvent the wheel' and you can reiterate the same points again verbatim but, if you do so, please consider amending your submission to take account of the points *highlighted in red* in the list below which different or modify those relating to the Farmers' Field.

savethedonkeyfield.co.uk



*** RELEVANT OBJECTIONS***

1. Access: Is the proposed access to the proposed development via Seagrove Manor Road and Seagrove Farm Road restricted and unsuitable?

a. Capacity:

i. Is Seagrove Manor Road already at full capacity? Is it too narrow for two cars/vans/lorries to pass without going onto the pavement? Are cars/vans/lorries routinely parked on the pavement?

ii. Is Seagrove Farm Road unsuitable for additional traffic? Is it too narrow?

b. Visibility: How good or bad is visibility from

i. Seagrove Farm Road onto Seagrove Manor Road and vice-versa?

ii. Seagrove Manor Road onto Old Seaview Lane and vice-versa?

iii. Old Seaview Lane onto Steyne Road and vice-versa?

c. Effect of additional traffic on the footpath and bridleway: Seagrove Farm Road carries a footpath and bridleway to Seagrove Bay and elsewhere.

i. How will additional traffic affect the families, children, dogs and horses using the bridleway and footpath?

ii. How will additional traffic affect those using Seagrove Pavilion?

iii. How will additional traffic affect those playing and watching football?

iv. How will additional traffic affect those living on or adjacent to Seagrove Manor Road?

d. Effect of any road enhancements and additional traffic on trees: how will the addition of passing bays and increased road surface affect the ancient oaks on Seagrove Farm Road?

(SP7 states that development proposals should not negatively impact on the capacity of lower level roads to support the development).

- ***The Donkey Field application potentially more than doubles the proposed increase in traffic via the access route over and above the Farmers' Field application***
- ***The Donkey Field application potentially doubles the construction traffic and likely extends the time scale of construction work over and above the Farmers' Field application***
- ***The Donkey Field application introduces passing traffic flow to the 8 houses proposed on the Farmers' Field thereby turning a proposed cul-de-sac into a through route***

2. Green field site – Character and Context – Should there be development of a “green field” site? In particular:

a. How will 9 houses, with associated car parking spaces and a road down the side of the field enhance the character and/or the context of the local area (i.e. the way in which the site/space relates to the surrounding area whether physically, functionally or visually).

b. Will the proposed development enhance the football field, the developed Farmers' Field (because at the least the Farmers' field will require a roadway running through it even if the proposed houses remain undeveloped, or the housing forming part of the old Seagrove Estate? Will it enhance the new Nettlestone estate?



c. Will the development conserve, enhance or promote the landscape, seascape and biodiversity?

(DM12 expects proposals to conserve, enhance and promote landscape, seascape, biodiversity on the Island).

3. Need: Has a specific local need for the 9 proposed dwellings been identified (i.e. a need in Seaview and Nettlestone)?

(SP1 requires a specific local need to be identified for development outside defined settlements – it is common ground that the Farmers Field is outside the defined settlement of Seaview and Nettlestone).

4. Impact on landscape - What will the impact of the proposed development be in relation to the broader landscape?

a. How important is the green corridor, of which the proposed development forms part (together with the Football Field and Donkey Field), in terms of the features and character of the locality?

b. Does the green corridor of which the development site forms part help to minimise the urban feel of the neighbourhood? Does it provide a pleasant, open aspect for all those using the football field and surrounding footpaths (used heavily to access the beach)?

c. Will the proposed development fill in and substantially destroy the green corridor between Nettlestone and Seaview?

d. Will there be an adverse impact of the landscape if the proposed development goes ahead?

e. Is it important to have separation between the two communities of Seaview and Nettlestone to maintain their separate and distinct identities?

f. Will the view to and from the sea and the beach be adversely affected by the proposed development?

(DM12 expects proposals to conserve, enhance and promote landscape, seascape, on the Island).

5. Sustainability – Will the proposed development enhance or maintain the vitality of Seaview or Nettlestone? Or is it too small to contribute to the locality?

(NPPF para 78 advises that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities)

DM = Development Management

SP = Strategic Policy

NPPF = National Planning Policy Framework

References to the above policies in respect of DM and SP are policies adopted by the Isle of Wight Council as part of their Planning Policy.