

Minutes of a meeting of Arreton Parish Council held on **Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2022** at **7pm** in **Arreton Community Hall**

**Present:** Cllrs Kimber, Calloway, Cooper, Healy, Orchard, Roberts and Verey

In attendance: IWC Cllr Ellis, Sheila Caws (Clerk) and 16 members of the public

**129/22 Apologies for Absence**

Cllr Gurney-Champion (family commitment)

**130/22 Questions from the public**

There were no questions from the members of the public at this stage.

**131/22 To receive any declarations of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interest and requests for dispensations under the Localism Act 2011. To give notice of any item to be raised under agenda item 134/22 – nothing was raised.**

**132/22 Planning and appeals**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Reference             | 22/00672/FUL  |
| Alternative Reference | PP-11166742   |
| Application Received  | Tue 12 Apr 2022   |
| Application Validated | Thu 05 May 2022   |
| Address               | Broadfields Farm Chapel Lane Merstone Arreton Newport Isle of Wight PO30 3DA  |
| Proposal              | Full planning consent for: retrospective infilling of a redundant farm irrigation pond; proposed development of two industrial buildings one B8 (Storage or distribution) use, one B2 (General industrial) and B8 use); and proposed hardstanding and parking |

A resident gave a presentation about the site.

After some discussion, it was agreed to object to this application on the following grounds:-

- i) It would appear that, according to planning law, this application should be treated as a major development owing to the floor space of the proposed buildings and the area of the site involved. This development was not listed as such on the relevant press list (May 25<sup>th</sup> 2022).
- ii) Accordingly, any design and access statement should include certain information, including the context of the proposed site which should “demonstrate the steps taken to appraise the context of the development and how the design of the development takes that context into account”. The *Design, Planning and Access Statement (DAS)* for this application takes into account its place within the site but makes no reference at all to the surrounding area and in particular the residential properties in the immediate vicinity and any potential effects on them.
- iii) The members of the Parish Council consider that this is an inadequate application for a major development and therefore should be refused on those grounds alone.
- iv) The *DAS* pays a great deal of attention to the farmhouse on the larger site, which is laudable as it is Grade II Listed. However, there is no mention of the neighbouring properties in Chapel Lane, which are considerably nearer to the proposed new buildings than the farmhouse and more likely to be affected by noise and any other

possible pollutants, especially as the prevailing wind blows in their direction. There have been complaints about dust (particulate pollution) in the past and emissions from the vehicles and equipment on site are another potential problem.

- v) It is noted that much of the paperwork refers to 'Broadfields Park' and not 'Broadfields Farm'. This implies an industrial site as opposed to an agricultural one and p.5 of the *DAS* confirms this. "Broadfields Park comprises a group of former agricultural barns and outbuildings which have been occupied for several years as industrial uses." However, there are conditions on previous planning applications, which presumably are still in force, that specify that parts of the site are for agricultural use only e.g. P/01445/13 and P/00525/15.
- vi) It is also noted that the proposed buildings will be erected on land that is an infill of half a pond, for which there does not appear to be a previous application. In an application dating from 2006 (P/00547/06), it was described as an "existing reservoir", whereas now it is a "redundant irrigation pond". It may be that irrigation is no longer such an important requirement on the farm but it should be noted that the current retrospective application for infilling does not cover the previous work, which appears to have taken place between 2006 and 2012. Unfortunately, the nature of the materials used for infilling are unknown and may have leached into the ground water.
- vii) It is noted that the large barn, for which an extension is requested in the current application, was built on this reclaimed land in an application dating from 2013 (P/01445/13).
- viii) It should also be noted that the footprint of the barn as built is considerably larger than that approved in the application from 2013. The footprint approved was smaller than that originally applied for but it appears that the barn was built in accordance with the original dimensions and not those that were approved. Because of this, in the current application the westernmost building is to be built onto an existing building that is approximately 50% larger than it should be.
- ix) In the *DAS* (p.15), reference is made to access to the site via a private road and not along Chapel Lane, with the imposition of a condition if necessary. However, such conditions have been added to previous applications but, as residents can attest, are frequently ignored. Chapel Lane is a narrow country road which is much used by pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders and is without footpaths and lighting. It is totally unsuited to heavy traffic and some means of preventing such use should be considered, whether or not this application is granted.
- x) Likewise, there is a 6'6" width restriction on Merstone Lane, which is also routinely flouted. This is not a problem if traffic uses the A3056 and the private access road at the northern end of Merstone Lane but is if coming through Merstone itself, where the road is very narrow in places.
- xi) It is noted that one company using the site has an application lodged with the Traffic Commissioners to use the farm as an operating centre. It is understood that the licence has not yet been granted.
- xii) The *DAS* (p.4) and the application form refer to the employment numbers of Broadfields' tenants of both existing and expanding companies. The members consider this to be misleading in some cases as, although the word 'supports' is used in the *DAS*, it could be implied that all these people work on or from the site but this is not necessarily the case and the application form makes no distinction. Should the employees of the expanding companies all work from the site, the provision of 30 parking spaces would be seriously inadequate, although it is noted that parking provision is based on the combined floor area of the new buildings and not the number of employees.
- xiii) The members would like to see more specific reports on subjects such as the environment/ecology and, in particular, flooding. The area has already been subject to localised flooding in the recent past, as nearby residents know to their cost. The

removal of what is left of the pond will only exacerbate this as the surface water from a considerable area of concrete hardstanding will have nowhere to go other than into neighbouring properties. The application form states that there is no increase in the flood risk as the water will drain into an existing water course and the remaining reservoirs. However, the lie of the land may prevent this.

- xiv) The application form makes no provision for the disposal of foul sewage but it may be that none will be generated in the new buildings.
- xv) Noise pollution is a matter of considerable concern to residents and not just to those in the immediate vicinity. Noise levels have risen considerably over the years but, previously, much of the work took place on the far side of the large barn, which acted as a barrier. However, a lot of activity now takes place on the eastern side of the barn and is much more noticeable.
- xvi) Trees that were originally planted as part of a landscaping scheme and which also helped to mitigate the noise nuisance have now been removed. A report on existing and potential noise pollution would be welcomed.
- xvii) Previous applications that were granted contained conditions on the hours worked but these are reportedly not being observed.
- xviii) Light pollution is another potential consideration for both the new proposals and the existing sites. Conditions have been imposed on developments as near as Blackwater and should be considered here.
- xix) As the application is not currently being considered as a major development, the members would like to see it called in either by the Ward Councillor or the Planning Committee and not be the subject of an officer's decision.
- xx) The members consider that there are so many problems with the existing site, that these should be investigated before any consideration is given to this application.

**133/22 To note the date of the next meeting, 11<sup>th</sup> July 2022**

This meeting will be preceded by the annual inspection of the burial grounds commencing at 6pm in Gore Cemetery.

**134/22 Any other matters raised by councillors for discussion only**

Nothing was raised.

There being nothing else raised, the meeting concluded at 8.55pm.

**Sheila Caws, Clerk to the Council**

Hillis Side, Rew Street, Gurnard, Isle of Wight PO31 8NW

E-mail: [arretonpc@outlook.com](mailto:arretonpc@outlook.com) Telephone: 07587 008183

20<sup>th</sup> June 2022

..... Chairman

..... Date