

Environment Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 21:56:16

Name/Organisation

Andrew Garratt

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Councillor

2. What Environment policy you are commenting on

EV5 - Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows

3. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph(s)? if yes which paragraph does this relate to?

Paragraphs 4.54, 4.58

These policies are welcome and particularly so in relation to Parkhurst Forest and Dickson's Copse, which are both close to areas which are allocated for a high level of housing and other development. Subsection (d) relating to a minimum buffer zone of 50m from development to ancient woodland is essential as ecology necessities do not stop at woodland boundaries. Policy should be clear that the point of measurement to a development boundary is where the ground is dug up or built on or otherwise changed as part of the development and not simply a measurement to the nearest "bricks and mortar". Wording at HA022 and "land at Horsebridge Hill" have weaker statements regarding buffer zones and should be amended to the stronger requirement of EV5.

4. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be legally compliant?

Yes

5. Please give details to support your answer to question 4

- **Yes - legally compliant**
- **Yes, complies with Duty to cooperate**

6. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be sound?

Yes - positively prepared

8. What modifications do you think are needed to make the Island Planning Strategy legally compliant and/or sound?

While I do not believe that the strategy is not sound nor legally compliant I believe that consideration should be given to comments made at (3) and repeated below:

These policies are welcome and particularly so in relation to Parkhurst Forest and Dickson's Copse, which are both close to areas which are allocated for a high level of housing and other development. Subsection (d) relating to a minimum buffer zone of 50m from development to ancient woodland is essential as ecology necessities do not stop at woodland boundaries. Policy should be clear that the point of measurement to a development boundary is where the ground is dug up or built on or otherwise changed as part of the development and not simply a measurement to the nearest "bricks and mortar". Wording at HA022 and "land at Horsebridge Hill" have weaker statements regarding buffer zones and should be amended to the stronger requirement of EV5.

9. Do you have any comments on the policies map?

The boundary of the area relating to KPS1 should be drawn further away from Parkhurst Forest to maximise the protection of the multiple environmentally important and sensitive sites within and near it.

11. Do you wish to request to appear at the hearing sessions that will take place?

No

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

NA

Housing Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 22:29:58

Name/Organisation

Andrew Garratt

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Councillor

2. What Housing policy you are commenting on

KPS1 - Key Priority Site: Former Camp Hill

3. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph(s)? if yes which paragraph does this relate to?

Paragraph 7.24

The allocation within the plan period (330) along with other nearby allocations and the existing planning permission at Horsebridge Hill present challenges for this area. The policy wording of "at least 750" would exacerbate that challenge if sought to be delivered. The figure should be tested as to whether it is well supported in being reasonable and realistic. The site is with the Ministry of Justice and who have, at the time of writing, do not appear to have indicated their view on long term use and whether it would be available for development.

The area is bounded to the west by Parkhurst Forest, to the north by the Noke Plantation and existing houses, to the south (other than Standen Avenue) by Parkhurst Forest and existing development. Access would be to Forest Road to the south and Horsebridge Hill/Parkhurst Road to the east. Development of several hundred houses would add to the pressures of these routes, which already are highly trafficked due to their importance for traffic accessing the hospital, industrial estate, IW college, and as a through route to and from Cowes, into and out of Newport, and through Newport to other parts of the Isle of Wight. All these routes should be considered as strategically important. The ability of any development to comply with subsections (d) to (f) on transport (and the later and welcome subsections on a masterplan and supplementary planning document) could be challenging and the wording relating to this should be tested to ensure it can be meaningfully achieved. Development of the scale of 330 or 750+ houses will bring greater pressure on services (e.g. GP surgeries, schools) and this needs to be properly reflected in this strategy, a masterplan and SPD as far as possible.

4. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be legally compliant?

Yes

5. Please give details to support your answer to question 4

- **Yes - legally compliant**
- **Yes, complies with Duty to cooperate**

6. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be sound?

Yes - positively prepared

8. What modifications do you think are needed to make the Island Planning Strategy legally compliant and/or sound?

The strategy may well be sound but could be improved as set out in (3) above and repeated below.

Paragraph 7.24

The allocation within the plan period (330) along with other nearby allocations and the existing planning permission at Horsebridge Hill present challenges for this area. The policy wording of "at least 750" would exacerbate that challenge if sought to be delivered. The figure should be tested as to whether it is well supported in being reasonable and realistic. The site is with the Ministry of Justice and who have, at the time of writing, do not appear to have indicated their view on long term use and whether it would be available for development.

The area is bounded to the west by Parkhurst Forest, to the north by the Noke Plantation and existing houses, to the south (other than Standen Avenue) by Parkhurst Forest and existing development. Access would be to Forest Road to the south and Horsebridge Hill/Parkhurst Road to the east. Development of several hundred houses would add to the pressures of these routes, which already are highly trafficked due to their importance for traffic accessing the hospital, industrial estate, IW college, and as a through route to and from Cowes, into and out of Newport, and through Newport to other parts of the Isle of Wight. All these routes should be considered as strategically important. The ability of any development to comply with subsections (d) to (f) on transport (and the later and welcome subsections on a masterplan and supplementary planning document) could be challenging and the wording relating to this should be tested to ensure it can be meaningfully achieved. Development of the scale of 330 or 750+ houses will bring greater pressure on services (e.g. GP surgeries, schools) and this needs to be properly reflected in this strategy, a masterplan and SPD as far as possible.

9. Do you have any comments on the policies map?

The boundary of KPS1 should be drawn further away from Parkhurst Forest to ensure that it and the environmentally important and sensitive sites within it, along with the field and other areas on its boundaries which are ecologically linked to it are better protected.

11. Do you wish to request to appear at the hearing sessions that will take place?

No

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

NA