

## Summaries of previous Area Action Plan consultations

The Isle of Wight Council's [Local Development Scheme](#) gives the commitment that the council will consult on draft versions of the Area Action Plans (AAPs), and the [Statement of Community Involvement](#) (SCI) sets out how the council will undertake the consultation.

Publishing the draft plans and accompanying environmental assessments is outside the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, therefore the consultation requirements are not the same.

The SCI sets out that at this stage of the plans' production the council will publish summaries of comments previously received in relation to the AAPs.

This document sets out summaries of the consultation responses received on the following documents:

- Regulation 18 consultation for the Medina Valley AAP
- Regulation 18 consultation for all three AAPs
- Informal Discussion Documents for all three AAPs

The council has also consulted on environmental assessments as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The issues arising from the consultation responses on these documents are set out in the next iteration of the environmental assessments, which have been published alongside the [draft plans](#).

### **Regulation 18 consultation for the Medina Valley AAP**

This consultation was undertaken in late 2012 when the council was intending to publish the plans separately, with the Medina Valley Plan being the first to be published. It was a targeted consultation with five responses.

### **Regulation 18 consultation for all three AAPs**

This targeted consultation was undertaken in late 2013. Thirteen comments were received, and a summary of these are set out in Appendix 2.

### **Informal Discussion Documents for all three AAPs**

The Informal Discussion Documents were published for each plan area for public consultation in the summer of 2014. Each document posed a series of specific questions relating to the plan area. Within the Medina Valley document 48 questions were posed, 47 in the Ryde document and 48 in the Bay. Overall there were 2841 specific responses to the questions posed in the three documents, and the summaries of these are set out in Appendix 3.

## Appendix 1

Generally consultees were in agreement with the proposed contents of the Medina Valley AAP. Statutory organisations provided detailed guidance and specific comments regarding the delivery of it.

Natural England have identified that the Medina Valley area contains and is in close proximity to a number of internationally designated sites which have the potential to be adversely impacted by the development proposed as part of the AAP. They are therefore pleased to see the requirement that allocated sites must demonstrate no adverse impact on the integrity of European sites. They do however indicate that it will be necessary to consider a strategic approach to mitigation in respect of European designated sites and GI will be a key factor in enabling the plan to ensure no adverse impact on the integrity of these.

The Environment Agency commented “we are pleased to see and support the inclusion of the statement that the AAP will have ‘regard to the policies of the Core Strategy’”. A sequential risk-based approach to determining the suitability of land for development in flood risk areas in undertaken to ensure that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding is avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. In addition, it will be necessary to demonstrate that any sites that are proposed within designated flood zones (2 and 3) are deliverable.

English Heritage (now Historic England) would like to see aspects of the historic environment addressed within the AAPs. In this way, the AAPs can help the Council to fulfil its obligations under the National Planning Policy Framework to have a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, and a clear strategy for enhancing the built and historic environment.

## Appendix 2

Generally consultees were supportive of the proposed contents of the AAPs and, where relevant, made comments on specific issues. Some consultees had no comments to add at this stage.

There was support in providing a meaningful mechanism to facilitate development in these areas that would assist in building and growing the economy. To do this it was recommended areas for business growth and job creation are identified as well as identifying the housing needs for the Isle of Wight with particular focus on providing a range of affordable housing. It was specifically noted that the Ryde masterplan should be made use of in the development of the AAP. Environmental issues associated with increased development, such as prevention in settlement coalescence or pollution control would need addressing.

Southern Water has identified that strategic and local infrastructure for sewerage treatment may be required to meet future development. They have not identified any fundamental reasons why any of the sites could not come forward for development within the Medina Valley and did not refer to the other 2 AAPs.

The Chamber of Commerce would like to see a specific policy to preserve wharfage within the key towns of the Medina River. It was suggested by another consultee that emphasis should be given to the value that yachting brings to the Medina Valley in terms of tourism and that this should be balanced with the needs of the working river. There should be a balance in creation of job creation/protection and any environmental considerations. Natural England commented that the Medina Valley AAP should recognise that employment sites with waterfront access has the potential to impact on European Sites and policies should ensure there is no result of these potential impacts occurring.

Natural England has noted specific items within the AAPs that have the potential to impact on European sites. Namely these are employment sites with waterfront access; sustainable transport links on both sides of the Medina River have the potential to impact on European sites, via recreational disturbance, and development at Fishbourne Ferry terminal. Natural England also notes the potential for policies to impact on the AONB and it should be ensured this does not occur. Natural England supports the requirement to address Green Infrastructure deficiencies within all 3 AAPs.

English Heritage (now Historic England) would like to see aspects of the historic environment addressed within the AAPs. In this way, the AAPs can help the Council to fulfil its obligations under the National Planning Policy Framework to have a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, and a clear strategy for enhancing the built and historic environment.

A couple of respondents would like to see existing rail links from Shanklin through to Ryde improved.

## Appendix 3

### Medina Valley

#### Medina Valley Q1 – What are your views on the use of brownfield land first, to support regeneration, and the impacts this could have on infrastructure development

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

The majority of individuals supported the use of brownfield sites first, especially where sites had been derelict for many years. There was support for the redevelopment of brownfield sites as a driver for regeneration but comment made that this should only happen where the local infrastructure can support/ or be sufficiently upgraded to support it. Further comment was made about the compatibility of land uses when redeveloping brownfield sites.

##### **Private company**

There was general support of a brownfield land first approach.

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that there is not sufficient brownfield land available on the island to deliver the objectively assessed housing requirement. Individual landowners/agents were mixed on their response with those who had brownfield land to promote clearly confirming the approach as set out within the NPPF/NPPG and those who had greenfield land to promote clearly confirming that there is insufficient land and that any brownfield land must be suitable, available and achievable.

##### **Interest group / organisations**

There was separate comment about brownfield sites for employment use with a request for additional flexibility on land allocations to support the development of small and medium sized businesses. Comment was made that the “brownfield first” approach is in line with national planning policy as it is a Core Principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the associated Planning Practice Guidance. There were additional comments about also ensuring the protection of sites with ecological or conservation (historic interest) value within this approach.

##### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was a consensus that brownfield land should be developed first particularly as these sites are considered more sustainable with some comments going as far as only allowing brownfield land to be developed and only when those sites were exhausted should greenfield land be considered. One respondent commented that no greenfield land should be developed on the island at all because there is an overwhelming sentiment on the Island against greenfield development.

#### Medina Valley Q2 – If viability is an issue on brownfield sites, should the local planning authority take a pragmatic approach to negotiating s106 contributions?

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Individuals confirmed a general support for a pragmatic approach to s106 requirements in order to achieve a more cohesive community. However there was some opposition to this approach with the comment “. I believe the rules for Section 106 money should be adhered to” being made.

**Private company**

There was a support for the pragmatic approach to s106 negotiations.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was confirmation of the position of the NPPF paragraphs 173 and 205 and NPPG which advises that a planning application should not be made unviable by virtue of a burden of Section 106 contributions. Viability is in fact issue on all development sites (brownfield and greenfield land) and a pragmatic view needs to be taken in respect of negotiating 106 contributions in all cases. Comment was also made in that the implementation of the CIL would also assist in certainty and fairness, but affordable housing would still need to be negotiable to ensure viability and deliverability. Additional comments were made by landowners who are in negotiation with the LPA at present who felt that the current practise, particularly in respect of affordable housing and commuted sums in lieu, was too onerous. It was felt that the viability toolkit was a factual toolkit and should be understood and adhered to by the Council and Landowner.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was no overall consensus on views from this sector with some agreeing that a pragmatic approach should be adopted and some organisations with particular interests saying yes “but don’t compromise on our area of interest”.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was general agreement that the LPA should be flexible and be prepared to accept a lower contribution towards infrastructure costs, so as not to encroach on greenfield land and this can make the difference between development of a site & it being left as an eyesore. However as a general principle the infrastructure costs should be met by the developer. In addition to this there was a request to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy as this would provide clarity for developers and eliminate the need for long drawn out negotiations.

**Medina Valley – Q3: Should housing allocations be made on fewer, larger sites or on a higher number of smaller sites?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

There were three different types of response, being a preference for fewer, larger sites, more, smaller sites and the idea that this should not be determined on a simplified either/or basis, but each site should be considered on its individual merits. The majority of respondents supported a greater number of smaller sites approach with reasons given to support this view as minimising impact on existing communities, smaller streams of traffic entering the highway network and that there should be an emphasis on quality less dense developments. Of those that supported fewer larger sites the justification given for this was that it may provide better and more sustainable infrastructure improvements.

**Private company**

This respondent suggested that the approach taken should be market led.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the 14 responses received it is possible to categorise these into the following 3 groups;

- Fewer, larger sites = 3 responses
- A range (i.e. the council should not be prescriptive) = 10 responses

- Control size (to be proportionate to settlement) = 1

The reasoning given for larger sites included;

- Required to deliver infrastructure necessary and create sustainable communities
- Multiple smaller sites would erode authority's ability to secure infrastructure contributions
- To deliver a higher number of smaller sites would lead to supply issues as multiple landowners and separate sites with individual planning issues would make delivery complex. This approach could lead to infilling and overcrowding, and inadequate delivery of infrastructure.
- There are large available and deliverable sites in sustainable locations
- A larger site can be comprehensively master-planned and integrated into the existing settlement.
- If the focus is upon delivering smaller sites (though this is not defined), there is a risk that this will not provide for the level of affordable housing need for the Island
- Larger developments, appropriately phased, would be in a better position to be self-supporting if the existing infrastructure were already at capacity.
- Ideally the allocations should identify larger brownfield sites rather than identification of many smaller sites. Whilst the smaller sites should not be disregarded or excluded from development the larger sites should be identified within the allocation as they will deliver substantial regeneration and achieve housing delivery targets.

The reasoning given for a range of sites included;

- Ability to consider a range of sites (sizes, locations, quantum, etc) to ensure most appropriate options are considered through the Site Allocation process.
- Some smaller sites may be appropriate and even preferable to large sites, as they would not have such a high demand on existing infrastructure in a specific area.
- The very real danger with the 'larger site' approach is that the developer may land bank the sites on which there are consents rather than implement the developments. It is appreciated that they risk a renewal of the consent being refused after three years. The developer can also make a commencement and then cease with the LPA having no real powers to require completion.
- On the Island there is an almost desperate need to create competition to generate development activity rather than rely on a single major developer who effectively monopolises the housing market and dictates the delivery of housing on the Island.

The response advocating a controlled approach justified this by stating that the Island is characterised by relatively modest settlements and it would be appropriate to control new development proportionately to the scale and character of the location.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Both Visit Isle of Wight and the Isle of Wight Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry supported a flexible approach. The Environment Agency highlighted that larger allocations would provide the Council with more opportunity to secure additional enhancements through the planning system that could help provide additional benefits to the wider community. One response preferred a higher number of smaller sites, while another stated that the scale and location of development should be informed by environmental assessment. One responded had no comment.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Of the 6 respondents making up this group, 4 supported the idea of smaller sites with reasons for this including;

- A higher number of smaller sites would allow better integration and minimise the impact of any proposals.
- Large scale sites did not facilitate a sense of ownership for the existing area and there appeared to be some difficulty in the sale of the new builds.

- Gives a better opportunity for diversity, jobs, better use of smaller brownfield sites, provision of appropriate accommodation, the local economy, quality of development etc.
- Fewer larger sites will certainly mean more greenfield development and possibly the need to review the settlement boundaries.

One respondent said that the issue depends upon the availability of large sites while another asked for further definition. Definitions when discussing smaller and larger sites was a recurring issue raised throughout the majority of the response groups.

#### **Medina Valley – Q4: What are your views on how the council should approach the size of sites that it allocates in the Medina Valley Plan?**

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Views expressed by this group of respondents included the following comments;

- Need to assess the impact on the increase traffic created by new development;
- Which sites are more appropriate for housing & which for jobs?
- To retain the integrity and individuality of villages/towns gaps should be retained between them to also give a feeling of 'space' or 'not everything is joined up';
- Use of a 'site-sensitive' approach as this can encompass small or large developments as appropriate to the area;
- Large housing estates ruin the rural character of the Island;
- If housing is restricted to needs of Island residents then sympathetic infill and brown field sites designated for housing should surely be sufficient in the future;
- East Cowes and Newport suffering from the effects of too many large scale developments. Small developments only should be considered. This would again make it possible for island builders to compete for business to build local homes. Using local builders also maintains the character of the island homes which traditionally have been more interesting and in keeping with their surroundings.
- A maximum of 20 to 30 properties should be on any developments

##### **Private company**

This respondent suggested that the approach taken should be market led.

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

Of the 11 respondents in this category 5 (being the single largest majority for this group) indicated that they preferred a flexible, unrestricted approach, on a site by site basis (ie considering the individual merits of each site). One respondent took an opposing view of control, based on a proportionate approach to match the scale and character of existing location. Two respondents said that in order to provide an informed comment more detail is needed regarding the definition of both smaller and larger sites. One respondent suggested that the allocation process should be focused on brownfield and based on an analysis of how suitable a site is.

##### **Interest group / organisations**

There was a wide range of views from this group of respondents, that can be summarised as;

- A flexible approach, including a mix of sites based on deliverability;
- Environmental assessment and historic interests should be used to inform scale and location;
- A higher number of smaller sites is preferable to development of fewer larger sites

- There has been enough large sites for housing development in East Cowes, therefore only small infill brownfield sites should be allowed in this location.
- No to ribbon development.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The following points summarise the responses from this group;

- Paramount to prevent settlement coalescence, therefore larger scale development (of the three areas suggested in para 1.15) would be supported.
- The agreed policy of green spaces between settlement areas limits the availability of large sites in Cowes. The proposed concentration of development in the Newport area must influence decision making.
- Accept the inevitability of encroachment outside the settlement boundaries into green areas but feel that smaller sites makes difficulties associated with such a development more manageable and result in new housing that is more likely to enhance the area.
- Brownfield site only.

**Medina Valley – Q5: What are your views on these broad locations for new housing development?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

While there was a broad consensus for the three locations there were some specific individual views, being, no more development in East Cowes, Medina Yard and SARO works should only be developed on the proviso that the deep water frontage is retained for marine-related uses (not housing), make sure brownfield sites are used first and prevent settlement coalescence between East Cowes and Whippingham.

**Private company**

The single private company response expressed support for all three sites, but did stipulate that Medina Yard should not have just housing due to the valuable waterside frontage.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was a general consensus of support from agents and owners for the three broad locations. However individual views included that there was a disproportionate emphasis on Newport and that consideration should be given to a wider distribution throughout the western area of the Medina valley, that Cowes is 'built-out', support for the use of greenfield sites, consideration should be given to an eastern extension to Newport in the Fairlee area, support for the focus of housing development around Newport, the Saro site is rural and therefore not suitable for housing as well as support for the Saro site. In summary, while there was general support for the broad approach, most of the time where one view of an area option was expressed there was often an opposing view; this was clearly driven by the individual site interests of the majority of respondents in this group.

**Interest group / organisations**

While there was support for the three locations from this group, the importance of the physical and historic environment, primarily through appropriate assessments when considering specific sites, was raised.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was general support for the broad locations; use of brownfield sites first, locations within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundaries and the prevention of settlement coalescence. Specific individual comments included a request for a definition of what was meant by ‘west of Newport’, that there is a recognised need for affordable/first-time houses near to Cowes, and development in the Newport area will have significant transport and other infrastructure issues.

**Medina Valley – Q6: How do you think the council should define “immediately adjacent” to the settlement boundary?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The general consensus was that development should be located within the settlement boundary and not extend past it. A number of respondents did however comment that immediately adjacent should not include the other side of the road, and that other factors should be considered when determining the suitability of a site.

**Private company**

It was suggested that this should be defined fairly loosely given the fragile short/medium term outlook for the island economy essentially it should be a market decision.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was general support for the current approach towards immediately adjacent, although greater flexibility was advocated potentially through permitting development outside and not immediately adjacent subject to detailed considerations. A number of respondents contended that further definition of immediately adjacent was unnecessary, would be unduly restrictive and would reduce development opportunities. A couple did suggest that a clearer definition could be given, based a good proportion of the site being contiguous to the settlement boundary. It was put forward by some respondents that potential development sites within the settlement boundary should be prioritised.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was support for the interpretation given in the discussion document, although further flexibility was suggested. It was also suggested that other issues such as visual, landscape and historic significance should be considered in terms of assessing suitability of development sites.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for the interpretation given in the discussion document, although the point was made that the distance the development extends beyond the settlement boundary is sometimes an issue. There was also the suggestion that the interpretation of immediately adjacent should be flexible and that the settlement boundary could be extended and the policy approach to support development within but not outside. In relation to specific settlement boundaries there was support for the proposed settlement boundary change at Northwood. It was suggested that the settlement boundary of Newport be extended to include Camp Hill and the former Governor’s House, and that the planning application site at Place Road is immediately adjacent.

**Medina Valley – Q7: What are your views on the approaches to ensuring no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites within and next to the Medina Valley as suggested in paragraph 2.3?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Generally individuals agree to the approaches set out to mitigate recreational impacts on the international nature conservation designations in the Medina Estuary. However

some concerns were raised about the level of finances needed to support this and the long term maintenance needed for new green space required for the approaches proposed. One individual was concerned about not being 'allowed' to do anything around the Island.

**Private company**

It was agreed that the approaches set out are sensible. It was suggested that through careful planning ecologically biodiverse environments can be enhanced and that the Medina Valley should be developed as a high quality tourist destination.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The general consensus amongst planning agents and landowners is that the approach suggested is reasonable. It is felt that designated sites should have very high levels of protection and that area protection should work alongside development. It was identified that the Council has already adopted a Solent Special Protection Area SPD which sets out when developers need to provide a financial contribution for impacts on the Solent Special Protection Area, as a result of increased recreational pressure from new development.

**Interest group / organisations**

The overall approach is agreed by all interested groups/organisations. However Natural England and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust both point out that the use of Green Infrastructure needs to be considered carefully so that sensitive habitats and species are not detrimentally impacted upon. Also the use of the phrase 'birds before people' should not be used because sites can be good for both wildlife and people.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The mitigation approach set out to ensure no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites in relation to the Medina Valley are largely supported. However Cowes Town Council's preferred approach would be to avoid over management of the estuary and leave it undeveloped. Newport Parish Council has similar views in that sites not within environmentally sensitive areas should be developed with preference.

**Medina Valley Q8 – Should the council seek 'local lettings' policies wherever possible, and if so should any particular group(s) of people be prioritised?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was general support for local lettings policies for affordable housing but no consensus over the definition of what constitutes "an islander" with some stating 5-10 years of continuous residency and some stating key workers with no definition of key worker.

**Private company**

Comment was that local lettings policies need to be tailored to the type of development and type of people that they serve. Up market developments should not include local lettings policies.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Land agents commented that development should be based on local demand and normal migration with comment about "how is an islander" defined and what length of residency would meet this definition? However there was also comment that this policy should not be so exclusive to the detriment of units not being occupied resulting in accommodation remaining vacant as non-islanders have a direct and positive impact on the local economy and support an inclusive and economically positive/progressive

approach.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was general support for local lettings policies with a question over who is an “islander” with a suggestion that this might mean “those who have lived here for ten years” There was no confirmation over whether this just applied to affordable housing or all housing but there was a consensus that “islanders” should be accommodated before in migrants were considered.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The main consensus of opinion was that affordable housing should be prioritised for local island residents and key workers but there was no firm comment in respect of open market dwellings.

**Medina Valley – Q9: Do you agree with the suggested amendments shown in the maps on the following pages?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a strong consensus of agreement with the suggested amendments amongst this group. Two responses requested changes, being;

- Further reduce the East Cowes Settlement Boundary, so that it is ‘in line with the others’; and,
- Gurnard/Cowes settlement boundary should run along the middle of Place Road, in order to prevent development in this area.

**Private company**

There was no response for this category of respondent.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The majority of this group of respondents disagreed with the suggested amendments. Reasons given include;

- Concern BAE Systems site is excluded from the Cowes settlement boundary as this is not consistent with the principle of ‘sustainable development’ as defined by the NPPF, due to being potentially harmful to economic growth on the Island;
- Question Gurnard Parish being removed from the settlement boundary as the AAP should still apply as does the Core Strategy;
- Northwood has been removed from the settlement boundary, however this area may benefit from regeneration and specific improvements with business, commercial and housing opportunities;
- Medina River has been removed from the settlement boundary, although spatially, the river is key to connectivity or the lack of it, between East Cowes and Cowes and an intrinsic part of the settlement and its character. If there were to be a proposal for a bridge, how would this fit in with the proposed settlement boundary?
- Boundary suggested changes are too rigid. Settlement boundaries should be based on the existing boundaries, for instance, putting a line along Egypt Hill is inappropriate as this clearly forms part of Cowes where planning permission has been granted for housing.
- Somerton Industrial estate is part of the urban infrastructure of West Cowes and is a part of the settlement. It is contiguous with the town and that therefore the Settlement Boundary should include the whole of that site which is clearly not part of the surrounding countryside.
- It is not clear why Gurnard would no longer have a settlement boundary
- Gurnard and Northwood appear to be somewhat illogical for they do not reflect the actual built environment. Whilst separating Cowes from E Cowes is perfectly

reasonable, to not recognise in planning terms that Northwood and Gurnard are established settlements is irrational.

- No clear logic to the exclusion of Gurnard from a defined settlement boundary. Gurnard is clearly a settlement in its own right that is relatively well served by local facilities.
- Leave Gurnard Northwood Cowes as adopted

Land at Worsley Road, Newport, was one area where there were responses from this group both in support of the suggested amendments and against. Arguments for this seem to centre on the site being an LDF site assessed as deliverable and it's exclusion is unclear for the against and, the site is an old UDP allocation that has failed to deliver the proposed allocation for those in support.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Responses from this group were fairly even split between agreement and disagreement with the suggested amendments.

The reasons given for disagreement can be summarised as;

- Makes sense to link Cowes and East Cowes in respect of flood alleviation measures and public access to the waterfront. They are also linked from a maritime and industrial heritage perspective.
- East Cowes settlement boundary should be reduced in the same way that Cowes/Somerton/Gurnard/ Northwood is proposed.
- There should be a reduction in the settlement boundary by the exclusion of Crossways field, Queensgate Primary School and the Vic Football field. This would maintain the gap between East Cowes and Whippingham when perceived from Beatrice Avenue and the main road, and maintain the approach to Osborne House as being rural. This is important for this Grade 1 listed estate. (Cowes settlement boundary is being much reduced in the AAP, creating larger gaps between Cowes, Northwood and Gurnard).
- Too rigid currently. Settlement boundaries should be based on the settlements and reviewed in a flexible way to effect economy, jobs and housing.

The reasons given for agreement can be summarised as;

- Pleased to see the Newport proposed settlement boundary change now exclude the Kitbridge farm SINC.
- Fully support the proposed revision to the Newport settlement boundary which now excludes the area between Worsley Road and Hunny Hill. This is an area of land assarted from Parkhurst Forest which should be conserved as of historic landscape interest.
- Agree with the suggested amendments shown on the map which are a better reflection of the reality of the separate communities.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The majority of responses from this group agreed with the suggested amendments. Comments given in support of the suggested amendments have been summarised in the following points;

- The only amendment I would make is to move the boundary on Place Road to run down the centre of the road, rather than to the rear of the building line. This boundary would then be similar to that of Baring Road, and would be consistent to the Parish Boundary of Cowes and Gurnard.
- Favour as far as possible 'tight' boundaries around settlements which do not draw in green field sites into development and which prevent planners re-designating green field sites as development sites.
- Newport – proposed but include camp hill and former Governors house.

Of the responses that disagreed with the suggested amendments the reasons for this have been summarised as;

- request a reduction in the settlement boundary so that Crossways Field, Queensgate Primary School and the Vic Football field should be excluded from the settlement boundary to maintain the perceived green gap between Whippingham and East Cowes which would be in line with the public opinion
- No boundary for Whippingham, Whippingham Parish Council does not accept East Cowes Boundary protects it as it is bordered by Newport and Wootton as well and our Council want it to be defined.
- Cowes/ Gurnard – Adopted

**Medina Valley – Q10: Do you think there are any other areas where changes to the settlement boundary should be considered?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Changes identified by this group of respondents include the following;

- land in East Cowes which includes Queensgate School, Vic's Football Ground and Crossways Field should be removed;
- Pleased to see the removal of the development area Worsley Road/Hunny Hill from future plans, and ditto land between Northwood and Cowes, and land between Cowes and Gurnard.
- Gurnard/Cowes settlement boundary should run along the middle of Place Road, in order to prevent development in this area.

**Private company**

No responses were received from this category of respondent.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Changes identified by this group of respondents include the following;

- Question Gurnard Parish being removed from the settlement boundary. The Area Action Plan should still apply as does the Core Strategy and Policies within this.
- Northwood has been removed from the settlement boundary. However this area may benefit from regeneration and specific improvements with business, commercial and housing opportunities.
- Medina River has been removed from the settlement boundary, although spatially, the river is key to connectivity or the lack of it, between East Cowes and Cowes and an intrinsic part of the settlement and its character. If there were to be a proposal for a bridge, how would this fit in with the proposed settlement boundary?
- Land at Worsley Road, Newport has been removed from the settlement boundary, yet this is an LDF site deemed 'deliverable'. The reasoning behind this is unclear.
- It is not clear why Gurnard would no longer have a settlement boundary.
- Settlement boundary adjustments creating separation is justifiable but not removal altogether. The suggested land areas to prevent settlement coalescence within 10.4 should be more than adequate to ensure separation of the various districts.
- Settlement boundary should be amended to incorporate the proposed residential development site at New Fairlee Farm to the north east of Newport.
- The local authority is aware that Camp Hill is vacant and derelict and its inclusion within the settlement boundary would be a wholly logical alteration which can be brought forward through the Medina Valley Plan.

**Interest group / organisations**

Changes identified by this group of respondents include the following;

- East Cowes settlement boundary should be reduced in the same way that Cowes/Somerton/Gurnard/ Northwood is proposed.
- There should be a reduction in the settlement boundary by the exclusion of Crossways field, Queensgate Primary School and the Vic Football field.
- Settlement boundaries should be based on the settlements and reviewed in a flexible way to affect economy, jobs and housing.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Changes identified by this group of respondents include the following;

- favour as far as possible 'tight' boundaries around settlements which do not draw in green field sites into development
- request a reduction in the settlement boundary so that Crossways Field, Queensgate Primary School and the Vic Football field should be excluded from the settlement boundary to maintain the perceived green gap between Whippingham and East Cowes
- There is nothing to describe Whippingham.
- A Councillor suggested that the settlement boundary in Place Rd should be straightened so that houses on the western side of Place Rd are outside the settlement area. Do you see any merit in this?
- The settlement boundary shown is currently running down the centre of gardens in Place Road should be moved further East to the middle of the road.
- The Jordan Valley is retained as a green gap – East of gardens in Worsley Road to Baring Road and South to Place Side.
- Providing all new development is within or adjacent to the settlement boundary there is no overwhelming or pressing need to radically adjust the present boundary. If the new boundary was designed to encompass all new development sites this would merely open up more land that could be defined as 'adjacent to the settlement boundary' and implications of that would quickly become very obvious.
- All land not within settlement boundaries should not be built on.

**Medina Valley Q11 – If enough land cannot be identified within or immediately adjacent to settlement boundaries, what other locations do you think should be considered for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a lack of understanding over who was a "gypsy, traveller, travelling showperson" and what it meant for the communities with some comments being made that a Council run site should be provided with appropriate facilities at a reasonable cost.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was general recognition that the LPA would be placed into a difficult position having to balance the needs of the community with the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Some commented that If existing unauthorised sites are appropriate and acceptable they could be regularised with appropriate management agreements however other comments were received including "Travellers should be kept as far away as possible from the town boundaries, and allocated an area far from the road as possible, preferably in the West Wight, strong controls should be made on their sites."

**Interest group / organisations**

Responses were received that allocations should be based in identified needs but that sites which have an unacceptable adverse effect on designations should be rejected.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was an understanding that the council has to meet its legal responsibilities but there was no consensus on whether this should be on a formal site or firming up existing unauthorised stopping places.

**Medina Valley Q12 – Should the council seek to regularise existing unauthorised stopping places as an alternative to providing new sites?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comments made were that any site needed proper sanitation and needed to be available and suitable and identified on a case by case basis. Further comment was made about land being available in public ownership that could be used for this purpose. Further comment was made about not using lay-bys to become permanent stopping places.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was no consensus of approach with comments ranging from “if existing unauthorised sites are appropriate and acceptable they could be regularised with appropriate management agreements” to “Perhaps a greenfield site in the countryside would be a better bet but would obviously raise issues of access, visual impact. available infrastructure”

**Interest group / organisations**

There was no consensus of approach with comments ranging from “there should be a policy for definite area” to “only if the existing unauthorised stopping place is an acceptable location”

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was no consensus of approach with comments ranging from “in favour of ‘firming up’ existing unauthorised stopping places” to “the Council should not seek to regularise existing unauthorised stopping places unless very exceptional circumstances prevailed” to “not in the Medina Valley”.

**Q13. What are your views on the need for a B8 distribution centre within the Medina Valley?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

In response to this question the majority of private individuals (6) felt that the current distribution facilities were sufficient. Of the eight two respondents felt that improving mainland facilities and making the most of those would reduce the number and size of vehicles coming to the Island. One respondent thought that the situation should be kept under review, the other person agreed on the assumption that any new facilities were to serve waterside uses and that this would be limited to land “limited up to Kingston Power Station”

**Private company**

One private company responded to this question. They felt that it “would be sensible” to include a distribution centre as part of the provision of a new port facility, although they questioned whether such a facility could ever be provided as “it is unlikely to be in the interests of single operators wishing to preserve their own facilities”

**Planning agent / landowner**

There were four responses received from this sector. Of these two were of the opinion that creating a distribution centre would be a good idea, subject to environmental and highway considerations. One said that it should be “driven by the market” and if required subject to demonstrating need and that if provided should be on the “eastern side of the River Medina so as to accommodate the volumes of traffic associated” and divert traffic away from residential areas.” The other respondent felt that sufficient facilities currently exist and they should be modernised first.

**Interest group / organisations**

Five responses were received from interest groups and organisations. Of these three supported that idea that utilising a mainland distribution centre would help reduce the need to have on the Island. One respondent felt that any decision should be informed by the potential effect on heritage assets while the other response received felt it was important to maintain Medina Yard for employment land needing water access.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

This question prompted a total of 6 responses from this sector. Of these one respondent offered no comment, two were not prepared to offer a comment until a site was identified. One felt that the idea of providing a B8 distribution centre “made sense but was probably not needed”. One felt that we should “limit as much as possible distributive transport and encourage the purchase of locally produced food products”. The final response was that “some high tech and low level was required”

**Medina Valley – Q14: Should we protect employment sites with water access, to make sure they are not lost to other uses?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

There was strong support from individuals for the protection of employment sites in favour of being developed as waterside employment opportunities. Reasons given to support this view included marine, leisure and commercial employment opportunities such sites can attract/offer, once lost to other uses sites will never return, future demands are not known and the use of such sites can have a beneficial impact on helping to reduce heavy vehicle movements on the Island’s roads.

**Private company**

Support for the protection of such sites for employment use as they can only be lost once. Consideration does need to be given as to how these sites will be used, but they do provide a unique opportunity due to their location.

**Planning agent / landowner**

All but one supported the principle of this approach, although the degree of support varied from protection, to a flexible approach including possible mixed uses with residential elements. Justification for this variability ranged from an essential requirement for the Island for protection, to a flexible policy so that sites are not sterilized. The reasons given by the respondent who did not explicitly support the protection of such employment sites included the potential sterilization of sites through to restrictive a policy approach and the prevention of regeneration achieved through mixed-use regeneration. A preferred approach to the use of a ‘blanket’ policy would be for the council to identify specific strategic waterside sites that could be safeguarded for a variety of uses.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was general support, but this ranged from unconditional support to a more flexible approach of mixed uses to enable economic growth. Concerns were raised over

the potential impacts coming from any net increase in sites with water access and associated activity on existing nature conservation sites (particularly the SPA).

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was strong support for the protection of employment sites with water access.

**Q15. How can the council support the individual shopping offers of Cowes, East Cowes and Newport town centres?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A common response to how the Council can support the individual shopping offers of town centres from individuals was that parking should be better facilitated (in particular the installation of a car park in East Cowes town centre) and parking should be made free. Some respondents agree that struggling businesses should be supported, especially where there are high retail vacancy rates. Two respondents stated that further allocation for retail units is not required.

**Private company**

One private company responded to the question for each town centre within the Medina Valley. They believe that Newport suffers from the cost of parking and the retail opportunity on offer (largely branded stores) and therefore smaller chains need encouragement here. They also state that Cowes needs little intervention but for East Cowes retail should be supported by offering flexibility through NNDR exemption/reliefs.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The three responses from planning agents were quite varied for this question. One agent welcomes the siting of new supermarkets whereas another opposes the new proposed Asda store. To improve the shopping offer of town centres one agent suggests that a park and ride facility would help. It was also commented that additional retail allocations are not needed and a further comment from agents was to “put people back in Town Centres”.

**Interest group / organisations**

The general response from interested organisations and groups is that shopping areas should be concentrated and boundaries dictated. To accompany this plans should focus development of towns, for example the “historic environment of towns should be enhanced to create an attractive shopping environment”. One respondent commented that East Cowes should have a long stay car park.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

A number of local councils and councillors recommended lowering business rates and improving parking facilities (either by reducing rates, making parking more available in town centres or ensuring out of centre businesses support the improvement of town centres financially) as a means of improving shopping facilities within the towns. Another common theme was the objection to new supermarkets where two of the eight comments specifically relate to this.

**Medina Valley – Q20: Are there any main town centre uses that we should restrict in certain areas, and if so where and why?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The majority considered that keeping a mix of uses would be most appropriate, and it was pointed out that offices do not need to be located in retail areas of the High Street

of any town unless they are selling a product on site eg insurance, estate agents etc.

**Private company**

This should be a market led solution.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was suggested that the management of pubs and restaurants would be a key factor, and a number of other issues/approaches were raised but were not considered to specifically relate to the question.

**Interest group / organisations**

No restriction for specific use, focus on flexibility, job creation and inward investment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was suggested that there be a restriction on uses such as amusement arcades, gambling premises and pawn brokers in the main town centre of Cowes.

**Medina Valley – Q21: Should there be core areas for specific main town centre uses, and if so what uses and where?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was support for maintaining a mix of uses.

**Interest group / organisations**

No restriction for specific use, focus on flexibility, job creation and inward investment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was not considered that there should be core areas for specific main town centre uses.

**Medina Valley – Q22: What are your views as to the suggestion that the main shopping area boundaries should be altered as set out in paragraph 9.15?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was suggested that a mixture of retail/service providers should be kept (or even extended). There was support for the suggested extension, although a new exciting town centre to include the area bounded by Clarence Road retail area, Chain Ferry/Ferry Road, Columbine Road, Waitrose, Well, Road, York Avenue was also suggested. It was also put forward that the Phoenix site should also be added to the outer shopping area, as it is planned that there should be car parking there, perhaps fronted by small shop units. The shops in Well Road, from Regency pharmacy to the post office, and Waitrose should be included, perhaps with the vacant block as the plans are to have shops there below apartments. There was concern that an 'us and them' situation could arise between old and new commercial development and that historical buildings were to be demolished.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was support of the suggestions if there were sustainable and viable, with due consideration given to the historic context. It was also suggested that Waitrose will encourage local residents to shop locally rather than travel elsewhere.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was a suggestion that there should be no restrictions on specific uses and that there should be flexibility, as this would help job creation and inward investment. Conversely there was the suggestion that the town centre should be extended to include the Trinity wharf and part of the Red Funnel High Street marshalling yard, as per the Outline planning permission already granted. This could be added to the outer shopping area, which should also include Waitrose and the shops in Well Road. It was also put forward that there should be a proper town plan that clearly sets direction for usage between competing interest such as leisure/heritage, retail, ferry marshalling, other industrial and return to residential.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Reference was made to the approach set out in the East Cowes Town Plan, specifically page 25 and the Phoenix marshalling yard, multi storey car park with shops.

**Medina Valley – Q23: Are there any main town centre uses that we should restrict in certain areas, and if so where and why?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was suggested that a good mix of shops and services is required and that general offices and housing be kept out of the retail section. It was also suggested that there should be no restrictions.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was an observation that leisure and residential do not mix, and that consideration should be given to the historic context. It was also suggested that Waitrose will encourage local residents to shop locally rather than travel elsewhere.

**Interest group / organisations**

No restriction for specific use, focus on flexibility, job creation and inward investment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Reference was made to the approach set out in the East Cowes Town Plan.

**Medina Valley – Q24: Should there be core areas for specific main town centre uses, and if so what uses and where?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was suggested that offices should be kept out of the main retail area, unless they require a shop front and that there should be no restriction on specific uses.

**Interest group / organisations**

It was suggested that there should be no restriction for specific use, focus on flexibility, job creation and inward investment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Reference was made to the approach set out in the East Cowes Town Plan.

**Medina Valley – Q25: What are your views on land listed within paragraph 10.4?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was overwhelming support for the prevention of settlement coalescence, although a number of changes were suggested to the areas identified in the document: Crossways field; Queensgate Primary School and the Vic Football field; the area behind Place Road and that Area 1 should be extended up to Worsley Road / to the west.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The areas were generally supported, although it was pointed out that small-scale sensitively designed schemes may not necessarily contribute to settlement coalescence and it was also suggested that there was no logical or justified case for them and that the focus should be on sensitive areas rather than being all encompassing. There was also the suggestion of retaining the existing settlement boundary at Gurnard.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was support for the areas identified, with a support given to the exclusion of the estuary from the settlement boundary and the prevention of settlement coalescence could increase the protection of heritage assets and their settings. It was also suggested that economic development shouldn't be prevented and that further refinement should be given to the approach.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for the land listed within paragraph 10.4, with further observations that there were no areas identified around Newport and that settlement coalescence should be prevented unless there is an overwhelming and long-term reason for doing so. It was also suggested that all land not within settlement boundaries should not be built on.

**Medina Valley – Q26: Are there other areas that need protecting to prevent settlement coalescence?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A number of specific areas were identified: Place Road (between identified areas 1&2), Northwood House; Park Road; the field between Hawthorn Meadows development and Whippingham Church; the field at Crossways (between the housing at Osborne, the school and the football ground); all areas that buffer settlement boundaries; to the south of Tuttons Hill to Place Road; the Luck area between Gurnard and Rew Street; and land between Cockleton Lane, Place Road and Tuttons Hill.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The creation of a 'greenbelt' area was suggested, and there was support for the 6 areas identified in the discussion document although it was also suggested that there was no logical or justified case for them and that the focus should be on sensitive areas rather than being all encompassing. There was also the suggestion of retaining the

existing settlement boundary at Gurnard. The area off Place Road was identified as an area that needed protecting to prevent settlement coalescence.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was the suggestion that reduction in the settlement boundary by the inclusion of Crossways field, Queensgate Primary School and the Vic Football field as it would maintain the gap between East Cowes and Whippingham and maintain the rural approach to Osborne House. It was also put forward that economic development should be a consideration in identifying areas.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

A general concern was expressed over settlement coalescence, but the point was made that it wasn't seen as a significant problem for Newport. A number of specific areas were identified: land at Kingswell diary, the undeveloped area between Cowes and Gurnard; Place Road, Tuttons Hill and Cockleton Lane; Horsebridge Hill / Cowes Road; North Fairlee Road / Island Harbour, Binfield area; and Kitbridge area along Forest Road.

**Other than the actions suggested in paragraph 11.3 can you think of any other opportunities there may be to improve the GI provision in the Medina Valley?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Respondents have identified opportunities within the Medina Valley to improve the provision of GI. Suggestions included: new hedging, planting native trees and wild flowers within built up areas, a new cycle track and footpath on the eastern side of the Medina from East Cowes to Newport. One individual stated they would like to see a holistic approach to assess the Island's GI network and account for ecological connectivity.

**Private company**

One private company suggested improvements to the cycle route between Newport and East Cowes and between Newport and West Wight / Cowes and West Wight.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two planning agents would like to see a cycle route between Newport and the West Wight instated. A land owner has made reference to a current planning application that includes provision of GI.

**Interest group / organisations**

Generally organisations and interest groups agree with the GI approach suggested. Most organisations have provided further suggestions to improve the GI network and a couple have said that it would be beneficial to determine areas most appropriate and show these on a map. Suggestions to improve the GI network include: providing new sports pitches, the Medina River and it's tributaries should be enhanced through development to provide corridors for both people and nature, improve land management whilst protecting the historic environment and the provision of SUDs. A conflict in responses occurred when relating the provision of GI to the mitigation in impacts on the SPA. Natural England identify that areas for recreational enhancement will reduce the impact on SPA whereas the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust say that the two should be dealt with separately.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Consensus is that the projects listed that will contribute to the improvement of the GI network are appropriate. An additional suggestion is to not allow 'eyesores in rural

areas'. A councillor goes on to provide a list of areas that could be protected as green gaps.

**Q28. Do you think it's a good idea to start a Newport to West Wight cycletrack, based on the former railway route?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The largest area of response to this question was from private individuals, 10 of whom responded to this question. From these 6 strongly supported the idea, one saying it was an excellent others citing benefits in terms of health, recreation and safety – Forest Road was described as a “high speed trunk road”, improved access to the countryside and tourism - offering the potential to make the Island “a major cycling attraction”. Two respondents were concerned that some sections of the old line were lost.

**Private company**

The sole private company response supported this idea.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two responses were received from this sector. Both supported the idea. One response identified “possible conflict between providing public access and managing areas for their ecological and landscape value” but concluded that establishing a cycle track along the former railway line appears to be “a good project subject to the above”.

**Interest group / organisations**

A total of seven responses were received from these groups. Of these, five were in support of the idea with one organisation highlighted benefits in terms of health, access to the countryside and benefits in terms of tourism and the economy. One group offered “no comment” and another raised concerns regarding potential impact on estuary and SPA. One organisation supported the idea but asked that safeguards be included to ensure it was not “detrimental to biodiversity, especially via bird disturbance”.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Seven representations were received from this group. All supported the idea with one saying “it will help promote tourism,” suggesting that it should be “accessible to horse riders too”. Another saying that we need cycle-tracks for our own population and tourism. Cycle tracks across the Island should be a transport/ tourism/ economy priority “

**Medina Valley – Q29: Do you think the current locations of local level recycling facilities are right? If so why, if not can you suggest any alternative locations?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a significant consensus that the current locations of local level recycling facilities are right, however the following locations were identified as potential sites for further recycling facilities;

- Stag Lane
- Aldi Store car park
- Other supermarket store locations such as Lidl and the future Asda store
- Gurnard

**Private company**

No comments were received from private companies.

**Planning agent / landowner**

While there was some agreement to the current provision of local level recycling facilities respondents from this group highlighted concerns over costs for any new additional facilities.

**Interest group / organisations**

The one respondent in this category identified both car parks and retail establishments as possible locations, but stated that this should not include what was termed as 'tourism car parks'.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

No issues were raised by this group in relation to the location of current local level recycling facilities and no additional or alternative locations were identified. However an access issue was raised, being the inability for non-car users to access recycling facilities.

**Medina Valley – Q30: What items do you want to be able to recycle at these local level recycling facilities?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

This group of respondents identified the following items that they would like to be able to recycle at local level recycling facilities; glass, paper, cardboard, textiles, metals, plastics, rubber, small consumer electrical items (including batteries).

**Planning agent / landowner**

No specific comments were received in relation to what items this group of respondents would want to be able to recycle at local level recycling facilities.

**Interest group / organisations**

No specific comments were received in relation to what items this group of respondents would want to be able to recycle at local level recycling facilities.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The general consensus of this group of respondents was that the current provision is generally adequate. Some specific comments were made by individual respondents, which can be summarised as opposed to the suggestion of a larger waste management facility at Pan Lane, and more recycling sites may lead to negative visual impact in certain locations. A query was also raised as to the location of the recycling facilities on Whippingham Road, Whippingham.

**Medina Valley – Q31: What are your views on the sites in paragraph 12.9?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a range of different views on the sites listed in paragraph 12.9, with no clear consensus. The main points can be summarised as;

- Seems to be an over emphasis of sites on the eastern bank of the Medina. Land adjacent to (East) Cowes power station, Whippingham and 2 sites at Fairlee. Is the one at Whippingham where the Technology Park is located, if so could probably be a contradiction of uses?
- Do we not already have an incinerator which was closed down, should that already known site be looked at first without blighting other areas?
- Saunders Way is a possible, although the smell of rotting compost and plastic bags flying everywhere might not be appreciated by the inhabitants of Hawthorn Meadows. There is a roundabout off the main road for easy access.
- Areas down by the sewage works/ North Fairlee Farm – narrow lanes and difficulty of access/ egress onto Fairlee Road – too near Newport traffic congestion.
- Looks reasonable

**Private company**

The single respondent, Southern Water stated that they had no objection in principle to a potential recycling facility in the area of their wastewater treatment works at Fairlee, however they would require further details and would welcome any discussion on this.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was general consensus from this group of respondents, however concerns were raised about funding and affordability.

**Interest group / organisations**

Both respondents in this group raised concerns about the Whippingham Road site, including the Conservation Area. English Heritage also raised historic environment concerns with regards to the sites at Whippingham Road, Pan Lane and North Fairlee (citing the historic interest features of Great Pan Farmhouse and North Fairlee Farmhouse, grade II listed).

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was general consensus that it would be better to have a single large waste management facility, centrally located such as at Standen Heath. Other comments on the sites included the suitability of both the Forest Rd and sewerage plant sites and that the other sites are unsuitable & will generate a huge local opposition.

**Medina Valley – Q32: Should there be more local waste facilities in the Medina Valley or would you prefer to see a larger appropriately located waste management facility that would be capable of dealing with most of the Island’s waste?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The general consensus of this group was a preference for a single larger appropriately located waste management facility, but there were other views ranging from a tiered approach of co-ordinating a central site with local facilities, to satisfaction with the existing provision and therefore no more local waste sites

**Private company**

The single respondent in this category questioned whether any more waste sites were required, given the existing waste facilities at Lynbottom and Forest Road.

**Planning agent / landowner**

While one respondent from this group agreed with local centres, citing good access and well used, concerns were raised by this group on funding and affordability of any

new waste facilities.

**Interest group / organisations**

The only comments from this group indicated a preference for smaller facilities.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The general consensus from this group was for a large waste management facility, with a number suggesting use of the existing sites at Forest Road and Standen Heath. Some respondents expressed concern at any new waste management site in the Medina Valley.

**Q33. What, if any, types of renewable energy technologies would you like to see on new developments?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Amongst responses from individuals there were no objections to the use of renewable energy technology on new developments. There was however one concern about the lack of funding from Government that would support such schemes. Most respondents listed solar technology as that they would like to see on new developments. Other common renewable technologies included: Combined Heat and Power, tidal and ground source heat pumps. There were a couple of objections to the use of wind turbines and one suggestion for the research into installing a tidal barrage across the river Medina.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Half the planning consultants that responded stated that solar or PV is forms of renewable technology that should be seen in new development. The other half of respondents expressed a desire to see renewable technology developments as long as it is suitable located and there is consideration for the environment. The potential for new forms of renewable technology should also be accounted for when producing the plans.

**Interest group / organisations**

The consensus amongst organisations and interest groups is that the use of renewable technology is acceptable. One respondent suggested ground source heat pumps and another would like to see a range of technologies used. The Wildlife Trust go on to list issues that need addressing to alleviate the impacts on wildlife for such proposals and Jim Fawcett of the Isle of Wight Council suggested wording to ensure small-scale technologies are installed on existing buildings.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

All respondents agreed that the use of renewables is essential to reduce the Island's carbon consumption. Three of the five respondents suggested solar as a form of renewable technology to be developed, however one comment was that solar should not be used. Other suggestions include the use of: small wind and water turbines and the capture of ground source heat.

**Q34. Do you think the council should use its resources to further explore whether such a bridge is feasible?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Fifteen responses from private individuals were received. Of these eight were opposed to the idea, some citing the cost whilst others suggesting alternatives such as a

tunnel, footbridge, new floating bridge swing bridge and improvements to Coppins Bridge. Two of these people also opposed the idea which they felt would add to traffic on Pallance Road. Seven private individuals generally supported the idea. Reasons for support included the need to link the communities on both sides, take traffic away from Coppins Bridge and provide another route to support the chain ferry.

**Private company**

One representation was received from a private company. This did not support the construction of a new bridge but instead supported improvements to the chain ferry and existing road network.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three representations were received from planning agents / landowners. Two opposed the idea, one of which pointed out that this has been looked at before “with no positive outcome”. The other supported the idea of a bridge but that this should be a “footbridge at Seaclose to Blackhouse Quay”

**Interest group / organisations**

Eight interest groups submitted responses to this question. Of these responses one response thought the idea of a “low-level bridge is an interesting and attractive one”, but suggested instead the construction of an opening barrage with roadway over. Of the others three were opposed to a bridge one suggesting that “any feasibility should be left to private interest” another citing prohibitive cost and the other saying that “new roads only encourages new traffic and does not alleviate any existing problem” suggesting instead that money should be spent “encouraging people to use alternatives to the car instead”

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

A total of seven responses were received from this group. Of these three were in favour of the idea, three against and one no comment. Those in favour generally recognised the difficulty in achieving funding; there was a reluctance to allow development just to fund the bridge, one suggesting we should approach the EU, the other suggested that money may be available from the Solent Local Enterprise partnership (SLEP). One positive respondent suggested a crossing linking Stag Lane to the Racecourse Roundabout. This respondent recognised that any residential development would “contribute to the housing target for Medina Valley”, but the “practicalities in terms of engineering and financing are enormous” and “therefore unlikely in the foreseeable future.” They concluded that “some advanced planning for a later date unless there is a radical and fundamental change in transportation here on the Island”. Those against the idea recalled that this idea has been looked at in detail before, cited the lack of funding, that “such a bridge & associated development will have a serious negative impact on the Medina Valley” suggesting that “a pro-active stance to explore ways to divert unnecessary traffic away from Newport town centre and Coppins Bridge roundabout. Would be a better use of resources”

**Q35. Do you agree that there should be a Floating Bridge between Cowes and East Cowes? What are your views on the importance of a pedestrian and vehicle link across the River Medina between Cowes and East Cowes?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The largest number of responses received to this question was from private individuals. All of the 14 responses received from this group were in support of retaining the floating bridge. Many cited the need to retain a direct link being essential in terms of connecting the two towns, while others recognised the value it serves in reducing the number of vehicles passing through Newport. One thought that if a fixed bridge was built then the chain ferry should be pedestrian only, another thought that it should be replaced by a swing bridge. The cost of using it was raised by some one respondent urging that it remain free, while another suggested charging 20p per journey.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Four responses were received from this sector. All were in general agreement that the floating bridge should be retained. One highlighted the problem of maintenance, suggesting that local developments should contribute to the repair of the craft through a planning agreement. Another submitted by agents on behalf of adjoining landowners (Medina Yard) expressed the wish to be involved in the “development and considerations of any future proposals in this regard”

**Interest group / organisations**

Ten responses were received to this question from interest groups / organisations. Of these five were clearly in favour of retaining the floating bridge as an essential link between the towns. Two highlighted the need to achieve a long term solution to the maintenance and upkeep of the craft, one of which suggested that local developments should contribute to the repair of the craft through a planning agreement. Three responses highlighted more technical issues including the need to carry out Habitat Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and need to consider the Isle of Wight Estuaries and Solent Disturbance Mitigation Projects and Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy (2010). Another highlighted the opportunity to ensure that tidal defences be raised to prevent future flooding. The third from Cowes Harbour Commission, underlined that any consideration needs to take account of the impact on navigation of the river.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Seven responses were received from this sector. All agreed that it was essential to keep a direct link between the two towns, both as a transport link and alternative to driving through Newport (Coppins Bridge) but also in terms of the benefit to the local economy. One respondent suggested that charges should be applied to foot passengers and another suggested that consideration should be given to constructing a bridge or tunnel be constructed between the two towns.

**Q36. Do you think that the council should consider the potential for park and ride for Newport?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Eleven responses were received from this sector. Of these eight were broadly in support of the idea. Of these three thought a site to serve Newport should be considered. One would support sites to the north, south, east and west of Newport. Two were not certain but thought that it might be worth pursuing. One respondent questioned who would fund any proposal, another asked who would pay for the bus?.

**Private company**

One response was received from a private company. This supported the idea but asked that the site should be of a “sensible size”, saying the existing P&R site at Cowes was too small and deterred business travellers.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from this sector. One did not support the idea. One supported the idea and thought a site north of Newport would be preferable suggesting that this would support other possible works to improve junctions and traffic flow through the town. The third noted that Newport has an “unduly complex and confusing traffic system” and while a park and ride site may help reduce traffic in the town it may not be well used. The respondent suggested that “a more coherent traffic management and parking management plan would possibly be just as effective”.

**Interest group / organisations**

Five responses were received from this sector. One was against the idea, one in favour. One suggested that research shows that park and ride schemes are only successful in certain locations – Cowes being one, but they can act to encourage car use to the site, will take up valuable space and could be a financial burden on the Council. The High Tech Park at Whippingham was suggested as a site at East Cowes. “No comment” was offered by English Heritage.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Seven responses were received from these respondents. Of these six were generally in support of the idea with one noting that Newport was the communication and employment “hub”. One supporter felt that the option would have to be cheaper and more convenient than car use and another would not wish to see the loss of rural land. One respondent suggested that sites at Fairlee Road, Staplers and Blackwater should be considered. The final response questioned how many people would use them “given that pensioners have bus passes and supermarkets provide adequate free parking”?

**Q37. Are there any sites that you think would make good park and ride sites? If so, where?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A total of six responses were received from private individuals. Of these one suggested the IW college at weekends. One the racecourse or North Fairlee Farm, the third noted that the site adjoining Newport Football Ground would have been ideal. Another supported sites to the north, south, east and west of Newport. The fifth response suggested a site at Seaclose and prison site for Newport and the new high tech park at Whippingham. The final response from this sector was similar suggesting a site near Seaclose Offices for park and walk and a site at the high tech park at Whippingham to serve East Cowes.

**Private company**

Two responses were received from this sector. One agreed with the idea but offered no suggestions the other suggested a combined site to deal with West Cowes and Newport “of sufficient size to ensure that business travellers can be assured of parking arrangements when they arrive and backed up with a small café or similar.”

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two responses were received from this group. One thought that the answer lay in a more coherent traffic management and parking plan, but suggested that if a site had to be found that Newport Football Ground might be a possible location, but felt that this would only deal with traffic entering Newport from the south and would “have its own issues”. The other response from this sector suggested that the council “might wish to consider undertaking an assessment of potential sites and approach those landowners.”

**Interest group / organisations**

There were four responses from this group, none of which suggested a site. One was positive but did not suggest a site. Cyclewright noted that experience from elsewhere shows that park and ride schemes can actually encourage car travel to the site and that if it is to work then parking in the town will have to be discouraged. English Heritage did not suggest any sites but instead asked that the choice “be informed by the potential effect on heritage assets and their setting and that “any site that would have an unacceptable adverse impact should be rejected.” In a similar vein Cowes Harbour Commission “would wish to be consulted on matters impacting water access or traffic”

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Five responses were received from this area. These were:

1. Newport Football Ground. Prison Estate, fields near the racecourse roundabout.
2. County Show Ground – for Cowes and Newport. Underused land in Parkhurst.
3. One respondent noted that addressing traffic from the west of Newport presents a challenge, but when looking at other directions offered the following locations -North Fairlee Farm, Seaclose, St Georges Park, Newclose Cricket Ground and IW College.
4. The “old car parks Parkhurst Road”
5. Festival site in Fairlee Road.

**Q38. If this project goes ahead what, if any, uses would you wish to see developed on the current marshalling areas in East Cowes?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Ten private individuals responded to this question. One offered no detailed comment. One suggested “a large marshalling yard could be developed on the Whippingham Road to the south of GKN, The traffic sported and sent to ferries in batches thereby easing congestion in the town.” Another offered a comment regarding the current marshalling facilities which were thought to be “unnecessary with the doubling and trebling of the space they desire.” Those respondents which offered potential uses for the current marshalling facilities all suggested the development of new facilities to enhance the town. These included the following:

1. “Enhance the town centre, create a permanent market.”
2. “Expansion of shopping centre, town square etc.”
3. Developments to make the town “more attractive to both visitors and local residents” – retail and recreation.
4. “Specialist retail store or facility” to “bring people from other parts of the Island into East Cowes especially to visit it.” For example “swimming pool, combined with a youth club and dance hall, conference centre and meeting rooms, offices as well or small hotel such as Premier Inn.”
5. In-town residential developments with amenity areas.

Two respondents referred to local plans being prepared by local community setting out a vision for the town and that this was being used in dialogue with the council and Red Funnel. This scheme seeks to improve waterside access and includes new retail, residential, parking and amenity areas and public realm.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from this group. Of these one was in general support of town centre redevelopment. One supported employment allocations supported by enabling housing developments. The other noted that “the area now occupied by marshalling yards take up a considerable part of the town centre which were formerly covered with traditional streets and buildings” and has “suffered many losses and degradation of character” The respondent suggested that “some of this character could be reinstated in significant locations” and there is the possibility for “some formal open spaces for events or as public space.”

**Interest group / organisations**

Five responses were received from this group. One highlighted the need to consider any historic interest in the marshalling yards. The East Cowes Group, IOW Society made reference to the work being undertaken by the local community to prepare a vision for the town – recently shared with the council and cross Solent ferry operator. The

other responses from this group were as follows:

1. "Hotel and leisure facilities e.g. Premier Inn / water-side culture".
2. "The Red Funnel Plan should be dovetailed into a wider plan," "Sustainable Transport Plan and wider Masterplan."
3. "Mix of uses particularly those which encourage visitors into and remain in East Cowes."

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Six responses were received from this sector.

1. Two made no comment.
2. One suggested "employment, especially marine related opportunities."
3. These sites have "obvious residential potential".
4. Café, shops, hotel, improved ferry amenities / traffic terminus, tourist attractions and Trinity Wharf used as landing to bring in tourists from shipping."
5. "Should focus on jobs, not more housing. How about a university campus?"

**Q39. Do you support the improvements planned for East Cowes?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

11 responses were received from private individuals. All were in general support, three offered no detailed comment while the rest were in support or "strong support" of planned improvements with three respondents supporting paragraphs 15.6, 15.7 and 15.8 in particular. The responses from this group were:

1. Support for the construction of a new breakwater.
2. Support for new ferry facilities and marshalling areas.
3. Support for a new floating bridge.
4. Support for tourism which was seen as being "vital to the Island economy"
5. Need to retain public access to waterside, provision of slipways and landing stages.

**Private company**

One response was received from this sector. This was in support of the improvements planned for the town but offered no detailed comment.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two responses were received from this sector. One was straightforward "yes", while the other was a more detailed response supporting the redevelopment of the marshalling areas and retention of the columbine building which was described in the response as a "well established iconic structure well known throughout the world"

**Interest group / organisations**

Six responses were received from this sector. All were broadly in support of the planned improvements for the town.

1. One thought that they should be dovetailed into a wider sustainable transport / master plan for the town.
2. One was broadly in support but was concerned that land previously assembled as part of wider masterplan are now being sold to the “highest bidder.”
3. English Heritage was although as a matter of principle likely to support sensitive improvements to the public realm, “would expect any proposals to conserve and ideally enhance the historic significance of heritage assets in the town centre”.
4. The East Cowes Group IW society pointed to the work already undertaken by them and others and already shared with the council.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Seven responses were received from this sector. Of these:

1. One supported the regeneration of the town.
2. One supported the marina development – but not housing.
3. Three did not offer detailed comments.
4. One was not sure.
5. One respondent pointed to a specific local traffic issue where lorries are causing problems at Saunders Way – pulling up on the highway rather than entering the site.

#### **Q40. Should the “Union Jack” building be retained as part of the project and, if so, what could it be used for?**

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Of the 35 responses received, almost half (16) were from private individuals. With the exception of one respondent who did not give a detailed comment and another who thought “we should encourage a large industrial or electronic employer to take it on”, all the others were in support of retaining what may be described as an “iconic” building for beneficial use. The suggestion was also made that the space in front of the building should be public realm and open to the public as part of improving waterside access as part of the comprehensive development of the area. Many suggested this should be maritime related or linked to the Classic Boat Museum. One suggesting “Columbine shed would make the ideal “Maritime Heritage Experience” based on the present collections of the Classic boat museum and gallery. Boat restoration / repair can run side by side with this to provide additional income. The upper side floors could be restaurants/ cafes to help fund the museum with nautical shops on the shore side where sea views are not necessary” Other comments suggested:

- Tourism related visitor attraction “in addition to Osborne House”.
- Classic Boat Museum should move into the space and expand.
- The Classic Boat Museum should share the space with another complimentary use such as a racing yacht operation or one of the following below.
- Heritage museum / gallery explaining history of site and East Cowes – flying boats, hovercraft, shipbuilding, links to Osborne House and local history.
- Café restaurant, retail office space.

##### **Private company**

The sole private company representation was in support of retaining the building for leisure / heritage use with the suggestion that a boat museum would be suitable use.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two representations were received from this sector. Both supported the retention of what one described as an iconic building. The possible uses suggested by one were to use the building for some “publically accessible uses.”

**Interest group / organisations**

Representations were received to this question from eight interest groups / organisations. Of these two supported the retention of the building for heritage / museum purposes but raised concerns regarding the viability of retaining such a large building for such a use. Visit IOW said it should only be retained “if practical use envisaged and commercially viable.” English Heritage noted that it is “recognised as a local heritage asset” whilst at the same time recognising the “potential difficulty in finding an alternative use for such a large building”. The councils Principle Officer (Environment) noted “that there is interest in the Columbine building as a base for tidal energy operations and maintenance. It is an important site because of its wharfage, deep water access and large apron for handling large pieces of equipment”. He questioned if the “statements in these paragraphs inhibit its development as an employment site if a viable scheme came forward”? The Solent Protection Society believes that “the `Union Jack` building should be retained. There is a national need for a National Museum of yachting where yachts could be exhibited; such a museum would be a big boost for the Isle of Wight and East Cowes in particular”. They noted that “the nearest thing to such a museum is in Falmouth but this is not a good location nor specifically for yachting.” The IW Archaeological Service felt that “the Columbine Works building should be retained as a historic building which serves as a reminder of the town's importance in the development of the flying boat and the hovercraft”. The Classic Boat Centre Trust noted that their gallery “already occupies part of the Columbine building already and we would be strongly in favour of the building being retained for a mixed use of heritage, leisure and community. The suggestion is that you bring forward such as market halls, exhibition space and similar are also very attractive although consideration will need to be given to viability and subsidy given its unlikely that the local authority could subsidise a scheme of this nature at present. Substantial central grant funding and/or commercial participation would be necessary”. The Classic Boat Centre Trust comments explained that they “would be keen to investigate jointly with the isle of Wight Council opportunities for a Heritage Lottery Fund bid or similar to establish a well-founded and secure facility for the local community but we recognise we need to do this in partnership with others and would not have the capacity to undertake it by ourselves”. The East Cowes Group Isle of Wight Society commented “use Columbine shed for maritime heritage experience as planned – allow space for this within the town to encourage tourists and increase the public realm”.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Eight representations were received from this sector. Three offered no comment but the rest were generally supportive commenting:

1. “The Union Jack and the building next to it should be retained.”
2. “Yes it should be retained. Marine related tourist attracting projects.”
3. “Yes the Union Jack should at least be retained”.
4. “Yes, it’s iconic.”

**Q41. Is there any reason why we shouldn’t deliver interactive signalling to advise users of traffic-related problems before they arrive in East Cowes?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Seven responses were received from this sector. These were mixed with no overriding view.

- One offered no detailed comment.
- Two people were against the idea, one commenting that with the current council deficit “interactive signalling appears to be a waste of resources”
- Two people thought alternatives should be considered such as SMS texts, mobile phone app with service updates, “good to use the mobile units when necessary around the island”
- Two people offered similar views that “if there was a multi storey car park in East Cowes and plenty of car parking for the Boat Museum, some people could come and spend the day in East Cowes while waiting for their ferry, spending more of their money in the town”.

**Private company**

The sole representation received from this sector though the idea to be “sensible”.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three comments were received from this sector. Two were however in answer to question 42 regarding Newport traffic improvements, the other supported the idea.

**Interest group / organisations**

Three responses were received from interest groups / organisations. Those comments submitted by Visit IoW and IW Chamber of Commerce were in support the idea. Whilst English Heritage offered no detailed comment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Six representations were received from this sector; of these two offered no comment. Cowes Town Council was not in support adding “that they are not cost effective as they do not solve the traffic problem.” Three were in support of the idea and could see no reason why not to deliver interactive signing, with one respondent supporting the idea pointing out that there is only one road into East Cowes and the other equally supportive but adding the proviso that “the Island is rural, can we consider please not having too many signs.”

**Q42. In addition to those listed in paragraph 16.3, are there any other junctions that you think are at capacity, or are problematic, and if so can you suggest any solutions?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Seven responses were received from this sector. Of these one offered no detailed comment, the other comments and suggestions were as follows:

1. “There are frequent traffic jams at junctions in Newport town centre, the answer surely, as stated previously, is to pedestrianize the town centre”.
2. A bridge over the river Medina as per Question 35 “may alleviate some of the problem”
3. “Coppins roundabout seems the obvious. Perhaps allow ‘part-time’ traffic lights, as used in many places on the mainland and abroad ... it does work”.

Two responses were specific to issues at East Cowes saying:

1. “Hopefully, with future plans for Red Funnel, traffic delays may be minimised and become a thing of the past”.
2. “No additional problematic junctions, apart from changes that may come about with the revised RF plans”

**Private company**

A single response was received from this sector suggesting that “a controlled crossing is necessary on the cycle path at Shide where it crosses Blackwater Road”.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from this sector, two offering detailed responses, one supporting all of those suggested. The first of the more detailed comments commented that “any junction improvements should be fully considered as part of the urban context as well as for traffic flow. There are many examples of poor quality inappropriate highway junctions which confuse and degrade the public realm” saying “this is particularly significant in Newport as the Island's central market town and also in the historic parts of Cowes and East Cowes” The specific comments from this respondent were as follows:

1. “The reference to the Field Place /Carisbrooke Road junction is confusing as this appears to be on the raised Mall which has no traffic flow”
2. “Possible changes to Quay Street and Sea St junctions could have significant implications for the historic fabric and character”
3. “Mill Street and Drill Hall Road have previously been discussed but these would also have very significant urban design impacts within the historic town.”

The other response from this sector was submitted on behalf of NHS IOW and was more specific to the hospital site. The NHS “owns land immediately adjacent the St Mary’s Roundabout and is aware of the congestion issues at this junction and others, especially at peak hours”. “The NHS is willing to discuss (with Island Roads) the issues and options and whether there is an ability to assist, which will improve accessibility to the hospital for patients, staff and visitors, and also as plans develop to bring forward development on land north of the hospital in accordance with the Island Plan allocation”

**Interest group / organisations**

Three comments were received from this sector. English Heritage offered no comment on this question. East Cowes Group of the Isle of Wight Society made reference to work underway by their group suggesting an option for East Cowes. The IOW Chamber of Commerce Tourism and Industry suggested:

- Coppins Bridge.
- Dodnor Estate.
- Fairlee Road needs widening.
- South Street
- Pyle Street into Coppins Bridge.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Five responses were received from this sector. Of these two respondents offered no comment at this stage. One made reference to the “so called improvements at Stag Lane” hoping that “those listed will not be improved”. The other comments were as follows:

1. “Do not implement the Absurd Newport Traffic Plan”.
2. Newport Parish Council sought clarification of some of the improvements listed.
  - “Dodnor Lane/Daish Way Junction we assume this is the mini-roundabout along Dodnor Lane to the rear of St. Mary’s”
  - “Field Place/Carisbrooke Road junction (could be a bit of a challenge! Slight difference in levels!!)”
  - “The Medina Way gyratory (assume this means Coppins Bridge and various approaches)”
  - “Hunnycross Way/Hunnyhill junction (this junction has already been improved, do you mean Hunnycross Way/Riverway (mini-roundabout) close to flyover

- near Lidl's?"
- "Quay Street/Sea Street junction (not aware of a significant problem here)"
- "Surprising that St. Mary's Roundabout does not appear on list and there is a very definite case for a signal controlled junctions at the entrance to Medina High School and at the junction of Wellington Road/Carisbrooke Road"

**Medina Valley – Q43: Are there any particular utility infrastructure issues within the Medina Valley that you think we need to be aware of?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Of the responses from this group the following specific (although not all related to utility) infrastructure issues were raised;

- Water quality in the Medina, with particular reference to both the disposal of foul water drainage and the disposal of foul water from boats during events.
- Water pressure in the lower part of East Cowes seems reduced.
- Traffic impacts
- Education (school places)
- Health facilities (including doctors, dentists and hospital capacities)
- Social services capabilities

**Private company**

Southern Water was the only respondent in this group. They highlighted the different funding mechanisms for water infrastructure depending on scale. Funding for strategic infrastructure will be achieved through the five yearly period price review process carried out by Ofwat, whereas local sewerage infrastructure should be funded by the development if this is specifically required to service individual development sites (although the developer may only need to fund a proportion of the total cost as Southern Water would take into account future income from customers).

**Planning agent / landowner**

Despite three responses to this question, only one respondent made any comments. These can be summarised as ensuring the historic context of Island towns is taken into account when considering highway junction improvements.

**Interest group / organisations**

Of the responses from this group the following specific infrastructure issues were raised;

- Waste collections need to be timed around busy traffic
- Further grid reinforcements are likely to be needed in order to facilitate the expansion of renewable energy generation on the Island. Since the interconnectors land within the Medina Valley AAP and one of the main 132kV substations is in East Cowes, it is fair to assume that work will be required in the Medina Valley AAP to upgrade the grid.
- Alternatives to electricity grid reinforcement, such as battery storage and hydrogen production, both of which will require significant space.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was a recurring utility infrastructure issue coming from this group, being sewers and drainage. Specific issues relating to this were;

- Gurnard, substandard leaking combined sewers, particularly at Shore Road, Worsley Road and the bottom of Woodvale Road.
- Retaining surface water within property boundaries
- Prison estate and Gunville Stream, problems with surface/foul drainage

**Medina Valley Q44 – In addition to the sites listed in paragraph 17.4, are there any other buildings or sites that you are aware of that you would like the council to consider taking action on?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comments were made that action should be taken on the following buildings

- Frank James, East Cowes
- Medina View, East Cowes

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comments were made that action should not be taken on any site where a detailed planning application has been submitted. In addition the following sites were identified:

- Newport Harbour
- Frank James Hospital
- Pyle St./South St

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments were made about the individual action on certain buildings, structures and land and the following properties and sites buildings were identified:

- Newport Harbour, Newport
- Cowes Hammerhead Crane, Cowes
- Columbine building, East Cowes
- Medina View, East Cowes

Further comment was made that the Council should also be looking at sites listed within the English Heritage “Heritage at Risk” register 2013.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Concerns were raised over the previous lack of action on empty and derelict properties on site by the Council including comment that the service could be more proactive.

However further properties and sites were identified as follows:

- Braunstone House (Lugley Street)
- Land east of Castle Road, and north of Market Hill, Cowes
- Land at the far end of Westwood Close, Cowes.
- Medina View Dover Road.

**Medina Valley Q45 – Do you support the council in putting in place a more pro-active approach to empty and derelict sites?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was unanimous support from private individuals for a proactive approach to empty and derelict sites with further comment that this proactive approach should extend to include the development period following any consent granted.

**Private company**

There was unanimous support from private individuals for a proactive approach to empty and derelict sites

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that a proactive approach should only be made when developers are not progressing with proposals but that there was support for this approach with key locations being encouraged to include hoardings promoting local art whilst securing the site.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was 100% support for a proactive approach including the use of appropriate hoardings but further comment was made that the ecological aspects of each site needed to be taken into consideration.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was 100% support for a proactive approach with further comment that we should also focus on getting people to develop once they have the necessary permission

**Medina Valley – Q46: What are your views on the use of Local Development Orders to enable economic development? What areas in particular do you think the council should consider?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was support for LDOs to help maintain a tidy appearance, although a concern was raised over whether LDOs removed the right to object to a proposal (as per a planning application), and if so it was not considered appropriate. A further suggestion was the use of CPOs if necessary.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was support for the inclusion of Folly Reach (SARO site) in an enterprise zone, although the use of LDO or CPO would be resisted by the landowner. There was support for the sites listed in paragraph 17.4 to be used for residential development, and there was a query as to why the options set out in 17.5 hadn't been used more regularly. It was also suggested that the private sector be left to progress development without such interventions.

**Interest group / organisations**

The use of LDOs were supported to support economic development and to maintain the appearance of development sites, with hoardings advertising local products and

events. LDOs should include adequate safeguards for the historic environment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for maintaining the appearance of development sites, along with the use of LDOs to regenerate sites (JS Whites and land south of UKSA were mentioned) and the introduction of a Local Enterprise Zone in the Medina Valley. However there was also a concern that long-term jobs, not housing, are required and there was an emphatic no due to concerns over delaying development.

**Medina Valley – Q47: Do you think the council should introduce a requirement for the appearance of development sites to be maintained to a reasonable standard?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

All respondents agreed, and a number also noted the potential negative impact of construction on the surrounding road network.

**Private company**

All respondents agreed.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The majority of the respondents supported the approach, with a condition being suggested as the appropriate mechanism. It was highlighted that a “reasonable standard” is subjective.

**Interest group / organisations**

All respondents agreed, and the use of a condition was suggested along with a query over what was meant by reasonable.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

All respondents agreed, although it was highlighted that a “reasonable standard” is subjective.

**Medina Valley – Q48: Is there any planning matter not covered in this document that you think the council needs to consider within the Medina Valley Plan?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Concerns were raised over the low quality of design of new development, and it was suggested that this needed to be addressed to maintain the Island’s character. A number of respondents stated that there should be no more development (whether it was needed or not) due to its detrimental impact visually, on the environment and because of the extra traffic it would generate. It was suggested that there should be a greater preservation of greenfields and even that National Park status should be sought. Some respondents identified the future of the Classic Boat Museum as an issue, along with the wider promotion of tourism, the need for the provision of all-weather facilities and the negative impact of development on tourism. A number of respondents asked questions over the future of Newport Harbour, whether there were plans for it and why it hadn’t been covered in the document. Concerns were raised over increasing traffic congestion and ways in which it could be managed at Coppins Bridge and Forest Road, along with a specific concern regarding the completion of the Hawthorn Meadows road network. The need to improve public transport was also mentioned.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was suggested that annual monitoring of housing numbers should be undertaken, that a binding process to understand and agree on economic viability assessments be introduced and that the infrastructure should be commensurate to the level of development. It was suggested that the Core Strategy should be reviewed in totality, rather than the partial review covering SP2, and that residential development could be introduced on hospital owned land.

**Interest group / organisations**

A range of interest groups responded to this question, and their responses mainly related to their subject of interest. There was support for the use of hoardings (or similar) to improve the appearance of development sites and to use as adverts for Island products, along with a flexible and pro-active approach towards economic development, the provision of infrastructure that improves the safety of non-motorised road users and LDOs for energy efficiency improvements to existing properties which currently require planning permission. It was suggested that the NPPF requires the council to identify and map the Island's ecological network and to provide a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, that the council should make new developments more wildlife friendly using a range of techniques and protect existing playing fields unless demonstrated to be surplus to requirements. Public access to the waterfront should be provided in future development, and the industrial heritage in Cowes and East Cowes should be utilised and maximised.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Concerns were raised over a number of issues, including: Newport Harbour management and the need for a development brief SPD, whether 35% affordable housing is achievable/realistic, the protracted nature of the preparation of the AAPs, lack of reference to heritage assets and the impact of development on tourism. It was suggested that higher quality housing should be provided and at a higher density in town centres, that greater emphasis needs to be placed on job creation, targeting of higher education, that there should be higher aspirations for the Island and that a greater level of development could be delivered in the Bay area.

## Ryde

### Q1. What are your views on the use of Brownfield land first, to support regeneration, and the impact this could have on infrastructure development?

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

All respondents agreed that brownfield land should be used first to support regeneration. It was added that there should be a high density within the core existing settlement, development should be of a good quality design to fit with the surroundings and that that some recreation grounds could also be developed.

##### **Private company**

It was commented that there should be a presumption in favour of brownfield land first.

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

Some planning agents and land owners agreed that the use of brownfield land first, to support regeneration. However concerns were raised over how much brownfield land is available and suitable for development. It was suggested that it would be useful to allocate sites and include development briefs for these.

##### **Interest group / organisations**

Generally it was agreed that brownfield land should be developed first. However several organisations said that there is no preference to developing brownfield or greenfield first but instead it will depend on site suitability, taking into account protected species, ecological connectivity or protection of heritage assets.

##### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Respondents to this question believe that brownfield land should be developed first and one respondent does not want to see greenfield sites developed at all. It was also suggested that smaller brownfield sites should take preference and that consideration should be given to the density and character of a site.

### Q2. If viability is an issue on brownfield sites, should the local planning authority take a pragmatic approach to negotiating s106 contributions?

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Generally private individuals agree that If viability is an issue on brownfield sites, the local planning authority should take a pragmatic approach to negotiating s106 contributions. It was commented that brown field should be a priority for development. One respondent suggested contributions should be collected to ensure the sewers in Ryde are not full.

##### **Private company**

The one respondent to this question agreed.

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

It was felt by all planning agents and land owners that the local planning authority should take a pragmatic approach when negotiating s106 contributions when viability is an issue on brown filed sites. It was also suggested that there should be flexibility when negotiating for greenfield sites too. The main reasons given for this were that it ensures

sites are viable for development and that infrastructure requirements vary per location.

**Interest group / organisations**

Some organisations and interested parties whom responded to this question agree that a pragmatic approach should be taken. However a couple of respondents disagreed and the reasons given for this were that the environment should not be compromised due to viability issues and it was commented that increased housing numbers may increase recreational impact on designated sites and contributions must be collected to mitigate against this. It was also stated that actually s106 agreements should be removed or reduced.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent agreed with taking a pragmatic approach, however suggested there should be consistency when developing brownfield sites in terms of housing density and character. It was suggested that instead the long term impacts of encouraging building work should be considered rather than collecting financial contributions for this.

**Ryde – Q3: Should housing allocations be made on fewer, larger sites or on a higher number of smaller sites?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A significant majority of respondents preferred the option of a higher number of smaller sites. Reasons given for this included larger developments creating ‘ghettos’, better standards of housing and the ability to use small brownfield sites within the town with an example of good high density infill given as 56 The Strand/East St.

**Private company**

The single response in this group preferred a higher number of smaller sites, although no reason was given.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the 10 responses given by this group just one preferred smaller sites (without providing any reason or justification). 3 responses preferred an approach where each site would be assessed on its merits and 6 responses preferred a range of sites. Of the responses preferring each site proposal being assessed on its merits, the following points were made;

- The individual size of a proposal should not have any bearing on the principles of development, if the consequences of its development are demonstrated to be beneficial and sustainable;
- There should be no “blanket” approach, as this suggests that some sites could be prevented from being developed sustainably and put pressure on inferior sites, simply due artificial size criteria

Of the responses preferring each a range of sites, the following points were made;

- should not rely upon one or two strategic allocations to meet the majority of the housing needs of Ryde, as this would place too much reliance on timely delivery of just one or two strategic allocations;
- a range of housing sites, providing the opportunity to deliver a range of housing types in different locations will help to spread the impact of new development (for example, in terms of highways impact), and will offer the Council the opportunity to make best use of existing community infrastructure;
- A range of sizes will suit varying developers;

- Need to define what is meant by larger and smaller sites;
- The development industry does not need a policy to be prescriptive when it could severely affect delivery rates;
- It is misleading to present an option to the community that suggests that either one or the other is a realistic solution that can fully meet housing needs;
- Only limited weight can be given to community responses as the Discussion Document does not give any information on:
  - any specific figures for the number of new houses required to be identified by this Plan;
  - how many smaller sites may be required;
  - where these other sites would be located; and
  - how many units would be required on them.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was no majority or preferred response in this group, but rather each respondent gave an individual answer, which can be summarised as;

- allow some flexibility
- support smaller sites (up to 300)
- without the relevant environmental assessments there is no certainty that adverse impacts can be avoided
- larger allocations would provide the council with more opportunity to secure additional enhancements through the planning system that could help provide additional benefits to the wider community.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

All three of the responses in this category expressed concerns over larger sites.

**Ryde – Q4: If there were to be a limit on numbers for housing allocations, how should it be worked out?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a range of different responses with no clear consensus. The responses can be summarised as;

- It should be based on local need
- keep to present developed areas and not start new and artificial new towns/ villages
- Young locals first
- By considering the urban character of the area, and the surrounding densities.

**Private company**

The single response in this group stated that any limit on numbers for housing allocations should be market driven.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The majority from this group agreed that there should be no limit, but rather a flexible approach should be taken informed by factors such as housing need, and the nature of the site in its ability to accommodate an assessed capacity.

**Interest group / organisations**

Of the four responses in this category one suggested a site specific approach, one stated that the Council have already identified housing numbers within Ryde and one stated that the location and scale of development should be informed by the relevant environmental assessments (the remaining response provided no detail).

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council feel that no single development should have more than 200 properties, although no reason is provided for this limit.

**Q5. How do you think the council should define “immediately adjacent” to the settlement boundary?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

One respondent believes that there should be flexibility to allow the market to influence decisions.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Some planning agents and land owners agreed with the first two maps showing definitions of “immediately adjacent” to the settlement boundary as set out in the discussion document. However general consensus was that there should be a flexible approach where sites are determined depending on the sustainability of a site. Therefore the third map could also be included within the definition if required and wording could be “close” to the settlement boundary.

**Interest group / organisations**

The majority of respondents agreed with the definitions set out within the discussion document. It was added that this should include whether an adjoining site shares a significant portion of the boundary and that option 3 could also be included within the definition with some flexibility. It was also suggested that instead of defining “immediately adjacent” that site suitability should be determined according to the sustainability of a site in terms of landscape character.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Both respondents agree with the ways shown within the AAP discussion document for defining “immediately adjacent” to the settlement boundary. However it was suggested that when determining planning applications that the density of the adjoining site, the need for a green buffer between sites, the green spaces within proposed site, the use of smaller brown-field sites first, a pragmatic approach to s106 agreement and housing allocations for small developments should also be considered.

**Ryde – Q6: Do you think the council should introduce specific planning requirements to manage flooding risk within the Monkton Mead catchment? Could such an approach be taken elsewhere, and if so where?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

All respondents agreed that some form of measures is required. Five supported the idea of introducing specific planning requirements while two identified issues with drainage/sewerage.

**Private company**

The single response agreed with introducing specific planning requirements.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three of the four responses in this category agreed with introducing specific planning requirements and one of these suggested it would be useful island wide. One response did not think this was necessary as they felt existing policy coverage provided by the NPPF and the Core Strategy and anything the Environment Agency might stipulate would be sufficient.

**Interest group / organisations**

Of the 8 responses in this category, 5 agreed that the council should introduce specific planning requirements. The remaining 3 did not disagree, but made comments that were either not relevant or it was not possible to discern an answer to the question from the response. In their support the Environment Agency stated that there is now an opportunity to say for Ryde that all sites must show a reduction in runoff rates, regardless of whether it be Greenfield or Brownfield. This will mean that water will be stored further up in the catchment (as it seems that the “majority of the large sites that have been put forward for consideration in Ryde are to its south”) which will almost certainly provide a betterment on the existing situation around the current problem areas in Ryde. The Chamber of Commerce suggested that alternatives to linking drainage into Monkton Mead should be encouraged and the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust support the provision of a green corridor along Monkton Mead Brook. The Environment Agency was the only respondent to suggest another location where a similar approach could be considered, identifying Freshwater. However, they also suggested that in seeking to address surface water management Island Plan sites should reduce run-off where possible regardless of location.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council agreed that the council should introduce specific planning requirements and identified Binstead as another area affected by flooding. They also stated that there is an issue of individual’s septic tanks discharging into rivers. Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council would support the introduction of planning requirements that manages flood risk within the whole of the Monkton Mead catchment area, identifying Ashley as where the watercourse rises and Smallbrook railway junction an infrastructure asset vulnerable to flooding.

**Q7. What are your views on the approaches to ensuring no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites within and next to the Ryde Plan area as suggested in paragraph 2.4?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Individuals neither objected nor agreed to the proposed measures set out to ensure there are no adverse effects on the integrity of European designated sites within and next to the Ryde Plan area. It was however suggested that there should be natural expansion to the town and that development should be restricted and carefully controlled. One individual states that they have no objection to the control of dogs as a main consideration when protecting the Ryde sands designation features and goes on to state that tourism within Ryde needs encouraging to improve the economy here and that a balance between this and protecting the environment should be sought.

**Private company**

One private company that responded to this question and they agree that “in principal these are sensible.”

**Planning agent / landowner**

One respondent agreed with the measures set out to mitigate impacts on the European designation if onsite mitigation is not provided. Another however objected to the

measures suggested here because they feel it would “not solve the Island’s problems”. One planning agent suggested that it is appropriate to assess this as part of the SDMP and another suggested an approach that good design integrates mitigation measures.

**Interest group / organisations**

One respondent stated that they agree to the approaches set out to ensure no adverse impact on the designated sites. Natural England and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust both point out that the use of Green Infrastructure needs to be considered carefully so that sensitive habitats and species are not detrimentally impacted upon. Also the use of the phrase ‘birds before people’ should not be used because sites can be good for both wildlife and people. One further suggestion to the approaches set out within the Ryde AAP discussion document is to include Monkton Mead as part of the Green Infrastructure network.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One town council responded to the question and they agree to the approach of using rangers to educate and manage people with a balance of letting people enjoy the landscape

**Ryde Q8 – Should the council seek ‘local lettings’ policies wherever possible, and if so should any particular group(s) of people be prioritised?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was majority support for a local lettings policy being used in development around Ryde but there was also concern that in order to support economic regeneration a good mix of people was required. One comment was made that the council should put a stop on people for the mainland buying homes until the waiting list was cleared. One comment was made that key workers needed to be prioritised but there was no further comment on who were “key workers”.

**Private company**

The one respondent commented that the market should probably decide.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was no overall support either way for this approach with questions being raised, such as “How would an island resident be defined?” and “policy should not discriminate against those people who need to reside on the island in the future” - One comment was made that more attention needed to be given to supporting those who were economically active but were below the threshold for buying a house.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was support for local lettings policies being introduced but also “no comment” was given by another respondent.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for local lettings policies being introduced to support existing residents and their families.

**Q9. Do you agree with the suggested amendments shown in the maps on the following pages?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Private individual's views on the proposed amendments to the settlement boundaries were mixed. Some agreed fully with the changes whilst others disagreed. The reasons for agreement for all proposed changes were to protect open spaces from major development. One comment however was that the harbour should be included as they would like to see it developed further whereas the esplanade should be excluded to protect it as open space.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was strong objection to the proposed revision of the settlement boundary at the South of Ryde. Agents believe that the area south of Swanmore school, along Ashey Road should remain within the settlement boundary. This is because it is seen as a good development site. Views on the proposed changes to the other three areas of change were split with some agents agreeing and some disagreeing. One reason stated for the disagreement was because of the need for housing and therefore it would be inappropriate to reduce the boundaries. Another agent agrees with the extensions to settlement boundaries to the east of Ryde and including the Harbour and Esplanade.

**Interest group / organisations**

The majority of respondents disagreed with the inclusion of the Esplanade and Harbour within the settlement boundary because they provide important open spaces and are in close proximity to the European SPA and Ramsar sites. One respondent agreed with the inclusion of Harcourt Sands within the boundary whilst one disagreed.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Generally the proposed changes were agreed with, except one objection to the inclusion of Harcourt Sands to the east of Ryde. This was because if extended more sites adjacent to the boundary have potential for development.

**Q10. Do you think there are any other areas where changes to the settlement boundary should be considered?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

One respondent suggested the Brickfields and Dame Anthony's Common areas could also be considered in terms of amending settlement boundaries. The rest of the respondents to this question either had no further suggestions or were unsure.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Planning agents suggested that Upton Road and Quarry Road should also be considered. There were a couple of comments regarding the inclusion of Harcourt Sands within the amended settlement boundary. It was suggested that if this were to happen consideration should be given to the adjacent land that could become more suitable for development, and perhaps a specific development brief provided for Harcourt Sands should be provided. It was also suggested that the settlement boundary at Harcourt Sands could be extended to include the sewerage station works at Appley and the Country Park.

**Interest group / organisations**

It was suggested by one respondent that the Oakfield green spaces surrounding the Monkton Mead Brook should be excluded from the settlement boundary, and that Upton Road should be considered in terms of making amendments.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was commented by one respondent to this question that there should be no proposals to include Fishbourne in development. The other respondent said that they are in favour of all proposed changes as shown in the discussion document.

**Q11. Should the council redraw the settlement boundary to include the Harcourt Sands site, or any other site?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

All respondents said that yes Harcourt Sands needs development and the settlement boundary should be redrawn to reflect this. It was commented that a separate document should accompany this and that redevelopment should be closely controlled.

**Private company**

One respondent stated that “yes Harcourt Sands should be included.”

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was agreed by planning agents and land owners that Harcourt Sands should be included within the settlement boundary. It was suggested that if amending the boundaries to include the site then a redevelopment design brief should accompany this to include a high quality standard of design and to protect views from the sea. Other sites to include may be: Ashy Road, Upton Road, Quarry Road, Appley Wood and the Council’s Archery Field and Simeon Street Recreation Ground (designated as open space).

**Interest group / organisations**

Views on whether Harcourt Sands should be were split, with half agreeing and half disagreeing. It was also commented that a substantial strip along the north boundary and Puckpool Park (including Puckpool Mortar Battery Scheduled Ancient Monument) should be excluded.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent states “yes please include Harcourt Sands within the Ryde settlement boundary”, whilst the other respondent supports the development of the site but does not wish to see the boundary redrawn.

**Ryde Q12 – If a site cannot be found within or immediately adjacent to a defined settlement boundary, what locations do you consider would be appropriate to meet the housing requirements of this community?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comment was made the further consultation should be carried out with the traveller/Romany communities. Suggestions were made that empty campsites in winter and fields farmers want to use for development should be used. Lastly comment was made that there are no suitable areas for gypsies and similar groups to settle asking for the site to be provided in another area.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that existing unauthorised sites should be regularised but that ideally sites should be within the settlement boundaries along with all other residential development. Other comments received were not in favour of sites being provided.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments made suggested that the identification of sites should be based on identified needs, with two sites being provided island-wide, so long as they have no adverse effect on heritage asset or its setting.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

No comments were received.

**Ryde Q13 – Should the council look to regularise existing unauthorised stopping places as an alternative to providing new sites?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was an equal split of responses in favour and against regularising existing unauthorised stopping places.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that if the sites are unauthorised then they should either be granted planning permission or enforcement action taken. If existing unauthorised sites are appropriate and acceptable they could be regularised with appropriate management agreements.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comment was made that allocation should be based on identified needs on a site to be identified within plan with two sites for travellers Island wide.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comment was made that regularise existing unauthorised stopping places would be planning by accident

**Q14. Do you think the council should alter its approach towards new employment opportunities from the Core Strategy? If so, how and why?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Most private individuals do not believe the council should alter its approach from the Core Strategy towards new employment opportunities. However a couple of respondents did suggest that a scheme to reflect the Island's economic situation would be useful. A scheme should focus on self-employment and to encourage much smaller units.

**Private company**

One respondent suggested adopting a flexible approach.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It is believed that the principal of the existing strategy is appropriate and that the approach does not need altering. It was commented that the council needs to be flexible in its approach. Another response however was that too much employment land has been allocated on the Island and efforts should be made to bring opportunities forward at Nicholson Road in Ryde.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments from organisations and interested parties were that all should be done to encourage new employment opportunities. It was suggested that specialism employment sites are required and there is space for this within Ryde (at Nicholson Road and Pennyfeathers). It was however mentioned that decisions on this should be informed once a Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal have been completed for the AAPs.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent stated that “the strategy for employment is sound”.

**Q15. Would the use of greenfield land for employment uses be acceptable, if it helped to minimise traffic movements at peak times between Ryde and Newport?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Opinions of private individuals on whether the use of greenfield land for employment use was acceptable, if it helped minimise traffic movements between Ryde and Newport, was divided. It was commented that if this were an option it would require careful planning including the type of employment offered. It was suggested that instead public transport could be improved instead.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Half the respondents to this question believe that this is an appropriate approach to take. One respondent stated no and the other suggested that it would depend on the specific context and location of development.

**Interest group / organisations**

The general consensus amongst organisations and interested parties is that the principal of using greenfield land for employment uses is acceptable if the correct assessments are carried out to confirm appropriate locations.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Respondent to this question stated that yes the use of greenfield land for employment would be acceptable, especially if it reduces the amount of commuter traffic from Ryde.

**Q16. Are there particular areas that you think would be best suited for employment uses, and if there are where are they?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Suggestions for sites best suited for employment uses were made by private individuals, and these include existing industrial areas, areas within Ryde and not in rural areas and that smaller units would be appropriate.

**Private company**

One respondent simply stated yes in response to this question.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Planning agents said that particular areas best suited for employment uses could include land around Monkton Street and Link Road and the Westridge area. It was also commented that locations for employment use will require appropriate assessments to be carried out first.

**Interest group / organisations**

One respondent stated that Westridge off Marlborough Road, Smallbrook Lane needs widening, and that Nicholson Road would be a realistic option. It was also suggested that areas identified for employment uses should not adversely impact on heritage assets.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was commented by one respondent to this question that if Nicholson Road was to be developed for employment uses then it is essential to protect the green corridor along the railway on both sides.

**Should the council look to keep Ryde's retail identity and offer by maintaining the general mix and type of retailers? If not, what should the council do?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Consensus amongst individuals is that yes the council should look to keep Ryde's retail identity and offer by maintaining the general mix and type of retailers. A further suggestion is that Ryde needs a low cost super market.

**Private company**

One private company responded and they agree to the question and they state that "Ryde retail identity is unique and its preservation should be encouraged however this is likely to be a market issue rather than a planning/local authority one".

**Planning agent / landowner**

One planning agent agrees with the approach suggested. However another agent suggests that first Ryde's identity needs to be established and another agent states that the existing offer should be supported and strengthened before allocating. One agent suggested that allocating land at Westridge would be good for retail.

**Interest group / organisations**

One respondent agreed that the council should look to keep Ryde's retail identity and offer by maintaining the general mix and type of retailers. Two further suggestions were to: link retail offers to the Ryde Masterplan; and to allow supply and demand to adjust this and to reduce retail areas and increase residential.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was one respondent to this question and they agree that the Council should look to maintain Ryde's retail offer.

**Q18. Could the council give better support to Ryde town centre? If so, how?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Three of the four private individuals who responded to this question believe the council should support Ryde's town centre. Suggestions on ways this can be done include: concentrating the shopping centre further, cutting down on pubs and gambling outlets, to use empty shops as art galleries and to provide family style housing near the town centre.

**Private company**

One private company responded to this question and suggested that NNDR (National Non Domestic Rates) are a barrier to occupancy and so there could be a better use of exemptions/discounts. The other suggestion made was to reduce parking charges or provide free parking.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two of the three respondents agree that the council could better support Ryde town centre. Suggested ways of doing this were to consider implementing a town manager, finding funding for environmental improvements and to consider the issues of parking. One respondent disagrees this is the role of the council but instead of the Town Council.

**Interest group / organisations**

It was suggested that the historic environment of towns should be enhanced to create an attractive shopping environment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent to this question suggests that to support the town centre free parking should be provided.

**Q19. What are your views as to the suggestion that the main shopping area boundaries should be altered as set out in paragraphs 8.2 & 8.3?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Generally it is agreed that the approach proposed within the discussion document to alter the main shopping area boundaries is appropriate. However one respondent stated that extending the shopping boundaries may be a possibility. There were further suggestions made including to convert some shops back into residential and to utilise Monkton Street with employment uses.

**Private company**

One respondent to this question believes that this should be market led rather than planning policy led.

**Planning agent / landowner**

One planning agent comments that this may be difficult to control under the current legislation and another agent disagrees with this approach altogether.

**Interest group / organisations**

One respondent provided no comment to this question whilst the other suggested that the approach should include a council car park so that the retail offer is extended.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The one respondent to this question had identified the approach as set out within the discussion document.

**Q20. Are there any main town centre uses that we should restrict in certain areas, and if so where and why?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The various private individuals who responded to this question commented that they would like to see night time economy focused on Union Street/Esplanade, to restrict estate agents, fast food, betting shops and chain outlets to the upper end of the high street and to reduce the number of fast food take away outlets altogether.

**Private company**

One respondent to this question believes that this should be market led rather than planning policy led.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was suggested by a planning agent that the retail offer within the core should allow for smaller independent units and uses should be mixed to minimise concentrations of particular types dominating. The other respondent who commented said that Town Centre development is dynamic and so not sure what this approach aims to do.

**Interest group / organisations**

One organisation commented that this would be conducive to the style and theme of the town centre and another respondent provided no comment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Respondents to this question stated that they would like to see restrictions on the number of gambling shops and lap dancing clubs and that there should be stricter and shorter licensing hours.

**Q21. Should there be core areas for specific main town centre uses, and if so what uses and where?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Private individuals stated that they would like to see estate agents, fast food, betting shops, drinking outlets and chain shops restricted to the upper end of the high street and that more independent shops encouraged in the town centre.

**Private company**

One respondent to this question believes that this should be market led rather than planning policy led.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was stated by the planning agents whom responded that all this may be difficult to control under the current legislation.

**Interest group / organisations**

One respondent to this question commented that a policy on a core area for specific town centre uses links to the Ryde Masterplan.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Generally there is support for a core shopping area and this should be a mix of retail, café and social uses. However it was added that the current number of betting shops should be reduced and licensing hours restricted.

**Q22. Do you think that the council should seek to prevent settlement coalescence, or if the development was high quality and delivered a range of other benefits would settlement coalescence be acceptable?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The majority of private individuals believe that the council should seek to prevent settlement coalescence. However a couple believe that if development is of a high quality and delivered with a range of benefits then coalescence is acceptable.

**Private company**

It was agreed by the one private company that settlement coalescence should be prevented if possible.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Views were split on this question with half the planning agents/land owners whom responded believing that settlement coalescence within the Ryde AAP area should be prevented. The other half believed that settlement coalescence does not need to be prevented, and one of the reasons given for this was to accommodate housing need in the area.

**Interest group / organisations**

Generally it was agreed that settlement coalescence within the Ryde area should be protected. It was however also suggested that the approach should be flexible to accommodate the creation of jobs and affordable housing.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The various respondents to this question all agreed that the council should seek to prevent settlement coalescence within the Ryde area.

**Q23. If you think the council should prevent settlement coalescence do you agree with the general areas we've identified? Do you think there are other areas that need protecting from settlement coalescence?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Generally it was agreed that the areas identified within the Ryde AAP discussion document to prevent settlement coalescence were appropriate. Further suggestions of areas to prevent coalescence included the Woodlands Vale Valley landscape, to maintain historic gaps and if Harcourt Sands is developed to keep the trees long the seafront.

**Private company**

The sites identified within the Ryde AAP discussion document to prevent settlement coalescence seem appropriate to the private company that responded to this question.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was suggested that first a proper analysis of settlement coalescence within Ryde should be undertaken before particular sites are protected.

**Interest group / organisations**

Most respondents agreed with the approach and suggested other areas that need protecting from settlement coalescence. It was suggested that the area east of Ryde (containing Puckpool Mortar Scheduled Ancient Monument and the grade II\* registered historic park and garden of Woodland Vale) should also be protected. One respondent commented that they do not support the sites being put forward to prevent settlement coalescence due to housing need.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Generally it is agreed by the respondents to this question that the sites identified within the discussion document are appropriate.

**Ryde – Q24: Do you think the current locations of local level recycling facilities are right? If so why, if not can you suggest any alternative locations?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

2 responses stated they were happy with the current level of provision. Of the other responses, comments made on the provision of recycling facilities included Ryde resembling a tip on a Tuesdays with both residents and tourists having to walk through rubbish, and why is there a need local recycling sites, when residents get their re-cycling bins collect every 2 weeks by IWC from doorstep or go to Tip. Also suggested was small recycle street bins for tourists better near points of sale, and a ban on fast food outlets on Esplanade /Old Town from using plastics/ polystyrene. Ryde is like a recycling tip for most of Tuesday. Tourists and residents tiptoe through the rubbish and dodge the bins for most of the day. The underground car park at the Co-op could be used. Suggested potential alternative locations are the marine to serve Ryde Harbour area and the underground car park at the Co-op.

**Private company**

No responses were received for this category.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the three responses received one felt that the existing arrangements were right, one suggested Great Preston Road, and one asked if recycling facilities were evenly distributed and that if not then it may be possible to identify a potential location this way.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce suggested public & retail car parks, except those used for tourism.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

No comments were made.

**Ryde – Q25: What items do you want to be able to recycle at these local level recycling facilities?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The items identified by this group that they would like to be able to recycle at local level facilities were glass, cardboard, packaging of all sorts, plastics and a suggestion was made of recycling garden waste to somewhere in Ryde such as Busy Bee so that they could also act as retailer for the compost created. One respondent did question the need for local recycling given the collection service provided, with a suggestion of small recycling street bins for tourists nearer points of sale, and a ban on fast food outlets on Esplanade /Old Town from using plastics/ polystyrene.

**Private company**

No responses were received from this group.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the 2 responses received one stated that the existing arrangements are sufficient while the other suggested detailed consideration is given to the need for certain types of facilities which might now be redundant with doorstep recycling, changing the focus to very specialised recycling facilities such as clothing banks and battery collection points.

**Interest group / organisations**

While the Chamber of Commerce identified general areas of materials for recycling, being clean recyclables, swap stuff and furniture exchange, they also felt that more interesting policies and strategies are required.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council raised the issue of the appropriateness of recycling specific materials at certain locations, for example the recycling of glass bottles may not be suitable in locations frequented by people and children such as near to the beaches, parks and play areas.

**Ryde – Q26: What are your views on the site identified in paragraph 10.9?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Comments from private individuals on the identified site included no objection, the need to be able to walk to it. One respondent highlighted the importance of waste collection services given the number of elderly and low income individuals who may not have access to a car.

**Private company**

The one respondent stated that given the proximity to Lynnbottom they are unsure as to the need.

**Planning agent / landowner**

One agent responded saying they felt the existing arrangements and location appeared right, while another agreed with the identified site.

**Interest group / organisations**

English Heritage has no objections to the potential site for waste management facilities at Nicholson Road, while the Chamber of Commerce stated that a bigger choice should be allowed.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council views on the identified site are that Nicholson Road is a possible site with the esplanade recycling going to Nicholson Road. In support of this they feel that Lynbottom is very busy and alternative sites, outside of Newport, should be considered rather than focusing on that one place.

**Ryde – Q27: Should there be more local waste facilities in Ryde or would you prefer to see a larger appropriately located waste management facility that would be capable of dealing with most of the Island’s waste?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Of the five responses in this category, one indicated there should be more waste facilities in Ryde, two thought appropriately located facilities would be preferable (one citing a central location and the other incinerator technology), and one preferred collection services. One respondent didn’t make any relevant comments.

**Private company**

The one respondent stated that given the proximity to Lynbottom they are unsure as to the need.

**Planning agent / landowner**

One respondent stated that the existing arrangements appear right, while another raised the issue of self-sufficiency. One response did not make any relevant comments.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce expressed a preference for smaller facilities.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council identified Nicholson Road as having potential for local facilities.

**Q28. What, if any, types of renewable energy technologies would you like to see on new developments?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Of the 5 responses from individuals to this question one was no comment and one was that renewable technology should not be developed as part of new development. One private individual stated that yes they would like to see new technologies and two further respondents suggested new technologies that could be developed, these included: ground source heat pumps, domestic wind turbines, solar panels, shadow voltaic glass and double glazing.

**Planning agent / landowner**

One planning agent stated that they would like to see PV on new developments. The two other respondents said that the types of energy developed should not be defined as the technology industry is changing rapidly. Whether renewable technology is used within developments will depend on the proposals and requires careful planning.

**Interest group / organisations**

The consensus amongst organisations and interest groups is that the use of renewable technology is acceptable. One respondent suggested the use of solar panels and photovoltaics and another would like to see a range of technologies used. The Wildlife Trust go on to list issues that need addressing to alleviate the impacts on wildlife for such proposals and Jim Fawcett of the Isle of Wight Council suggested wording to ensure small-scale technologies are installed on existing buildings.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The one respondent to this question states that “yes ... every new build should have an element of renewable energy”.

**Q29. Other than the actions suggested in paragraph 12.3 can you think of any other opportunities there may be to improve the GI provision in and around Ryde and the wider AAP area?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Individuals provided further suggestions that could improve the provision of Green Infrastructure within Ryde, these include: provision of new small allotments, improve street tree planting to join up green spaces, involve dog walkers in the development of dog walking areas, regenerate gardens at the bottom of Westhill Road, encourage wild flowers to grow.

**Private company**

The one respondent to this question suggests the cycle route between Newport and Ryde should be improved and that a cycle route between Ryde and Sandown would be important.

**Planning agent / landowner**

No further opportunities to improve the provision of GI were identified.

**Interest group / organisations**

Generally organisations and interest groups agree with the GI approach suggested. Most organisations have provided further suggestions to improve the GI network and a couple have said that it would be beneficial to determine areas most appropriate and show these on a map. Suggestions to improve the GI network include: providing new sports pitches, support improvements to green spaces adjoining the railway line especially at Rosemary Lane and Common, creation of new seafront open spaces (including a new open space link between Appley and Puckpool Parks along the northern edge of Harcourt Sands), maintenance of the grade II\* registered historic park and garden of Woodland Vale, utilise the Monkton Mead corridor and improve the wet woodland at Oakfield at 'the Ark' and the site adjacent to the bus depot. It was also suggested that providing access to Swanmore Meadow should be avoided due to it's protection of wildlife.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent to this question suggested provisions to contribute to the protection of the GI network, these are: maintenance of a green corridor along the railway on both sides of Nicholson Road if land to be used for employment and the green corridor at Fishbourne, Nettlestone, Seaview and Ryde Golf Course should remain as green sites.

**Q30. What do you think the tourism offer for Ryde should be, and how could we achieve it?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Private individuals offered various suggestions to what the tourism offer should be in Ryde and how this could be achieved. These suggestions are summarised here:

- Maintain the Island’s distinctiveness
- Utilise Ryde pier to include shops or restaurants
- Improve the Solent foot passenger travel offer
- To think about the tourism market and improve the quality on offer to reflect this
- To redevelop York Hotel, Harcourt Sands and Ryde Theatre
- To instate an Isle of Wight coastal path
- The develop a university on Island

**Private company**

It was suggested by the one respondent to this question that the tourism offer in Ryde “needs to encompass a mixture of larger hotels and smaller guest houses plus also cater for day trips from Portsmouth... Generally it is felt that the tourist offering in Ryde is holding up reasonably well although there could possibly be development in more higher quality establishments to encourage the more affluent tourist.”

**Planning agent / landowner**

In summary planning agents suggested the following to improve the tourism offer within Ryde:

- To maintain the quality of the built and historic environment
- Maintain a mix of hotels and guest houses
- Variety of facilities to cater for a wide range of visitors
- Firstly to research the needs of future tourism requirements and use this evidence to plan for the tourism offer

More undercover entertainment

**Interest group / organisations**

Emphasis was on the significance of the historic environment and heritage assets of Ryde which should be improved and used to promote Ryde as a tourist destination. Ways of doing this could include promoting the town as a Victorian seaside resort and reinstating the steam train. It was also commented that this could be linked to the Ryde Masterplan, that there could be more quality hotel accommodation and that the niche shopping currently on offer further encouraged.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent suggested that emphasis should be on heritage and that parking needs to addressed, including free parking.

**Ryde Q31. What do you think should happen with key sites, such as Harcourt Sands, Ryde Theatre and the seafront area? Are there any other key sites or areas that you think we should look at?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Ideas from private individuals as to the possible use of Harcourt Sands include: hotel, restaurants, a type of Centre Parks or housing. It was suggested that Ryde Theatre could be

used as a cinema, arts centre, good wine bar, indoor market, flats or to have links with Portsmouth University. For development of the seafront area people who responded would like to see it protected as a Green Infrastructure asset, to remove dogs from the beach or to develop the area with restaurants and bars with sea views. Further key sites identified were The Royal Yorks which it was suggested needs rebuilding and the Melville Hall which needs demolishing.

#### **Private company**

One respondent stated that:

- (a) Pedestrianisation of Union Street would be sensible if it promoted a café culture however alternative parking provision would be needed – the short stay parking provision is quite unique and of considerable benefit to the town.
- (b) Harcourt Sands would benefit from re-development as mixed holiday/permanent residential accommodation subject to market led solutions.
- (c) Ryde theatre, having been sold in now really in the hands of the market – it is not clear apart from planning influence what the Council could do.
- (d) The attraction of the seafront area should be developed as it is one of Ryde’s key assets – this means ensuring there is a high quality and variety of catering and retail outlets, but avoiding saturation, the current balance is probably about right, and that the area should be actively kept tidy and well maintained.

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

Generally the planning agents response to this question is that these key sites should be developed appropriately. It was suggested that Harcourt Sands should be developed for residential rather than tourism.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Generally development of Harcourt Sands is supported if the mature trees, open space and heritage assets are maintained. One respondent would like to see mixed use residential on the site whereas another respondent stated it should not be used for residential. Ryde Theatre should be used as a performance space and not for residential. Consensus was that the seafront should be developed primarily for leisure uses. Finally one further suggestion for a key site is to improve train stations within Ryde to accommodate the steam trains.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One respondent states that a pragmatic approach is required for Harcourt Sands, perhaps including high quality residential with a tourism element. They also commented that Ryde Masterplan will cover the seafront and the railway should remain here.

### **Ryde Q32. Do you agree with all or some of these? If so, or if not, why? Are there other issues that you think are important to Ryde?**

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Six responses were received from private individuals. Of these one was in response to another question. Another gave the same response as to that submitted to question 38 (The Bay). The response started by saying “The Island is laden with cars”. “It’s a worrying thought when planning new homes [WE DON’T NEED] that people feel it their right to own polluting vehicles” The response has been summarised again below for ease of reference:

- Concern over local housing growth, increased car use, large lorries, increasing number of chain stores and supermarkets (“Asda NO”). The respondent noted “how my home pulsates as HGVs drive by, often causing my wall art to jangle” The person suggested that “consideration might be given to laying down tram lines and using the tram, making the Island a better healthier place to dwell for locals and visitors alike”

The other four responses generally supported a coordinated approach to planning in the town and seafront area one respondent saying “we need to focus our efforts on a specific market – it has to be chosen by the Council and we need to go for it, whatever it is. There is a muddle at the moment with different people doing different things”

- Another two considered the location of the bus terminal and if it could be relocated to stands along the seafront.
- Pedestrian links could be enhanced by replacing the traffic lights on the Esplanade.
- Improving public transport connections through the town was considered by three respondents. The idea of a trolley bus was described by one person as “naff” she also discounted the idea of a light tram system saying “perhaps better investment to get the Steam Trains coming into Ryde – even down the pier”
- Other suggestions included a variety of solutions including a chairlift up George Street and single decker bus circulating the town.

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

There were two responses received from this sector. One noted that the problems in Ryde are similar to those experienced “time and time again and no doubt so has every seaside town up and down the country” The other commented that “the use of a light tram system for the pier would be very desirable and should be part of a scheme to remove traffic from the pier. A tram system within the town may be less beneficial and more intrusive”

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Four responses were received from this sector. The IOW Chamber of Commerce Tourism and Industry made reference to the Masterplanning iWork that they are leading on. The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust supported the improvement of seafront and esplanade open spaces which are historically, visually and recreationally critical to the town “. While English Heritage Welcomed sensitive proposals to improve the public realm, but underlined the need to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the town, which has both economic and social benefits in terms of shoppers and the quality of life of residents and workers in the town. The Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust made a general comment noting that the “Solent Disturbance and Mitigation project has identified recreational disturbance on the European designated sites. As such any work will need to ensure that it does not lead to further increases in disturbance” And that all proposals should be assessed against the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The only comment from this sector was for Ryde Town Council who agreed to the suggestions adding that “development may need to respect the architectural character of the town. Relocation needs to be sensitive”.

### **Ryde Q33. How do you feel about the pedestrianisation of Union Street? Are there other areas in and around the town centre and esplanade that could be pedestrianised?**

#### **Summary of responses**

##### **Private Individual**

Five responses were received from private individuals in response to this question. With regards to Union street one was in favour and four against. The comment in favour felt that “Union good place to do it, and economics have been proved sound. Getting traffic out of the old town must be priority, but bus routes may be a problem”

The four against pedestrianising Union Street gave the following reasons:

- “Too steep for successful pedestrianisation”
- “Cafe culture is seasonal”
- “There are many non-cafe businesses - banks, post office, shops”
- “It would be a very wide empty street in the winter and would have a big impact on passing trade and for deliveries”

- “Large crowds of drinkers outside, whether seated or standing, will not enhance Union Street”
- “The alternative routes are unsuitable. It would also be a disaster for the shops in the street. There are insufficient car parking spaces in the right places. Leave it alone!”
- “One of the great things about Union Street is that you can stop the car, rush into a shop and rush out”.
- “Not a good idea – not practical”

Alternative suggestions were:

- That “Union Street could be widened in places for the summer, which might also slow traffic”
- “The introduction of a 20mph limit throughout Ryde would be pedestrian friendly”
- “The introduction of more zebra crossings would prioritise pedestrians crossing Lind Street at NatWest, crossing at Garfield Road between Edinburgh Woollen Mill and Fox Estate agents to link that side of the street for pedestrians”.
- “Another zebra crossing lower down would be useful”

One respondent gave consideration to pedestrianising the Esplanade saying:

- “Yes to shared use” but recognised that “bus routes may be a problem” and road is a “major east west route and all traffic using it has to go up or down through old town”

#### **Private company**

One response was received from this sector. This thought “pedestrianisation of Union Street sensible subject to provision of parking arrangements elsewhere”.

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

Three comments were received from this sector. These were as follows

1. One thought it to be “inappropriate”.
2. One thought that “Pedestrianisation may cause problems and a properly designed shared surface arrangement may be more sustainable”
3. The third made reference to the High Street end which the respondent thought looked “tatty and the plant boxes look like an afterthought that have been left uncared for. It gives the impression of a town being run down rather than on the up”. They suggested instead “a half-way measure and just simply double the footpath on one side and remove cars from one side?”

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Four responses were received from this sector. English Heritage offered no comment. The IOW Chamber of Commerce Tourism and Industry made reference to the Masterplanning work that they are leading on. The IOW Gardens Trust supported the idea of “a shared surface solution for the Esplanade” Visit IOW noted that “Trading on a hill will always minimise any affect this would have”.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council were the only respondents from this sector commenting “No, to the pedestrianisation of Union Street, as there are no viable alternative routes to divert traffic”

**Ryde – Q34: Should the council continue to manage the harbour or could it be managed in a different way, perhaps by a third party?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The majority of respondents indicated that either it didn't matter who managed the harbour (as long as it is managed) or that it should be an organisation other than the council. One suggestion was that it be included as part of a wider seafront regeneration.

**Private company**

While the single respondent did not directly answer the question, they did suggest that the harbour has not been fully exploited and that there is a market for a relatively small 'non large marina' facility. The suggested that the issues with Ryde Harbour are that it has not been marketed very well and investment in facilities is required (e.g. power on the pontoon, shoreside facilities and possibly 24hr security).

**Planning agent / landowner**

There were conflicting views from respondents within this group. One response stated that the harbour is a public asset in a key location and if it were to be managed by a third party the town would suffer if the harbour becomes non-viable and run-down. However another response suggests that it is sold off, as it appears that public money is being spent on it when it could be spent elsewhere, i.e. with the council concentrating on its core activities and essential services etc.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce suggest the harbour should form part of the Masterplan for Ryde while the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust believe that if the council is not required to maintain it, then the harbour should be closed and restored back to its natural state.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council agreed that the harbour could be managed in a different way and be developed, and welcome anything that would keep it going as a harbour.

**Ryde – Q35: Should alternative uses be considered for the harbour? If so, what and why?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Of the four responses in this category one did not know, while one did think alternative uses should be considered suggesting tourist related activity including hotel and restaurants. Two responses said no, but suggested various changes including investment in the harbour itself (the idea of a lock-gate on the harbour was suggested).

**Private company**

The single response commented that it would be unlikely that any alternative uses could be achieved for the harbour, other than removing it. They thought the existing asset should be developed and exploited.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the three responses in this group one simply agreed that alternative uses should be considered, while of the two that said no one stated that the harbour is a public asset in a key location and if it were to be managed by a third party the town would suffer if the harbour becomes non-viable and run-down.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce suggest the harbour should form part of the Masterplan for Ryde while the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust believe the harbour should be closed and restored back to its natural state. Visit Isle of Wight agrees that alternative uses should be considered and English Heritage state that any such alternative uses should conserve and enhance the harbour's historic significance!

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council does not think alternative uses should be considered, but that the harbour should remain as such.

**Ryde Q36. Do you agree with any, or a combination of these options? If so, or if not, why? Are there other options that you think we should consider?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The bulk of the comments received to this question were from private individuals. Of these:

- One said that the council should "focus" on the issues listed.
- Two said retain the railway but upgrade the rolling stock.
- One said "prioritise improvement of Ryde Esplanade Station and improve connections"
- One respondent felt that "improving links should be part of master-plan for transport hub".
- Two agreed the reintroduction of the steam railway, one to Ryde St Johns station, the other "all way to Esplanade if feasible.
- Two agreed to improvements to Smallbrook"
- One particularly disagreed with item 7.

**Private company**

There were no responses received from this sector with regards to this question.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There were three responses received from this sector.

1. One was" not sure how you can do this without any funding"
2. One thought "Ryde needs a transport hub"
3. The other noted that "the existing underground carriages and the remaining parts of the station have historic interest and significance and could be refurbished as part of the heritage tourist industry which would complement any scheme to use steam trains". He emphasised the "that high quality appropriate design would be a priority and simple but high quality public realm improvements and traffic management would be integral to success".

**Interest group / organisations**

There were four responses received from this sector.

- English Heritage recognised the "heritage interest of the 1938 underground rolling stock is part of Isle of Wight Steam
- Railway the attraction of this railway"

- IW Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry supported the steam railway idea.
- Isle of Wight Steam Railway noted that Island Line is a “heavy loss making railway” with “non-standard clearances (structures, not track) which is why it can currently only accommodate tube trains”. They were of the opinion that Conversion to a tramway would be prohibitively expensive, with no return on the investment. Savings could be made by closing Smallbrook Junction station, moving the passing loop from Sandown to Brading (thus enabling a 30-minute service), remove signalling and drive “on line of sight”, as indeed do tramways. This is entirely feasible with just two trains operating, and no freight or other complications” The asked that “If an opportunity arises for the improvement or reconstruction of Ryde Esplanade station, provision could be made for the IWSR to access the station”.

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There were three responses received from this sector.

1. Ryde Town Council supported the retention of the railway and were of the opinion that “there should be better integration of road, rail and seaborne approaches to Ryde to improve the tourist experience”.
2. Havenstreet & Ashey Parish Council generally supported “the development and expansion of the IOW Steam Railway. It would therefore support a proposal to bring the steam railway back into Ryde St. Johns station, or even Ryde Esplanade station, if it ever became feasible. Subject to bringing the steam railway back into St .Johns, H&APC would probably have no objection to the development of Smallbrook station into a fully operational and accessible station. It does however have major reservations about the possibility of a park- and-ride scheme being included in the development of the station” they noted that “at present, any (commuter) traffic from the Newport area using St. Johns park-and-ride, is likely to use the main road, and St. Johns Hill to access it. Siting the park-and-ride at Smallbrook will inevitably induce that traffic away from that route, and through Havenstreet and Smallbrook road junction”.
3. Cllr Robert Seely expressed the belief that “the Council needs to give considerable priority to ensuring the future of the railway line, modernizing it, enabling steam to run the full length, look into developing Smallbrook park and ride, and extending the line to Ventnor. He recognised that this “will be expensive and time- consuming,” but thought we have no choice but to do so. The loss of the railway will have very significant costs in terms of road traffic, road development, pollution, etc. He felt that a significant attraction in Ventnor (such as a national museum satellite) could help drive traffic along the line from Ryde and that railway line reopened between Ryde and Newport. He felt that “we should begin to campaign now to get the money” . He also felt that we might be able to “link the railway line to cycle routes (i.e. have the cycle route running along a line), to gain extra funding (accessing funding streams for rail and alternative transport)?”

#### **Ryde Q37. What do you think of the idea of bringing the steam railway into Ryde St Johns Station?**

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

The bulk of the responses to this question were from private individuals. Of the five received all were in favour of bringing the steam railway into Ryde St Johns Station. Many citing tourism and benefits to the economy.

- Two supported the idea.
- Two suggested the Esplanade, saying “most tourists won’t see it at St Johns”.
- One person suggested using the disused platform at Esplanade Station, saying “that would be a popular tourist attraction for the Esplanade. If not then St John's Station would be good”.
- Two thought it should go “right up the Pier”

##### **Private company**

The one response from this sector thought the idea to be of “questionable merit certainly as a public policy objective”.

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from agents.

1. One thought it a “good idea”
2. One thought it “worth a trial if cheap”
3. The third respondent commented “the best place for the Steam Railway is probably in line with their aspirations for their own steam railway”.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Three responses were received to this question from this sector, one of which from English Heritage offered no comment.

- IW Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry noted that this was included in the considerations underway through their Ryde Masterplanning work.
- Isle of Wight Steam Railway agreed with that proposition, “but would prefer to go to Ryde Esplanade”

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Three responses were received from this sector.

1. Ryde Town Council stated that it “is of the view that the steam railway should be brought into St Johns station. The council prefers the use of rail to using the roads and believes it is vitally important to retain that rail link”.
2. Havenstreet & Ashey Parish Council “generally supports the development and expansion of the IOW Steam Railway. It would therefore support a proposal to bring the steam railway back into Ryde St. Johns station, or even Ryde Esplanade station, if it ever became feasible”.
3. Cllr Robert Seely believes “that the Council needs to give considerable priority to ensuring the future of the railway line, modernizing it, enabling steam to run the full length, look into developing Smallbrook park and ride, and extending the line to Ventnor”

### **Ryde Q38. What do you think of the idea of improving Smallbrook Junction to make it into a fully operational and accessible station, potentially including park and ride?**

#### **Summary of responses**

##### **Private Individual**

Five responses were received from private individuals to this question.

Three responses were in favour saying:

1. “The development of Smallbrook Junction would be welcome”
2. “Very much in favour as traffic reduction in Ryde and convenience to commuters in other parts of Island”
3. “Yes please Smallbrook fully operational as interim for Q37”.

Two responses were against the idea:

1. “Won’t help Ryde, will it?”
2. “Cannot see need for “park and ride””.

One also asking if there could “also be a new station at Rink Road, perhaps with access from the bridge? This could be a useful stop for residents and is only a short walk through the recreation ground to the boating lake and beach”

**Private company**

The one response received from this sector thought the idea “sensible”

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from this sector. The comments for these were:

- “Has potential.”
- “Depend if the Steam Railway remove their consent”
- “Worth exploring”

**Interest group / organisations**

Five responses were received from this sector. Of these English Heritage offered no comment, and Visit IOW did not support the idea. The others were as follows:

- IW Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry – “yes”
- Island Rivers Partnership “would like any improvements at Smallbrook to also enhance river access and not related specifically to this question “would welcome the opportunity to work with the Isle of Wight Council to ensure that the AAP provides stronger protection and releases more opportunities for Ryde's watercourses”
- Secretary, Ryde Saints FC - supported the ideas which they thought “will help to facilitate the development of grass football facilities which are badly needed in Ryde”

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Three responses were received from this sector.

1. Ryde Town Council “believes this is a good idea”
2. Havenstreet & Ashey Parish Council commented that they “would probably have no objection to the development of Smallbrook station into a fully operational and accessible station. It does however have major reservations about the possibility of a park- and-ride scheme being included in the development of the station. At present, any (commuter) traffic from the Newport area using St. Johns park-and-ride, is likely to use the main road, and St. Johns Hill to access it. Siting the park-and-ride at Smallbrook will inevitably induce that traffic away from that route, and through Havenstreet and Smallbrook road junction”.
3. Cllr Robert Seely suggested that the “Council needs to give considerable priority to ensuring the future of the railway line, modernizing it, enabling steam to run the full length, look into developing Smallbrook park and ride, and extending the line to Ventnor”.

**Ryde Q39. Do you think there are any improvements that can be made to the existing Fishbourne ferry terminal?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Four responses were received from private individuals to this question. These were:

1. “Bus connections after the catamaran finishes; either a dedicated minibus to Ryde or divert one of the No 9 buses to meet each of the night ferries”.
2. One respondent supported Fishbourne Parish Council which responded quoting its draft Supplementary Planning Document, at that time out for consultation which includes text saying “that it expects that proposals for development to improve the capacity or throughput of the ferry terminal will be located within the boundaries of the existing terminal”.
3. “Get a competitor to Wightlink”
4. One respondent was unsure saying “Don’t know how”.

**Private company**

The one response received from this sector thought improvements could be made to “Bus route and parking provision” He also commented “ it needs to be considered whether Fishbourne and Ryde Pier can be sustained separately”.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from planning agents to this question. One responded “no”, the other two made more general comments saying :

1. “This is a complex issue which requires specialist input. Environmental considerations should be considered alongside commercial and operational issues”.
2. The other reported they were “completely confused with this, as in one breath you are advocating Fishbourne bringing forward its own neighbourhood or supplementary document (or chapter) and then in the next breath we are talking about this being a fundamental strategic part of Ryde”.

**Interest group / organisations**

Five responses were received from this sector:

- IW Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry “Fishbourne access, potential relief road through Quarr Abbey” grounds.
- Visit IOW commented that “an emergency alternative exit route for that terminal should be considered”.

English Heritage made no comment but Natural England and Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust commented regarding the potential implications that any improvements could have.

- Natural England commented that “improvements would need to ensure that they did not lead to impacts on designated sites”.
- Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust commented that “in improving this area consideration will need to be made about the sensitive environment. A Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability appraisal should inform this discussion together with an assessment of the impacts to the islands ecological networks

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Two responses were received from this sector. These were:

1. Fishbourne Parish Council commented that “IWC in conjunction with FPC has produced a draft Supplementary Planning Document” - at that time out for consultation. “Within this document (para.5) the Parish Council states that it expects that proposals for development to improve the capacity or throughput of the ferry terminal will be located within the boundaries of the existing terminal. Supporting information and evidence can be found in sub- paragraphs 5.1 to 5.12”.
2. Ryde Town Council commented that “traffic going to and from the terminal creates problems at peak times”. It offered no specific suggestions.

**Ryde Q40. Do you think an alternative ferry terminal site should be investigated, either for Wightlink or an alternative provider?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Five responses were received from private individuals to this question. These can be summarised as:

- Three were in favour – with one saying “worth investigating”
- Two were against the idea – one citing “over development – how can they demonstrate the need for such a new and intrusive facility and the huge investment required”.

**Private company**

The one response received from this sector thought “an alternative ferry port encompassing multi-operators and multi-mainland destinations would be sensible providing for the ability to berth more than one vessel at any one time – this would aid both competition and resilience. This would also allow the possibility of developing freight only type solutions of greater use of containerisation to keep large lorries off of island roads”.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Five responses were received from planning agents to this question, one was not in support of the idea , the other three commented as follows:

1. One thought that “alternative sites are likely to be controversial and complex. There do not appear to be any obvious available locations”.
2. Two thought that a new ferry terminal should be investigated, but that this should not be just for one operator but shared. One agent commenting that it “should be similar to an airport where slots are provided to be leased to increase competition and help drive down prices to ensure accessibility to the Island is kept at an economic level”.
3. The third agreed with the idea but thought that an alternative maybe to “have a satellite lorry park rather than a new ferry terminal”

**Interest group / organisations**

Six responses were received from this sector:

- English Heritage offered no comment.
- Visit Isle of Wight thought it should be down to “supply and demand – let the market decide”.
- IW Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry agreed saying that “it is an economic benefit to Ryde and the Island area as a whole”.

IW Archaeological Service and Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust raised concerns regarding the environmental consequences of providing an alternative ferry terminal saying:

1. IW Archaeological Service – “As well as being protected by nature conservation designations the north east coast of the Island is extremely important for its historic environment. The impact on this resource would also have to be considered if any site for an alternative ferry terminal was proposed”
2. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust - “A Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal should inform this discussion together with an assessment of the impacts to the islands ecological networks”.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

One response was received and this was from Ryde Town Council who thought that “alternative sites are not available”.

**Ryde Q41. Do you think there are any other junctions in addition to those identified in paragraph 17.3, that you think are at capacity, or are problematic, and if so can you suggest any solutions?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Two offered alternative solutions saying:

- No comment on junctions, but more houses mean more cars”
- “Can we improve public transport and then they won’t be near capacity. The buses are too big, inconvenient, don’t stop in the right places and the fares are prohibitive”

The improvement suggested by one was:

- “Opening up Spencer Road to through traffic would create a third way into Ryde from the West”

The other respondent from this sector didn’t know the solutions.

**Private company**

The one response received from this sector commented that agreed with those listed but added “the Brading Road/Smallbrook Lane junction is particularly difficult with access from Smallbrook Road onto Great Preston Road being both difficult and dangerous – it is surprising there are not more accidents there”.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Three responses were received from planning agents to this question.

- One was a more general comment saying: “It is important that the highway junctions should take full account of townscape and context particularly with the historic town”
- The second was content that the “private sector progress” this.
- The third offered no additional comments.

**Interest group / organisations**

There were two responses from this sector: English Heritage offered no specific comment.

- IW Chamber of Commerce, Tourism & Industry commented on the Esplanade/George Street junction asking “why can't we turn right? And Ryde Castle roundabout - that's not a roundabout. They thought “all travel through Ryde needs looking at”. Noting that this was being looked at as part of their Ryde Masterplan work.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The single response from this sector was from Ryde Town Council who thought:

- “The existing main road should be diverted and potentially create a direct route between Fishbourne and Tesco’s”. But noted that “this may be impossible”.
- “St John’s Road traffic lights at the junction with the High Street. Very narrow and tight for turning and passing”.
- “The Roundabout at the Esplanade near Ryde Castle where the give way are opposite to what is normal”
- “The roundabout at Smallbrook stadium. Travelling from Ashe Road Ryde the view of traffic emerging from the right is very limited”

**Ryde – Q42: Are there any particular utility infrastructure issues within the Ryde Plan area that you think we need to be aware of?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Utility infrastructure issues raised by this group of respondents were;

- Green Space, planning for provision of green space does not mean just area, but quality whether for wild-life, relaxation or active recreation. Bits of grass just become dog loos. And who is going to maintain this new green-space, what’s the cost, and who’s paying in perpetuity – as I presume IWC will not. There are some innovative schemes tried. But long term maintenance values must be agreed with Developer AND recipient before planning permission is given.
- Drainage, the fact that according to Southern Water, the sewers in The Strand and elsewhere have reached capacity. Sewage backs up and overflows. Drainage and flood problem related to Monkton Mead. Pennyfeathers development needs to be added to the big question of drainage and sewage.

**Private company**

Southern Water stated that funding for strategic infrastructure will be achieved through the five yearly periodic price review process carried out by Ofwat. However, local sewerage infrastructure should be funded by the development, if this is specifically required to service individual development sites. Southern Water would take into account future income from customers, so that the developer would only need to fund a proportion of the total cost.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comments made by this group of respondents covered two points, being that it is important that the highway junctions should take full account of townscape and context particularly with the historic town, and let private sector progress any utility infrastructure issues.

**Interest group / organisations**

The only comment from this group was made by the IW Chamber of Commerce, who highlighted making links to Ryde Masterplan.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council raised the bus station as a piece of infrastructure requiring consideration due to being unsightly and needs tidying and that there are issues with dispersal of pedestrians from Ryde Bus station.

**Ryde Q43 - Are there any other sites in addition to those listed in paragraph 18.3, that you would like the council to consider taking action on?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Sites identified were:

- St Thomas's church,
- St John's Park Gardens,
- Small 'Pulham' cast 'stone' catalogue Fountain Bowl & upright (missing top statue) Eastern Gardens, Esplanade.
- 26 Bellevue Road,
- The old telecom club at the end of Dover Street

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that there was full support for using appropriate powers as described but that the Planning Authority has a whole pallet of powers which are not used. Other comments made were that the private sector should be allowed to progress.

**Interest group / organisations**

Sites identified were:

- Ryde Theatre,
- Royal York Hotel,
- Ryde Pier,
- Planet Ice,
- the old Ryde Convent School,

with further comment that organisations would help the council with the survey of historic parks, gardens and designed landscapes at risk.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Sites identified were:

- disused building on the bridge at St Johns Station,
- York hotel.

**Ryde Q44 - Do you support the council in putting in place a more pro-active approach to empty and derelict sites?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was unanimous support for the council putting in place a more pro-active approach to empty and derelict sites.

**Private company**

There was unanimous support for the council putting in place a more pro-active approach to empty and derelict sites.

**Planning agent / landowner**

You have an Empty Housing Officer, Enforcement Section and a Conservation Section which should have the skills set needed. You have a Tree Section which acts as interventionist in bringing the free market forward. Maybe these roles could change and they could ask what trees could be removed from a site to enable and stimulate development, rather than looking at retaining all trees on site.

Let private sector progress

**Interest group / organisations**

Comment was made that supported this approach but further comment that sites should be hidden with hoardings or sheets/cloths, to promote public art or the "island". Additional comment was made that any proposals should be mindful of conservation and the protection of species.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for this approach with further comment that the council should get people to develop once they have the necessary permission.

**Ryde Q45 - What are your views on the use of Local Development Orders to enable economic development? What areas in particular do you think the council should consider?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was support for this approach with St Thomas's identified as an area.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that the scale and location of developments in the area could probably be dealt with appropriately within the existing core strategy policy structure. Other

comments received stated that the private sector should be left to progress development.

Sites identified were:

- St Nicholas Road,
- Great Preston Road industrial estate

**Interest group / organisations**

Areas identified: Seafront and Westridge. As long adequate safeguards for the historic environment are in place.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for this approach.

**Ryde – Q46: Do you think that the council should introduce a requirement for the appearance of development sites to be maintained to a reasonable standard?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was general consensus that the council should introduce such a requirement, although one response did express concerns over whether or not any additional funding gained as a result of Assisted Area Status would be spent wisely.

**Private company**

The single response agreed that the council should introduce a requirement.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Despite there being only 3 responses there was a range of views from agreement to stating there is no legal basis to achieve this, while one response suggested that there is no need for any additional policy or legal mechanism as this can already be enforced through suitable conditions. This last response went on to suggest that some care will need to be given to defining a 'reasonable standard', that the general approach is a good idea but can only be enforced if the council has resources to monitor, with a possible solution being communities taking ownership of public realm spaces (noting this only occurs where such space is meaningful, well designed and integral to the development, thus the focus should be upon design policy).

**Interest group / organisations**

All four of the respondents in this group agreed that the council should introduce a requirement and the issue of defining 'reasonable' was raised again.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council agreed that the council should introduce a requirement.

**Ryde – Q47: Is there any planning related matter not covered in this document that you think the council needs to consider within the Ryde Plan?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Respondents in this group identified the following matters to be considered within the Ryde Plan;

- Cycle network
- Control of tv aerials and dishes
- Landscape character, heritage and the value these bring to a sense of place and local distinctiveness which in turn encourages economic investment
- Stop modernisation of the Island
- Losing Island's character and becoming the same as anywhere else (e.g. buildings & supermarkets)
- Can we strive to be different and provide a refreshing break void of business and air polluting traffic
- Need SMART objectives

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

Respondents in this group identified the following matters to be considered within the Ryde Plan;

- Reduction of street clutter and signage and public realm enhancement.
- Loss of independent shops particularly in the High Street and secondary areas.
- Westridge and around Pennyfeathers should be seen as a second employment and retail area, and also allow to re-houses uses such as the ice rink to re-locate here which would then open up the seafront area to be developed into a gateway entrance to the Island.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Respondents in this group identified the following matters to be considered within the Ryde Plan;

- Ensure that existing playing field is protected from development, unless it is proven to be surplus to requirements in the play pitch strategy;
- Link to Ryde Masterplan, focus on jobs and affordable housing and consideration of Westridge as a secondary retail area to create local employment, but not to compete with the Town centre (Union & High Streets). Westridge could also be considered for relocating seafront facilities or sites to enable redevelopment of Ryde seafront.
- Identify and map the components of Ecological Networks
- Consideration should be given to the possibilities for wildlife enhancement in new developments.
- Address the historic environment in Ryde, including conserving, enhancing and promoting access to heritage assets in the town.
- Consider LDOs for certain energy efficiency improvements to existing properties which currently require planning permission

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Ryde Town Council identified the following matters to be considered within the Ryde Plan;

- Need for a strategy to maintain green spaces, such as Ladies Walk
- Need to get a university campus or investment on the Island in order to attract high calibre employers.

Clr Seely identified the following matters to be considered within the Ryde Plan;

- Development must be sensitive to the authority's status as an island and AONB
- Need people of all ages to make a contribution to Island life as current policies on building are not sustainable and is harming tourism.
- Need a growth strategy that focuses on creating jobs, not a lazy fallback to a house build strategy
- As part of a employment growth strategy, can the Island particularly target higher education.

## The Bay

### The Bay – Q1: What are your views on the council permitting further development to contribute to the regeneration of The Bay area?

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Views expressed by respondents in this group on the council permitting further development to contribute to the regeneration of The Bay area can be summarised as;

- Further development to regenerate The Bay area is very necessary;
- A lot more could be done to regenerate without development;
- Employment and infrastructure needs to be provided for additional housing;
- Further development should be restricted to what is really needed (not what developers or government want);
- Development in the Bay should primarily be aimed at developing the Bay economy, with emphasis on encouraging businesses that provide year round rather than just seasonal employment;
- Expansion of the residential stock in the bay, whilst important, should be secondary to the aim of developing the Bay economy;
- Specific areas within the area awarded Assisted Area Status should be specifically identified and zoned for Business Development;
- Any regeneration of The Bay should first take account of all historic buildings that require restoration and retention i.e. The Grand, Savoy Court, Sandown Hotel, Rivoli Cinema and the Pier;
- The cinema would be a much needed addition to the town as it could be used as a cinema, stage venue and a meeting hall.

##### **Private company**

View expressed by the single respondent in this group felt that the council should only be permitting development to the extent necessary for anticipated population growth.

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

Views expressed by respondents in this group on the council permitting further development to contribute to the regeneration of The Bay area can be summarised as;

- Support council approach as believe it will encourage the most sustainable development;
- Core Strategy SP2 housing quantum figures considered to be out of date as they pre-date adoption of the NPPF;
- The local plan needs to meet the objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the market area, therefore considered it highly likely that the housing requirement for the Bay area will be increased in order to reflect the NPPF's more positive emphasis on housing delivery;
- Further housing development in the Bay area will help to support the overall regeneration objectives of the plan;
- it is not clear how any responses received to this question posed will help the Council to identify such appropriate development sites, and whether any further residential development permitted would come out of the 370 dwelling allowance cited in the permitting further development - whether residential or other types of development (including tourism) - would undoubtedly contribute to the regeneration of The Bay area main policy;
- Further development could be allowed if sites are appropriate and sustainable in accordance with core strategy policies;
- emphasis should be on brownfield sites;
- The amount of development should be proportionate to the scale and character of the location;
- Could additional development in The Bay be used to reduce numbers elsewhere in more sensitive locations?
- a pragmatic approach to the consideration of the location of development must be taken;

- Settlement boundaries should be expanded to include areas that are most likely to contribute to regeneration;
- extremely unlikely that housing and development needs can be solely met on brownfield land, and even less likely that the regeneration and redevelopment of previously developed sites can provide for infrastructure requirements given the constraints that the sites present.

**Interest group / organisations**

Both the Chamber of Commerce and Visit Isle of Wight agree on permitting further development to contribute to the regeneration of the Bay area. Sandown Forum feel there is very little need for more housing above the plan allocation of 20 units per annum and therefore think that further development should only be permitted if it is linked to wider economic regeneration of the Bay area. Healing Arts feel the Bay is already fairly densely built-up, with particular concern about the spread beyond the boundaries and looking to use brownfield sites where possible, harmonising good contemporary design with existing buildings. The RSPB think it is not clear that permitting further development will have the desired effect, while the EA highlight the requirements to meet the Sequential Test as set out in the NPPF. Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association think that increases in residential stock should be driven by the local need to support the expanding economy that it is believed Assisted Area Status will bring, and that there are other areas of the Island more suited to large scale residential development, and in areas that expanded capacity is less likely to attract holiday home buyers. They also think specific zones within the area of the Bay that has been awarded Assisted Area Status should be identified and zoned for Business Infrastructure.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Lake Parish Council is not averse to permitting further development to contribute towards regeneration, but would favour use of brownfield land first, with a pragmatic approach to S106 contributions.

CLLr Ward thinks there is very little need for more housing above the Area Plan allocation of 20 units per year and that regeneration of economic and light industrial development desperately needed. Also, that it should be easier for the redevelopment or re-use of redundant and/or empty buildings.

Sandown Town Council think further development should be permitted within the development area.

Shanklin Town Council thinks that development in the Bay should primarily be aimed at developing the Bay economy, with emphasis on encouraging businesses that provide year round rather than just seasonal employment. Specific areas within the area awarded Assisted Area Status should be specifically identified and zoned for Business Development.

**The Bay – Q2: What are your views on the use of brownfield land first, to support regeneration, and the impact this could have on infrastructure development?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was generally viewed that brownfield land should be used first to support regeneration. It was added that when developing brownfield land consideration should be given to infrastructure requirements and in particular drainage systems. It was commented that some greenfield development would be acceptable, in particular on land adjacent to Whitecross Lane. Another respondent however stated that it is important to maintain as much greenfield land within The Bay as possible.

**Private company**

The one respondent to this question stated that brownfield land should be developed first and that The Bay area has a number of ex-commercial areas which would benefit from regeneration within brownfield sites.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Generally it was agreed amongst planning agents and land owners that priority should be given to the development of brownfield sites first. However the potential for development of greenfield sites was also recognised and it was commented that due to housing need some greenfield will have to come forward. One respondent had no preference for the development of a type of site but recognised it would be useful to have clearer guidance for developers on how best to approach gaining planning permission for a greenfield sites.

**Interest group / organisations**

Most organisations and interested parties whom responded felt that brownfield land should be developed first. However some believe that instead the approach should be flexible and development should occur in the right place to meet the needs of the Island. To achieve this several respondents provided suggestions including: conducting ecological surveys to ensure protected sites and species are not harmed, to ensure heritage assets are not harmed and that an assessment of the Bay should first be carried out to determine the best location to develop tourism accommodation and where current sites could be renovated. Specific areas were also mentioned and it was suggested that the area between Fort Street and Isle of Wight Zoo is the prime location in Sandown for tourism-related development, that land behind the existing Spithead Business Park should be designated as a light industrial/commercial zone, land adjacent to Whitecross Lane is appropriate for development and within Lake commercial development should not be delayed by encouraging developers to look for “brown-field” sites.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

A couple of respondents believe that only brownfield land should be developed at all. A couple of other respondents agree that brownfield should be developed first but that some greenfield land is appropriate for development. Areas appropriate for development were suggested as being land adjacent to Whitecross Lane and land at the back of Spithead business centre. It was commented that all development should maintain an appropriate amount of green infrastructure.

**The Bay – Q3: If viability is an issue on brownfield sites, should the local planning authority take a pragmatic approach to negotiating s106 contributions?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was agreed by private individuals that a pragmatic approach should be sought. This is a summary of the suggestions for doing this:

- make contributions significant enough to ensure greenfield development is just as uneconomic as brownfield development
- where employment for local people is provided contributions should be exempt
- where large hotels are converted into residential flats in the right location contributions should be exempt

contributions should be made to install foul water sewers and surface water sewers

**Private company**

It was viewed by the one respondent to this question that a pragmatic approach to collection s106 agreements should be taken when viability is an issue on brownfield sites.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was agreed by all respondents to this question that a pragmatic approach should be taken. It was stated by one respondent that *“non- previously developed sites that have fewer constraints are much more likely to be able to contribute significantly towards community needs, infrastructure, and objectives of economic regeneration”*.

**Interest group / organisations**

Some organisations and interested parties whom responded to this question agree that a pragmatic approach should be taken. It was suggested that contributions should be collected for alleviating traffic issues. However a couple of respondents disagreed and the reasons given for this were that the environment should not be compromised due to viability issues and it was commented that increased housing numbers may increase recreational impact on designated sites and contributions must be collected to mitigate against this. It was also stated that actually s106 agreements should be removed or reduced.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Generally it was agreed that a pragmatic approach should be taken to securing s106 agreements. To do this it was suggested that:

- where employment for local people is provided contributions should be exempt
- where large hotels are converted into residential flats in the right location contributions should be exempt

One respondent however suggested that instead the long term impacts of encouraging building work should be considered rather than collecting financial contributions for development.

**The Bay – Q4: How do you think the council should define “immediately adjacent” to the settlement boundary?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A couple of private individuals suggested that a pragmatic approach to defining “immediately adjacent” should be used. The following should be considered when determining the suitability of a development:

- to maintain areas of Green Infrastructure
- small estates and cul de sacs off main roads separated by trees and verges are preferable to ribbon development along existing through routes
- avoid building roads and pathways over existing ditches

One respondent believes there should be no development outside of the boundary even if it is “immediately adjacent”.

**Private company**

One respondent to this question stated to use “*a broad location*”.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Planning agents and land owners believe that the approach to defining “immediately adjacent” to the settlement boundary should be flexible depending on site suitability. One agent commented that the third option could also be used and that it could be defined as “close” rather than “next to”. Another agent comment that this should not mean annexed.

**Interest group / organisations**

The general consensus is that a flexible and common sense approach to this should be used. It was suggested that before development of a site landscape and historic significance should be considered and that ribbon development avoided and adjacent sites defined according to use first. A couple of respondents agreed with the approach but added that the majority of a sites boundary should be “immediately adjacent”.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Two of the three respondents stated that a pragmatic and common sense approach should be taken when defining “immediately adjacent”. The other respondent stated that “‘Immediately adjacent to’ should be defined as ‘right next to the settlement boundary line’”.

**The Bay - Q5: What are your views on the approaches to ensuring no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites within and next to the Bay?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was stated amongst the responses from private individuals that the approach appears good. Further suggestions on approaches to ensure there are no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites were also given, these include: excluding Sites of Special Scientific Interest or of significant Historical Interest from the development envelope.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Views of planning agents on this question varied. It is believed that the approaches set out would not solve the Island’s issues, however another respondent stated that the future of the environment should be considered as a priority and development that harms this not allowed. A suggestion was also made that through good design designated sites and development can work.

**Interest group / organisations**

The overall approach is agreed by all interested groups/organisations. Consensus was that it is the right approach specifically to reduce recreational pressure on the America Woods SSSI. However the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust point out that the use of Green Infrastructure needs to be considered carefully so that sensitive habitats and species are not detrimentally impacted upon. Also it was recommended by a couple of organisations that the use of the phrase ‘birds before people’ should not be used because sites can be good for both wildlife and people. Further approaches to ensure there are no adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites were suggested. These include: enhancing wetlands at Culver Parade, support for brownfield development as is less likely to impact upon designated sites, Scotchells Brook and the Yar River provide corridors that diver pressure away from designated sites, protect heritage assets and character, include a buffer zone of natural development with all new development that may affect a designation and to exclude protected areas from all development.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The general consensus is that a common sense approach that is flexible should be applied. One town council suggest excluding development from protected sites.

**Bay Q6 - Should the council seek ‘local lettings’ policies wherever possible and if so, should any particular group(s) of people be prioritised?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comments were made that there will be a need in all areas of the island to support housing for specific groups with difficulties. Further comments were made that island residents should be given priority but other stated that the policy already existed. Additional comments were made that restrictions on advertising properties (including open market dwellings) should be introduced. Other comments were made that no restrictions should be made and a free market economy should be allowed to exist.

**Private company**

Comment was made that no restrictions should be made and a free market economy should be allowed to exist.

**Planning agent / landowner**

One agent said that no restrictions should be introduced and another asked questions about how and island resident would be defined? Would it be based on income levels and other criteria as well?

**Interest group / organisations**

There was an equal mix of organisations who were in favour and those who were not in favour of introducing local lettings policies with some confirming that local residents should be given priority, some saying that in special circumstances (rehabilitation of offenders and youth hostels) this policy needs to be applied but other comments were made that no restrictions should be made and a free market economy should be allowed to exist.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The majority of comments made were that 'Local letting' policies should prioritise primarily local people with further comments made that this should be 'those born here or lived here in excess of 10 years,' or 'born as Islanders'. However one comment was received that no restrictions should be made and a free market economy should be allowed to exist.

**Bay Q7 – Do you think that there are problems with HMOs in The Bay? If so, why and what are they?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Comments were made that the statistics about the level of HMO's on the island needed better explanation.

Some comments were made that the level of HMO's was not excessively high (as there is a need for all types of property to be distributed across the island to maintain a fair balance) but other comments stated that there were too many. Further comment was made that properties (including old existing ones) did not meet current building regulations with respondents commenting that any change of use to an HMO should be accompanied by building regulation improvements. The last comment made was that it was considered that HMOs in the Bay seem to house a disproportionate number of individuals with chronic alcohol and/or substance abuse problems.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was provided that this area needed further analysis and investigation. It was commented that a concentration of HMOs could collectively alter the character and economic status of a locality.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments were made that the statistics about the level of HMO's on the island needed better explanation with further comment made that some properties have slipped into the category of homes of multiple occupation without being developed to meet current building regulations. Further comment was made that this sector needs to be regulated stating that this sector seems to be badly managed, with little or no maintenance and low management of anti-social behaviour. The last comment made was that 'numbers in a resort' should be limited and accommodation for such individuals should only be provided where appropriate 'care in the community' to address their addictions can be provided.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comment was made that effective management should be a condition of planning approval. Further comment was made that the Local Authority should compulsory purchase

HMO's and close them down to rescue the community from being blighted. Comment was made that the levels of social deprivation in Sandown were the consequence of having too many HMOs and hostels housing vulnerable people. Comments were made that the statistics about the level of HMO's on the island needed better explanation with further comment made that some properties have slipped into the category of homes of multiple occupation without being developed to meet current building regulations (stop HMOs being a cheap but poor quality option rather than creating self-contained flats) .

**Bay Q8 – If you think there are problems, could these be addressed through better management of the HMO or through planning restrictions?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comments were made that problems should be addressed through both better and appropriate management and support. In addition applying strict compliance with current building regulations would reduce the amount of poor quality HMO provision.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comments were made that the character, economic status and context of the local area would be changed by growing the economy in the local area.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments were made that there should be strict regulation of managers and owners of HMOs, funded by the HMOs, Further comments were made that HMO's should be limited to a set % of the town's resident population at any time and that any change of use should require that the conversion is strictly in compliance with current building regulations as this would reduce the amount of poor quality HMO provision.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comments were made that HMO's should be limited to a set % of the town's resident population at any time and that any change of use should require that the conversion is strictly in compliance with current building regulations as this would reduce the amount of poor quality HMO provision. Further comments were made that effective management should be a condition of planning approval. Lastly comment was made that the concept of multi- occupancy should be phased out except for highly regulated special facilities.

**Bay Q9 – Would you prefer to see people housed in one bedroom flats or HMOs?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was no overall consensus with further comment made that a mixture of studio flats and one-bedroom flats might be better.

**Private company**

Comment was made that one bedroom flats would be preferred.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that one bedroom flats would be preferred.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comment was made that one bedroom flats would be preferred.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comment was made that one bedroom flats would be preferred with a further comment that HMO's should be banned.

**Bay Q10 – Would you prefer to see converted properties used for single person or family accommodation?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comments were made that converted properties should be left to a mix of single person and family accommodation depending on the size of accommodation and facilities based on market dynamics.

**Private company**

Converted properties were the preference from this respondent.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comments were made that converted properties should be left to a mix of single person and family accommodation depending on the size of accommodation and facilities based on market dynamics. However other comments were made that these properties should be converted for single people.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments were made that converted properties should be left to a mix of single person and family accommodation depending on the size of accommodation and facilities based on market dynamics. However other comments were made that these properties should be converted for single people.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comments were made that converted properties should be left to a mix of single person and family accommodation depending on the size of accommodation and facilities based on market dynamics. However other comments were that these properties should be converted for family accommodation, they would then be available for both families and single people

**The Bay – Q11: Do you agree with the possible amendments shown in the maps on the previous few pages?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The majority of private individuals agreed to the proposed amendments to the settlement boundaries within The Bay. One respondent said that areas already ear marked for development should remain so.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Generally planning agents disagree with the amendments shown in the maps because the boundary is drawn too tight to the settlement and therefore does not accommodate for

future housing. Specifically agents state that removing the field adjacent to Broadlea Primary School is unnecessary as this is designated as Open Space and so protected from development anyway. It was also suggested that the boundary should be extended to include visitor attractions at Culver Parade and housing at Yaverland.

**Interest group / organisations**

Views on redrawing the settlement boundary within The Bay were divided. Some respondents would like the boundary to remain as it is and that leisure land including the zoo and land at Yaverland should be included. It was also mentioned that the Sandown Wastewater Treatment Works should remain within the boundary because aesthetically it is developed land and within keeping with the development and that future housing requirements may require further development of the works. Other respondents agree with the proposed amendments and reasons given for this are that the land omitted are within a floodplain and inappropriate for development and that a gap between Sandown and Yaverland should be protected.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Opinions on the possible amendments to the settlement boundary were split amongst respondents in this group. Half believe the boundary should remain as it currently is whereas the other respondents agree with the changes. It was stated that areas already earmarked for development should remain so and that the area in Sandown is adjacent to the light Commercial units around College Close and East Yar Road, should be kept but specifically zoned for commercial development.

**The Bay – Q12:**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was suggested that consideration should be given to Lake settlement boundary too and that there should be allowance for the provision of a footpath to connect the north end of Sandown to the sea.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Planning agents and land owners suggested the following areas where changes could be made:

- To include east and west of Luccombe Road
- Possible inclusion of some residential development adjacent to Cheverton Copse Holiday Park, as either a mobile home residential park, or for low cost homes.

The settlement boundary should include Sandown Airport area which could encourage an enterprise zone and employment space, and potential tourism.

**Interest group / organisations**

One respondent to this question stated that the boundary lines should be drawn tight to existing settlements, to protect 'green' sites and promote 'brownfield' development. However other respondents suggested other areas that should also be included and it was commented that Sandown Airport could be classed as an enterprise zone and that some current holiday parks around Shanklin should be considered. One respondent would like to see land on the eastern edge of the map also removed from the possible new boundary as this is in the flood risk zone.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was commented that the proposed amendments to the boundaries are favoured however it was also commented that the current boundaries are acceptable. Further comments on this were that Los Altos park should be retained as green space and that a detailed development boundary map for Shanklin should have been included for further

consideration.

**Bay Q13 – If enough land cannot be identified within or immediately adjacent to settlement boundaries, what other locations do you think should be considered for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comment was made that Gypsy encampments should be away from holiday areas such as Sandown as it has minimal history of being a stopping point for travellers. Suggestion was made that a site for travellers might reasonably be positioned somewhere near to that on the edge of Newport with its greater facilities. Further comment was made that any location would need access to main roadways, tapped water, facilities for disposing of waste sewerage, possibly pasture for horses, rubbish clearance, sufficient parking for vans, trailers and cars and consideration given to existing residents with a different lifestyle. Additionally it was commented that the Council should meet with the Gypsy Council and Traveller and Showmen organisations for discussions, then meet with the residents in the areas chosen.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that if existing unauthorised sites are appropriate and acceptable they could be regularised with appropriate management agreements. Other comments were made that no sites should be provided.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments were made that two sites should be designated Island wide with allocation should be based on identified needs on a site to be identified within plan but sites that would have an unacceptable adverse on a heritage asset or its setting should be rejected. Further comment was made that no sites should be provided. Other comments were received that areas of land where development is problematic because of movement/ subsidence and yet temporary use would be sensible.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comment was made that the Bay has minimal history of being a stopping point for travellers stating that a site for travellers might reasonably be positioned somewhere near to that on the edge of Newport with its greater facilities.

**Bay Q14 – Should the council seek to regularise existing unauthorised stopping places as an alternative to providing new sites?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comments raised were that Sandown to Shanklin is a holiday resort and any “encampment” areas should be very limited possibly not allowed at all as permanent things. Further comments received asked for further evidence of need stating that the IWC should fulfil its minimum statutory duty. However one comment was received stating that if the sites have been used for many years with no problems and offer required community facilities then they should be regularised.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Planning agents were not in favour of this approach.

**Interest group / organisations**

Comments received were not in favour of this approach with additional comments being made that no stopping places for travellers should be established in the Bay and if they are to be regularised then only if the site is an acceptable location in terms of impact on heritage assets.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Comment was made that sites should only be provided as required by law only with the IWC fulfilling its minimum statutory duty only. Other comments received were not in favour of regularising existing unauthorised encampments.

**The Bay – Q15: Do you think the council should alter its approach towards new employment opportunities from the Core Strategy? If so, how and why?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

While there was no clear consensus, comments made by this group can be summarised as;

- expand employment on the Island into new high tech areas, but not at the expense of tourism;
- approach should be flexible and should ensure that support is given to encouraging diversity to enhance town centres;
- plan for improving skills, plan for level of commuting ensuring frequent affordable travel by buses, trains and boats.

**Private company**

The single respondent stated that the approach should be as broad as possible so that there is no hindrance to potential commercial activity.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was no consensus from this group, with a range of responses from 'no' to the strategy should change (to encourage small factory units and start up units in the Bay area. Other comments included being consistent with the existing Core Strategy approach towards new employment and, in order to provide greater certainty and to help facilitate development, where possible sites should be allocated for such tourism/economic development. The Culver Parade area should be identified as a 'tourism opportunity area', where proposals to redevelop and improve the existing tourist attractions along Culver Parade will be supported.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was a general consensus from this group that the approach should be altered from one being focused on tourism to a broader strategy, including small business development, retail and high tech. However, none of this should be at the expense of tourism and indeed some (e.g. retail) may even be related to it. Sandown Forum also identified the potential promotion of the Bay as an area for adventure and activity holidays.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

All three respondents agreed that the council should take a wider approach towards new employment opportunities. This should still include tourism, but also consider new areas such as high tech and how this can be facilitated through better communications (which may enable different ways of working, such as from home) and providing a skilled workforce (ie through appropriate education). Expanding the tourism offer to include adventure/activity type breaks was also raised.

**The Bay – Q16: Are there particular areas that you think would be best suited for employment uses, and if so where are they?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The majority of comments tended to relate to uses, suggesting a focus on tourism, high tech and provision for small businesses. One respondent did say that the Bay area has many industrial/retail estates and that there should be more affordable units for artisan businesses within these and high street areas.

**Private company**

The single response stated that given the depressed economic performance of both the Island and the Bay area the approach towards employment opportunities should be as broad as possible so that there is no hindrance to potential commercial activity.

**Planning agent / landowner**

While the majority do not identify any specific sites but state that employment land should be an integral part of development within the Bay and to keep as existing but more small centres, one respondent did identify the following areas;

- Significant potential to enhance and extend the existing tourism offer in the area of land between Fort Street and Isle of Wight Zoo, focusing heavily on the underperforming attraction at Dinosaur Isle, the adjacent former boating lake, and the currently unmanaged land adjacent;
- Land east of College Close should be allocated in the Bay Plan for employment use, which would be an extension to the existing established employment site.

**Interest group / organisations**

Visit Isle of Wight suggests that land adjacent to the coast should be prioritised for tourism use, and the hinterland of towns should be examined as to designation for light industrial. The Chamber of Commerce support the encouragement of affordable small retail, tourism and business space, while Sandown Forum identify Lake industrial area, Sandown Airport and Sandown industrial areas as areas best suited for employment uses. Healing Arts also identify Sandown Airport and land to the rear of Sandown Academy to be considered for certain types of recreational business activity and new forms of tourism, while English Heritage state that sites that would have an unacceptable adverse impact on a heritage asset or its setting should be rejected. Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association feel that it would be sensible to concentrate commercial development in those areas included within the Assisted Area Status boundaries. They also think Lake is a prime site for commercial development behind the current Spithead Business Park and up towards Sandown Airport. They also think that there is potential to build larger new business premises in the area along the northern end of Whitewell Road as it runs into Lake and that the areas adjacent to the existing business parks in Sandown lend themselves to the development of more small scale commercial/industrial units.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Both Cllr Ward and Sandown Town Council identify Sandown Airport, with Cllr Ward also identified Lake and Sandown industrial areas. Shanklin Town Council identify the areas adjacent to the existing business park and superstore in Lake as a prime site for commercial development as it is centrally located in the Bay. They also think that the area along Whitwell Road could provide appropriate sites for large business premises, while the areas adjacent to the existing business parks in Sandown would suit small scale commercial units, with both areas being covered by the Assisted Area Status.

**The Bay – Q17: Do you think that the council should support proposals to, or actively seek to, diversify the employment offer away from tourism?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a strong consensus that the council should support proposals to, or actively seek to, diversify the employment offer away from tourism. Specific points made were;

- There should not be any retail developments outside the town centres or current industrial estates as it does damage the trade of high street shops and increase traffic;

- Agree, but not at the expense of tourism, which needs investment such as a major new attraction unique to the Bay.

#### **Private company**

The single respondent stated that in general it is not considered that more retail allocation is needed in the Bay area, but planning and landuse should not be a barrier to inward investment.

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

There was an even split of views for and against from this group of respondents.

Those agreeing with Question 17 made the following points;

- employment uses other than tourism should be encouraged to provide a mix for economic regeneration
- edge of town development should be a last resort and the town centres of Sandown and Shanklin should be supported to retain the mix of independent shops and businesses
- move away from tourism, in the sense of the protection of certain holiday accommodation
- large old fashioned caravan parks and dated large hotels have had their day
- need a more modern approach to meet with the desire in the market for boutique hotels, cheaper chain hotels and also eco- friendly lodges, glamping and more modern holiday parks, along with smaller independent campsites and b&bs/hotels.
- having a policy which mostly prevents changes of use for run-down hotels to residential is not in-keeping with the market. This in turn creates negative, depressed and soulless areas within The Bay.
- any investment to an appropriate alternative use should be viewed positively
- more people living in the area means more people to support shops and services
- employment also needs to be focussed upon away from tourism to make a more sustainable year round economy.
- education is at the heart of creating a skilled workforce, if then offered the potential for start-up business units with flexible uses linking in with skills.

Those disagreeing with Question 17 made the following points;

- suggests a shift from tourism to other types of employment. We consider that such an approach is contrary to the objectives of the Island Plan and does not recognise the potential of Sandown, and in particular the Culver Parade area, to form the basis of tourism-led regeneration for Sandown and The Bay area in general
- the Bay Plan should recognise the crucial role that tourism (particularly year-round tourism) contributes towards job creation and the local economy. This section of the document reads almost like a managed decline of tourism
- Sandown, and in particular Culver Parade, is a huge opportunity to rebuild the resort as a quality destination by the introduction of sensitive new activities coupled with improvements to existing attractions
- looking for additional ways to diversify the economy, through non- tourism-related development elsewhere in Sandown and The Bay would be supported, but this should be additional to the focus on rebuilding the tourism economy, not a replacement for it. Moving away from tourism, in a resort that is as well-established as Sandown, and with such great potential for enhancement, would be a very dangerous approach.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

Again, there was a split of views for and against from this group of respondents.

Those agreeing (Visit Isle of Wight and the IW Chamber of Commerce) with Question 17 made the following points;

- supply and demand should allow employment diversification as well as asset change
- priority for change of use should consider leisure as key but if not applicable then 106 agreements could encourage funds towards facilities elsewhere
- yes, zoning Sandown airport

Those disagreeing (Sandown Forum, Healing Arts and Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association) with Question 17 made the following points;

- no, should be in addition to tourism
- should actively support tourism and small business
- Sandown High Street is a disaster and urgently needs revitalising
- Older hotels need to be closed and redeveloped for diverse residential occupancy.
- The Bay location and access to the seafront is a great positive.
- current range/diversity is one of the worst on the Island, poor gift shops and over domination of gambling, small business should be encouraged such as GloryArtGlass in Melville Street
- The Esplanade at Sandown needs capital investment to make it an attractive seafront needs to abandon the neo-Victorian design and invest in good contemporary design
- parking and there is nothing in BAAP about traffic circulation.
- Tourism is currently the main industry of the Bay area, and needs investment, which the IOW Council should support.
- it would be good for the Bay economy for there to be a more diverse spread of businesses, but as well as tourism not instead of tourism.
- The Island in general, and the Bay in particular, could do with a major new attraction

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Cllr Ward agreed with the question, he feels that the Bay is too dependent upon tourism, that the seaside holiday is in decline and will continue to decline according to the DMO's tourism report. Both Sandown and Shanklin Town Councils agree, but this should be to supplement tourism and not at its expense, with Shanklin going on to suggest a major new attraction would help.

#### **The Bay – Q18: Could the council give better support to Sandown and Shanklin town centres? If so how?**

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

Suggestions made by this group of respondents with regards to providing better support to Sandown and Shanklin town centres are;

- Pedestrianize Shanklin High Street
- Sandown High Street needs tidying up
- Empty shops make the area look depressed, a condition should be imposed that empty shops must be well maintained and decorated internally with artwork or similar
- IWC should support the whole Bay area including Lake
- Important to keep a core of retail premises, premises at the periphery should be treated sympathetically if they seek to change to residential or office use
- Encourage diverse quality shops to open by reducing business rates.
- Libraries should be retained.
- Assist owners of the heritage hotels, pier, cinema and any building large enough to provide a large meeting/social activity hall, with funding and assistance to obtain grants so that such buildings can be restored, maintained and offer a current and future heritage.

**Private company**

The single respondent made three suggestions, being better use of exemptions/discounts, increased parking facilities including short stay and reduced charges, and greater flexibility for outside tables, chairs etc.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Suggestions made by this group of respondents with regards to providing better support to Sandown and Shanklin town centres are;

- support the town centres by retaining them as the main focus for comparison and convenience retailing.
- tourism-related retailing should be acceptable outside the town centres in Sandown and Shanklin, where it would not harm the centres.
- Investment in tourist attractions at Culver Parade to improve year- round tourism
- Employment uses other than tourism should be encouraged to provide a mix for economic regeneration.
- Edge of town development should be a last resort and the town centres of Sandown and Shanklin should be supported to retain the mix of independent shops and businesses.
- Environment and public realm improvements would be beneficial as would a town centre manager.

**Interest group / organisations**

Visit Isle of Wight suggest letting supply and demand dictate how town centres look and suggest reducing the length of high streets to allow for residential use at either end.

The Chamber of Commerce agree as do Sandown Forum who suggest the following;

- Compulsory purchase of derelict sites.
- attract businesses by lobbying
- encourage retail outlets at lower end of High Street and limit the number of cafés opening.
- the IW Council should plan for limiting the retail areas in towns and increase the quality offered. In Sandown, a town 'plaza' could be located at the junction of High Street with Albert Road and the possibility of a 'pedestrianisation' area in part of the High Street.

Healing Arts disagree with the question, with the view that;

- Older hotels need to be closed and redeveloped for diverse residential occupancy.
- The current range/diversity of shops is one of the worst on the Island.
- The Esplanade at Sandown needs capital investment to make it an attractive seafront
- the parking of vehicles needs to be substantially limited and controlled
- There is nothing in BAAP about traffic circulation.

Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association is concerned about the number of empty and charity shops, particularly in the High Street. They think a core of retail premises in the town centre should be retained, while premises at the periphery should be treated sympathetically if they seek to change to residential or office use. Tourism related premises on the Esplanade should be maintained for tourism purposes, but planning should be sympathetic to changes of use that still support tourism. Grants or interest free/low interest loans might facilitate the towns looking better, and looking better might encourage more visitors to stay and shop, which would re-vitalise the high street economy.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Cllr Ward suggests;

- compulsory purchase of derelict sites
  - attract start-up businesses by giving business rate incentives, especially retail outlets at lower end of Sandown High Street
  - in Sandown, a town 'plaza' could be located at the junction of High Street with Albert Road. However, he does not support the full time pedestrianisation of the High street.
- Sandown Town Council agree the council could give better support and suggest the Conservation Area is abolished. Shanklin Town Council feel that the number of empty shops on Shanklin High Street makes the area look depressed and think a condition should be imposed that empty shops must be well maintained and decorated internally with artwork or similar. Rate exemptions should be refused if this is not complied with. They also think that it is important to keep a core of retail premises, and premises at the periphery should be treated sympathetically if they seek to change to residential or office use.

**The Bay – Q19: What are your views as to the suggestion that the main shopping area boundaries should be altered as set out in paragraph 8.3?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Two respondents agreed with the suggested extension/revision to the main shopping area boundary as set out in paragraph 8.3. However one respondent did think that there are currently too many empty and charity shops, that expansion of retail is pointless unless there is a concerted effort to expand retail trade and suggests IWC has a significant impact through parking charges/restrictions.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The general consensus from this group was one of support for extending retail frontages. Additional comments made were that with new p.d. rights it may be harder to control and protect certain town centre uses and, in relation to protection, discretion is necessary and some flexibility may be required.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was no overall consensus from this group, with the following views expressed;

- Aesthetics are probably more important than what the area is used for;
- Freedom to choose;
- No need for change, once changed it will be impossible to change back, it is difficult to predict future retail trends;
- There are currently too many empty and charity shops in Shanklin, based on this expansion is unrealistic;
- Concerned at the inconsistent approach of the existing IOW Council parking arrangements, and the worsening of the situation by the proposed changes - Sandown High Street has 1 hour free parking and when walking down the street you will pass fewer empty shops and Charity Shops there than you do in Shanklin

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The comments made by Sandown Town Council are in reference to paragraph 8.7 and are therefore more appropriately addressed under Question 23. The comments made by Shanklin Town Council can be summarised as;

- There is a practical issue in Shanklin as much the area to the East of Regent Street is actually occupied by two Churches.
- There are currently too many empty and Charity Shops in Shanklin, so expansion of the retail stock is pointless unless there is a concerted effort to expand the retail trade.
- Current and proposed IOW Council parking arrangements actually mitigate against high street retail, and it is noticeable that Sandown High Street with 1 hour free parking has fewer empty shops and Charity Shops than Shanklin, where there is only very limited half hour free parking or paid parking in car parks. However 30-60 minutes free

parking in all Bay paid parking locations would almost certainly aid the retail sector.

## **The Bay – Q20: Are there any main town centre uses that we should restrict in certain areas, and if so where and why?**

### Summary of responses

#### **Private Individual**

While there was no consensus, responses made by this group can be summarised as;

- Excessive outdoor consumption of alcohol.
- Sandown does not need more large betting shops (these should be limited to one per town)
- Sandown does not need large numbers of cafes that appear to open for only a few months then close again. There should be some local regulations/restrictions regarding type of business usage, signage and maintenance of town centre buildings. Such regulations should be enforced by the IOW Council.
- it is necessary to travel out of Sandown to shop and that just increases traffic.
- no restriction necessary for Main Town Centre uses
- licences for street vendors should preclude them from trading within 500M of existing permanent premises offering similar products anywhere within the Bay.

#### **Private company**

No comments were received from this group.

#### **Planning agent / landowner**

The consensus from this group was that flexibility is required.

#### **Interest group / organisations**

There was no clear consensus from this group of responses. The Chamber of Commerce think there should be greater freedom and that there is currently no flexibility, whereas Sandown Forum said that boundaries should be left where they are as once changed it will be impossible to change back and it is difficult to predict future retail trends. Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association feel that street vendors should not be allowed to trade near to existing permanent premises offering similar products. Visit Isle of Wight feel that aesthetics are more important than what an area is used for. Healing Arts stated gambling as a main town centre use that should be restricted. Specifically they feel that Sandown Pier and its buildings current use for gambling accessed mostly by young persons, whilst technically not illegal, is in their view highly unattractive and detrimental to reinvigorating the Tourism economy and meeting the objectives of the Public health strategy. They think that strong consideration should be given to reconsidering both its current use and to considering its potential future use and also how to protect and safeguard the structure

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Sandown Town Council feel that any restriction could cause the town to become fragmented and that at the moment there is no completely 'dead area' that visitors will shun, rather than walk through to the next area. E.g. retail shops, backs of hotels now opening more and more to 'non-residents' leading to beach, leading to Sandham Gardens, to Dinosaur park and beyond. Alterations in uses should be allowed on the basis that 'market forces will prevail. Shanklin Town Council's view is that licences for street vendors should preclude them from trading within 500M of existing permanent premises offering similar products anywhere within the Bay. Cllr Ward said that betting shops and public houses and bars should be limited and Cllr Seely echoed this view on gambling establishments but also included lap-dancing clubs, stating they undermine town centres.

**The Bay – Q21: Should there be core areas for specific main town centre uses, and if so what uses and where?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Of the three responses one suggested a full discussion is needed, one deferred to the residents of Sandown and Shanklin to determine and one stated with regards to Sandown that there is a lack of shopping opportunities, no large meeting hall, no cinema or theatre and that these are required to bring life back into the town.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The single response from this group did not identify any core areas, but did suggest that extending the retail frontages may help to protect the independent shops and avoid changes to less appropriate uses, but that discretion is necessary and some flexibility may be required.

**Interest group / organisations**

While there was no consensus from the responses in this group there were a number of comments which have been summarised as;

- Aesthetics are probably more important than what the area is used for, all should look attractive to allow change of use;
- Better car parking for Shanklin Theater for both access and to sustain the theatre
- Flexibility
- No need for change, as once changed it will be impossible to change back, difficult to predict future retail trends;

Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association did identify a specific area for main town centre uses, being Regent Street in Shanklin, from the junction with the High Street to the mini roundabout by the doctor's surgery.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Sandown Town Council feel that any restriction could cause the town to become fragmented and that at the moment there is no completely 'dead area' that visitors will shun, rather than walk through to the next area. E.g. retail shops, backs of hotels now opening more and more to 'non-residents' leading to beach, leading to Sandham Gardens, to Dinosaur park and beyond. Alterations in uses should be allowed on the basis that 'market forces will prevail. Shanklin Town Council identified the area within Shanklin from Regent Street junction with the High Street to the mini roundabout by the doctor's surgery that should be a core area for specific main town centre uses. Cllr Seely supports a core area for shopping, stating that it helps to create a buzz and feel to a town.

**The Bay – Q22: What are your views on whether shops in Lake should be protected to make sure they don't get converted to other uses?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The general consensus was that shops in Lake should be protected, with Lake High Street being identified as the key area.

**Private company**

The single response from this group felt that it was difficult to see Lake sustainable alongside both Shanklin & Sandown and consequently a policy of managed retreat from Lake of shop use may be sensible.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was a general consensus from this group that the shops in Lake do provide a level of economic activity, but that a flexible approach should be taken and that the market will determine use and demand. However there was also general agreement that the shopping environment could be improved, primarily through better parking provision and improvements to the public realm and shop frontages.

**Interest group / organisations**

Both the Chamber of Commerce and Sandown Forum think that the current situation is adequate, that there is no need for change and that any change should/will be determined by the market. Healing Arts state that the current shopping environment of Lake High Street is poorly designed and maintained and unattractive. They think that car parking should not be allowed on shop forecourts and that the status of pedestrian access needs to be reinstated and the street frontages invested in.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Lake Parish Council is in favour of protecting shops in Lake so they do not get converted to other uses. Cllr Ward feels that Lake High Street has developed well over the last few years.

**The Bay – Q23: What are your views as to the suggestion that the main shopping area boundaries could be altered?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was no overall consensus from this group of respondents with contrasting views of both allowing change of use to premises on the edge of the town centre to protection of existing retail. There was a general agreement that tourism/retail uses along the seafront and Culver Parade should be retained. Car parking was also raised as an issue in terms of preventing easy access to shops.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comments made by the single respondent are summarised as;

- beneficial to provide a mix of business used throughout the town centre but realistically it may be necessary to accept some retraction of retail uses;
- The town centre has many independent businesses which should be supported and the town relies on tourist income for viability. Upgrading, restoration and enhancement would benefit businesses and the tourist economy and could encourage a higher quality business environment based on restoration of the historic core.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was no consensus from this group of respondents. While the Chamber of Commerce think this is best left to the market to determine, Sandown Forum think the boundaries should be left as they are and Healing Arts state the boundaries of Sandown High Street should be maintained from Culver Parade to Beachfield Road, with investment in its infrastructure.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Cllr Ward stated that there was no need for change and that the boundaries should be left as they are. Shanklin Town Council wouldn't object to peripheral premises in the town centre being allowed to change use, but thin tourism on the Esplanade should be retained.

**The Bay – Q24: Are there any main town centre uses that we should restrict in certain areas, and if so where and why?**

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

While there was no consensus of responses, the responses can be summarised as;

- Consideration of amenity impact when locating leisure activities
- Some areas along Culver Parade could be included in an extension of the shopping area and improved to be of more interest to visitors and locals alike.
- PARKING is a big problem in Sandown. Parking restrictions put off customers.
- Council should waive licence charges for Carnivals, Street Fairs, and Regattas etc.

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

The general consensus from this group was that there should be some form of protection/enhancement of tourism and leisure uses. The main points made can be summarised as;

- Given the Bay's strong tourism role, certain uses, which support the tourism economy, are not restricted along Sandown seafront, including tourism-related retailing, restaurants, hotels, hotel accommodation, amusement arcades/bingo and visitor attractions;
- The town centre has many independent businesses which should be supported and the town relies on tourist income for viability;
- Upgrading, restoration and enhancement would benefit businesses and the tourist economy and could encourage a higher quality business environment based on restoration of the historic core.
- Leisure.

##### **Interest group / organisations**

Sandown Forum think commercial gambling outlets (including betting shops) and fast food outlets should be restricted as main town centre uses. Healing Arts also identify gambling provided on the pier as a use and location that should be restricted. Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association identify the need for the restriction of charity shops in Regent Street, recognising that the east side has a number, so designating the west side for 'real' shops.

##### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Both Cllr Ward and Sandown Town Council identify gambling outlets (including betting shops) as a use to be restricted in the town centre. Shanklin Town Council feel that in order to support tourism the Isle of Wight Council should waive licence charges for carnivals, street fayres, regattas etc.

#### **The Bay – Q25: Should there be core areas for specific main town centre uses, and if so what uses and where?**

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

There were a number of areas identified where there was general consensus, being;

- The seafront area including Culver Parade and the pier for tourism related uses, although there was a suggestion of extending the shopping area to include Culver Parade.
- Existing town centre parking should be retained and improved/extended

Individual comments included;

- Main general shopping areas, library and post office should be in and around the high street;
- Doctors, dentists, schools and churches should remain within easy reach of residents;

- main bus stop in the middle of Sandown is too far for many elderly residents, although the bus access to Ryde, Shanklin and Ventnor is good.
- Purpose built Hotels on the seafront or on cliff tops overlooking the sea should be retained, or if required replaced with new hotels.
- Prime site tourist accommodation should be retained and protected. However planning should recognise shifts in the Tourism Market and consider changes such as hotels into holiday self-catering.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was general consensus for the protection and concentration of retail uses within town centres. Specific comments made can be summarised as;

- convenience and comparison shopping, bars, pubs and night clubs should generally be focused on the town centres;
- flexibility needs to be given in the seafront areas of Sandown and Shanklin to ensure that opportunities to provide facilities that support tourists are not lost
- Paragraph 8.9 refers to the backs of hotels; here, there may be opportunities to create more active frontages by introducing restaurants, bars, pubs and night clubs.
- The town centre has many independent businesses which should be supported and the town relies on tourist income for viability.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce feel the market should be allowed to determine what happens and similarly Sandown Forum don't think there should be an emphasis on use and location, stating that diversity is healthy. Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association think the existing hotels in the Old Village, Keats Green, the cliff-top and the Esplanade should be maintained as hotels and that retail outlets on the Esplanade should support the tourism offering. They also feel that purpose built Hotels on the seafront or on cliff tops overlooking the see should be retained, or if required replaced with new hotels, and that prime site tourist accommodation should be retained and protected. However planning should recognise shifts in the Tourism Market and be sympathetic to changes such as hotels into holiday self-catering accommodation.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There were two contrast views expressed by this group. Cllr Ward and Sandown Town Council both feel there is little requirement for such intervention , that diversity is healthy and there should be preparation for readjustment as shopping on the high street becomes less popular. In contrast, Shanklin Town Council think that the Old Village and Esplanade in Shanklin should be maintained for Tourism related businesses, purpose built Hotels on the seafront or on cliff tops overlooking the see should be retained, or if required replaced with new hotels and prime site tourist accommodation should be retained and protected. However planning should recognise shifts in the Tourism Market and consider changes such as hotels into holiday self-catering.

**The Bay – Q26: Where a site is vacant, but its last use was for tourism, do you think that development only associated with tourism should be allowed on the site?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was suggested that if the site was in a prime location or a historic building then the answer was yes and that sympathetic restoration or residential development could be appropriate. Flexibility, by judging each case on its merits, was put forward by one respondent and another suggested a tourist office along Culver Parade.

**Private company**

No – market should be allowed to decide however there should be an active policy of promoting tourist use maybe through NNDR exemptions or similar.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The respondents were split, with one saying no and the other suggesting some flexibility and imagination. The question of whether it would be realistic to allow alternative uses for a limited period to monitor the impact and viability was raised.

**Interest group / organisations**

Opinions on this were split amongst the organisations and interested parties. Many respondents who believe that tourism uses should be protected to remain so also commented that this would depend on the location, for example sites facing the sea, in prime locations and in particular along the Esplanade and Culver Parade should be protected for tourism use. Other respondents believe that vacant sites where the last use was for tourism should not necessarily remain so. As long as the tourism offer for the Bay is improved as a whole the use of individual sites should be determined based on what is best for each site. One respondent stated that before making any decisions on this a HRA and SA should inform policy on this.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was no clear consensus from the respondents. One advocated a pragmatic approach, rather than leaving a site empty. One responded yes and one no. There was, however, a majority opinion that any approach is dependent upon the area and whether it is a 'prime location' or not.

**The Bay – Q27: Do you think the council should seek to improve the street economy? If so, how, where and why?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was believed that the council should seek to improve the street economy. To do this it was suggested that:

- A market area within Sandown should be provided
- Have a Tourist Office along Culver Parade
- To pedestrianize Shanklin High Street

**Planning agent / landowner**

All planning agents think that the council should seek to improve the street economy. To do this it was suggested that:

- Properties to be upgraded
- Provide a street market
- Provide a clear strategy to regenerate both towns within The Bay
- Consider partial pedestrianization within both towns
- Free car parking
- Through economic growth

**Interest group / organisations**

Three of the four respondents stated "yes" in response to this question, the fourth respondent provided no comment. In comment to how this could be achieved it was suggested that:

- The high streets should be pedestrianized
- Provide town plans for both towns within The Bay

- Provide a transport hub on the site of the derelict Savoy Court flats
- Provide free parking for the first hour of use within towns

Require owners of empty shops to keep them presentable

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

All respondents believe that the council should be seeking to improve the street economy. To do this main areas within Sandown could be pedestrianized and parking charges should be addressed.

**The Bay – Q28: Do you think the council should introduce special protection measures for hotels? If so, what and why?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was felt that generally the quality of the tourist accommodation offer within The Bay needs improving. One respondent stated that *“If this [special protection measures] means protecting the use of hotels for tourism or business visitors then this would be a good thing”*. One respondent said that it would only be appropriate to apply limitations to properties in key locations ((i.e. seafronts and cliff tops). It was suggested that redundant hotels could be converted into high quality housing, business use or that policy should allow for easier conversion of Guest Houses into residential.

**Private company**

One respondent thinks that the council should introduce special protection measures for hotels and that the quality of the hotel stock needs raising. This could be done by introducing NNDR exemption/discounts and flexibility on planning/building regulation from a greater provision of on street/off street parking for hotel sites without their own parking.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was felt amongst the planning agents whom responded that the council should not introduce special protection measures for hotels. This is because the market for accommodation is changing and business needs to adapt accordingly.

**Interest group / organisations**

Views on this were split and it was said that no the council should not introduce measures but instead allow the market to respond. It was suggested that policy should allow for easier conversion of Guest Houses into residential. One respondent stated that before a decision on this is made a Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal should first be carried out. Other respondents believe that the council should introduce measures but a common response was that this should be flexible. It was suggested that there could be new and improved tourist attractions along Culver Parade and that small to medium sized private hotels and restaurants should be encouraged.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was felt that generally the quality of the tourist accommodation offer within The Bay needs improving. All respondents suggested areas where a protection measure could apply and these included: the Esplanade and Culver Parade in Sandown or more generally key locations such as seafronts and cliff tops. It was suggested that policy should allow for easier conversion of Guest Houses into residential.

**The Bay – Q29: Do you think the approach set out is the best way to manage existing hotel and tourism accommodation stock?  
If not, do you have any ideas about how this could be done?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

One private individual stated that they do not agree with the approach to best manage the existing hotel and tourism accommodation stock as set out within the discussion document. Instead it was suggested that businesses could be improved with a comprehensive marketing strategy. Other ideas as to how this could be managed included: protecting Morton swampy areas, converting some hotels into other types of tourism accommodation or residential, development of a conference sized hotel, to keep tourism accommodation within key areas, to drop the element where economically unviable tourism accommodation is converted and to let free market operate outside of these areas.

**Private company**

One private company whom responded to this question believe that the approach set out is sensible with regards to the existing hotel and tourism stock.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was believed that the approach seems appropriate, but it was also suggested the marketing period for existing stock should be 6 months and not 12.

**Interest group / organisations**

Generally the respondents to this question disagreed with the approach set out here. Instead the approach should be flexible and left to the open market to dictate the presence of tourism accommodation within The Bay area. In particular it was suggested that the policy stating sites should be on the market for 12 months should be reduced to 6 months. One respondent provided a few suggestions that might address the balance between overcapacity and maintaining tourism infrastructure, and these were:

- Define key locations (Esplanades, Cliff-Tops, Old Village) where you want to maintain tourism infrastructure. Only apply restrictions on change of use to these key locations.
- To reflect changes in holiday patterns allow hotels to convert to self-catering holiday accommodation, but to avoid the often seen ruse of then applying to convert for sale as residential units a year later, put planning conditions on any such developments that tourism use must apply for at least ten years.
- To allow flexibility to respond to changes in demand allow Guest House/Guest Accommodation/B&Bs to enter the market easily (as long as they comply with appropriate health and safety and food hygiene legislation), but also allow them to stop trading just as easily. This will allow a buffer to respond to market pressures.
- Remove the “not financially viable” criteria for hotels to be able to change use, this just encourages lack of investment and lower standards. Instead allow market forces to determine the level of Hotel beds required, and allow change of use and redevelopment of hotels not in prime locations.
- Allow and encourage Hotels in prime locations to upgrade and/or rebuild to current market expectations.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Some respondents do not agree with the approach set out and all respondents provided ideas to manage the existing hotel and tourism accommodation stock. These ideas were to: have a more flexible approach by dropping the element where economically unviable tourism accommodation is converted and to keep tourism accommodation within key areas and let free market operate outside of these areas.

**The Bay - Q30: Do you think we should protect the gap between Brading and Sandown?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Consensus amongst private individuals is that the gap between Brading and Sandown should be protected. A common theme amongst responses was that the area is a flood plain and so development would not be appropriate here anyway.

**Private company**

One private company responded and agreed that the green gap between Brading and Sandown should be protected.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two of the three planning consultants that responded stated yes to this question. One planning consultant however disagreed that the area should be protected as a green gap because land may be required to meet housing targets.

**Interest group / organisations**

Generally it is agreed that the area between Sandown and Brading should serve as a green gap. Of those who agreed a couple of the respondents suggested amendments to the protected area shown on the map. These suggestions included removing the parade area and the bit that runs to Yaverland; and Southern Water would like to see the land they own removed from this protection too. Other suggestions included increasing the designated area to include Brown's golf course, the former boating lake and Sandham Grounds. There were a couple of organisations who disagreed with designating a protected area and suggested that instead settlement coalescence could be protected through the settlement boundaries and avoiding development on the flood plain.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was agreed by all respondents to this question that the area between Brading and Sandown should be protected to prevent settlement coalescence.

**The Bay - Q31. Do you think that there are other areas that should be protected to prevent settlement coalescence?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A common response from private individuals to this question is that the whole areas around Yaverland to Morton Common and to Dionsaur Isle should be protected. One respondent added that "We do not see any great merit in trying to maintain any gap between Shanklin and Lake, and there already is none between Lake and Sandown."

**Planning agent / landowner**

Two planning agents simply stated 'yes' that there are other areas that should be protected to prevent settlement coalescence. One planning agent disagrees that areas should be protected to prevent settlement coalescence due to the need for housing.

**Interest group / organisations**

Views of organisations and interested parties were split on this question. Half stated that no there are no other areas that need to be considered to prevent settlement coalescence. The other half suggested further areas that should be protected to prevent settlement coalescence. These suggestions were the whole Yaverland area, all land between Brading and Sandown and existing open spaces within Shanklin. One respondent added that "We do not see any great merit in trying to maintain any gap between Shanklin and Lake, and there already is none between Lake and Sandown."

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was recommended that the area between Brading and Sandown as shown in the AAP discussion document should be extended to include land further to the west. Other areas also recommended by respondents were Batts Copse, Sibden Hill, America Wood and Shanklin Down.

**The Bay - Q32. Other than the actions suggested in paragraph 13.2, can you think of any other opportunities there may be to improve the GI provision in The Bay?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was suggested by private individuals that areas between old "Wight City" and Sandown Zoo, Chine Gardens, Rylestone Gardens, Keates Green, Big Meade, Batts Copse, Sibden Hill, Shanklin Down and America Wood could be protected to improve GI provision in The Bay.

**Private company**

One respondent recommends that cycle ways between Shanklin and Wroxall, Sandown and Ryde, and along the Sandown/Shanklin seafronts should be considered to improve GI provision in The Bay.

**Planning agent / landowner**

It was suggested that connectivity between the coastal and inland green space should be considered.

**Interest group / organisations**

In total 11 organisations and interested parties responded and most suggested further opportunities that could improve GI provision in The Bay. It was suggested that playing fields should be reviewed and included within the GI provision, to include SuDS within new development and to plant trees where possible. Specific areas such as Culver Parade and the wetlands behind, the Eastern Yar and Scotchells Brook, the former boating lake and a strip of land adjacent to the designated Village Green were also identified that could be protected to enhance the GI network.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

The various respondents to this question suggested the following areas that could contribute to GI provision in The Bay: marshland adjoining the former boating lake, cycle paths, Chine Gardens, Rylestone Gardens, Keates Green, Big Meade, Batts Copse, Sibden Hill, Shanklin Down and America Wood.

**The Bay - Q33. Do you agree with a focus on improving the public areas in the Bay, particularly along the Esplanade? Are there other things you think the plan could do to help improve the public realm?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

One respondent agrees with a focus on improving public areas in The Bay. There were also other things suggested that could help the public realm, these were: making Shanklin and Sandown High Streets traffic free, to use Los Altos Park for outdoor events and to improve the areas between the old "Wight City" and Sandown Zoo.

**Private company**

One private company responded and they agree with the approach set out in the discussion document. A further suggestion provided was that provision for offshore swinging moorings for visiting yachts/leisure users in inclement weather would be sensible, supported by a water taxi and/or landing stage.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Generally it was agreed by planning agents that public realm enhancements are appropriate for The Bay.

**Interest group / organisations**

Organisations and interested parties agree with a focus on improving public areas in the Bay, particularly along the Esplanade. Further suggestions the plan could do to improve the public realm included: focusing on derelict and distressed buildings, DMO to lead on taking forward the masterplan, use money from the European designation to regenerate the area, provision of public art and experiences, new public conveniences, planting vegetation and to ensure that new buildings are built to a good quality.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It is generally agreed that a focus on improving public areas within The Bay should be included within a masterplan. Other things to include could be the repair of sea walls, provision of public conveniences, use of European money for regeneration, further investigation into the possible installation of a marina within Sandown and Shanklin, and consider listing specific properties within Shanklin.

**The Bay - Q34. Do you think there are opportunities for new areas of public space, if so why and where? Would you support the idea of working to help develop outdoor activities?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

A common response from individuals is that they would like to see existing open space areas improved first.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Opinions were split on this question with one planning agent agreeing to the principal and one disagreeing.

**Interest group / organisations**

The majority of respondents would like to see the creation of new open space, areas proposed for this include the Battery Gardens, extension of the Yar River Trail to include the seafront, a strip of land adjacent to a new created Village Green within Shanklin, Tower Gardens, Rylestone Gardens and Big Meade within Shanklin. A couple of respondents agreed that the council should work to help develop outdoor activities too.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It was proposed that the Battery Gardens could be created as open space as well as Big Meade, and an area next to Batts Copse. The general consensus was that outdoor activities should be promoted. It was also suggested that The Bay needs a marina.

**The Bay – Q35: To what extent, if at all, do you think there is an air quality issue in the Plan area, either at the junction of the A3055 (Sandown Road) and A3056 (Newport Road) or elsewhere?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It is felt that air quality is an issue within The Bay area. Whilst it is recognised there is an issue at the junction of the A3055 (Sandown Road) and A3056 (Newport Road) there are also issues at the Wastewater Treatment Works in Sandown and at Shanklin High Street.

**Planning agent / landowner**

One respondent had no comment whilst the other suggested that traffic management and air quality is an issue.

**Interest group / organisations**

General consensus was that air quality at this junction is an issue. It was also suggested that there are issues at the High Street in Sandown, especially along the narrower section of road between its junction with Esplanade Road and St. John's Road junction.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

It has been recognised that there are serious air quality issues as the A3055 (Sandown Road) and A3056 (Newport Road) junction. It was also commented that there are concerns with air quality at The Heights, Lake and Morton Common.

**The Bay – Q36: To what extent, if at all, do you think we should take the location of potential development sites in relation to the 3 rail stations in the Plan area into account when identifying the best sites?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

It was considered that the location of the three rail stations within The Bay area should be taken into account when deciding on potential development sites. However it was commented that if a site is not close this should not inhibit development, reasons for this are that whilst rail transport is more sustainable there also has to be employment opportunities within commuter distance and that the public transport service needs improving.

**Private company**

One respondent to this question stated that *“The ageing stock on the Island railway together with the relatively short track means that it does not have a particularly large impact on economic development and therefore it should not be of great concern as regard to planning policy”*.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Planning agents suggested that this should be addressed within transport policy but that the location of the rail stations would not appear to be particularly significant in this respect as road traffic dominates the area. It was suggested by one agent that a new look should be provided as to potential drop off station at Brading Marshes to allow easier access to Sandown seafront re- development.

**Interest group / organisations**

It was suggested that areas around the stations are already well developed and so it would be better to consider the necessity of a by-pass round the Bay area to reduce through traffic along already overcrowded routes. Another suggestion was to develop drop off points at the stations. It was noted that Shanklin Railway Station is grade II listed and any development the vicinity of the station should respect its historical significance. One respondent stated that “no” this does not need to be considered at all.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Two of the four respondents to this question think that there is no further development potential within the vicinity of the rail stations. Another stated that development not being close to a station should not inhibit it's potential. A further suggestion was that the railway line needs upgrading and potentially developing a park and ride at Smallbrook.

**The Bay - Q37. To what extent, if at all, do you think we should explore other sustainable transport measures in relation to the rail stations, such as park and ride and linking up other ways of getting about?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Four responses were received from private individuals, The comments from this group can be summarised as follows:

1. One was clear that "people will still want to use their cars. Public transport will never be good enough – it is poor unless money is spent on it. Parking is a problem everywhere in Sandown".
2. One suggested that a bus service running in a loop around the town would be better for residents who wish to access the station, The Heights, Doctors surgery, Post Office, shops at the south of the High Street.
3. One mourned the loss of the railways suggesting that the council "should certainly explore other more sustainable transport measures" such as light railway/tramway.
4. The forth comment suggested that "if you wish to encourage 'park and ride price it lower than drive and park! In the longer term the light railway/tram connection between the Bay and Newport/Cowes along the old Railway line routes should be seriously considered; this would make visiting the Island without a car much more attractive".

**Planning agent / landowner**

There were two responses from this sector, one felt that there was little requirement to explore other sustainable transport measures. The other acknowledged that road traffic dominates the area and traffic management and air quality is an issue. The location of the rail stations would not appear to be particularly significant in this respect. It was felt that this is somewhat lessened by the fact that this is a coastal area and "vehicle design and lower emissions should reduce the problem to some extent".

**Interest group / organisations**

Responses were received from five groups from this sector. English Heritage offered no comment. IW Chamber of Commerce Tourism and Industry supported the idea. Visit IOW expressed caution saying "rail link may disappear by 2019. Don't base transport links purely round stations". Sandown forum thought that there was a "definite need for a park and ride in Sandown. Perhaps the area behind the Sandown railway stations could be explored." While Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association were of the opinion that there was sufficient capacity at Sandown and Shanklin Stations already. They "would enthusiastically endorse this idea as a long term environmentally friendly approach to travel on the Island".

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Four responses were received from this sector.

1. One suggested that it should be acceptable to use bus passes on Island Line and that extra money should be put into community bus schemes.
2. Two felt that there already is sufficient capacity at railway stations.
3. One suggested that the railway should be converted to "a fast bus way lane"
4. One replicated a response submitted by a private individual if you wish to encourage 'park and ride price it lower than drive and park! In the longer term the light railway/tram connection between the Bay and Newport/Cowes along the old Railway line routes should be seriously considered; this would make visiting the Island

without a car much more attractive".

### **The Bay - Q38. Are you aware of any traffic problems in the Plan area? If so where, and do you know why these occur?**

#### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

There were five responses received from private individuals. Of these three were more general comments to do with car use, poor public transport, lack of parking in Sandown and road maintenance causing hold ups during the summer months. The third covered a range of issues including local housing growth, increased car use, large lorries, increasing number of chain stores and supermarkets ("Asda NO"). The respondent noted "how my home pulsates as HGVs drive by, often causing my wall art to jangle" The person suggested that "consideration might be given to laying down tram lines and using the tram, making the Island a better healthier place to dwell for locals and visitors alike" The other two were more site specific, the first felt that the "new roundabout at Newport Road/ Whitecross Lane has been help and has resolved the traffic hold-ups that used to occur at that junction" The issue he felt .needed resolving was "the bus stop outside the Spithead Business Centre; it should be recessed into the bank and allow traffic to flow freely"

The final respondent listed the following issues:

1. "Shanklin junction of Victoria Avenue and High Street (Issue is volume of traffic with narrow roads – by-pass really only solution)
2. Around Shanklin Bus Station (more an issue of safety than congestion – zebra crossings too close to junction for safety but cannot be moved to sensible position because of current design of bus stops.
3. Lake traffic lights at junction Newport Road (partly caused by positioning of bus stop.
4. The frequency of road works in Lake (Sandown Road and Lake Hill), which appears to be almost continuous".

He was of the opinion that "in the long term a by-pass diverting through traffic and particularly heavy goods vehicles round the back of the narrow roads of Shanklin/Sandown and Lake and ovoid using the rat run of Perowne Way is the only sensible way to address congestion".

##### **Planning agent / landowner**

There were two responses received from planning agents. There comments were:

1. "The main road through Lake does get congested at peak times particularly at the junction with Sandown Road."
2. "The Broadway needs widening"

##### **Interest group / organisations**

There were four responses received from this sector. English Heritage offered no comment.

One was a general comment saying "there always seems to be road works somewhere in Lake, and this impacts movement around the whole Bay area". Two made comment about the Lake traffic lights at junction with Newport Road. The other suggestions were as follows:

- "Junction of Morton Road/Avenue Road/ Perowne Way – road layout unable to cope with the variable traffic movements and traffic lights".
- Junction of Beachfield Road/Grange Road/Lake Hill/ Broadway – The road past Christ Church is too narrow to support large vehicles to pass safely. Possible one way system via either Melville Street or New Road, which has been used in the past as a temporary measure when road works have been undertaken"
- In Shanklin at the junction of Victoria Avenue and High Street
- Shanklin Old Village
- Around the Coop/Shanklin Bus Station
- Lake traffic lights in High Street

- The frequency of road works in Lake
- The problem in Shanklin has probably been addressed as far as is possible with the existing roads with the recent junction changes implemented following input from the Town Council in discussion with local premises.
- There are three issues in Lake:
- The buses stopping just past the Newport Road lights block the road and cause tail-backs (this also impacts on air quality)
- The traffic lights half way along Lake high street do not appear to be synchronised with those at the junction. Since pupils for the school use the Zebra crossing by the Fairway, we would question the need for these pedestrian crossing lights., in view of their disruptive effect on traffic

Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association concluded that “a by-pass for Shanklin and Sandown is the only sensible way to address congestion in the long term. Existing roads in Shanklin are not suitable for the volumes of through traffic, and particularly for large HGVs.”

#### **Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Four representations were received from this sector. Three raised concerns regarding the junction of Beachfield Road/Grange Road/Lake Hill/Broadway – were traffic tails back to the inadequate junction layout at the War Memorial (Fairway). And the road past Christ Church is too narrow to support large vehicles to pass safely.

Three respondents suggested that the long term solution would be a “by-pass diverting through traffic and particularly heavy goods vehicles round the back of the narrow roads of Shanklin and Sandown is the only sensible way to address congestion”.

The following suggestions / issues were also raised:

- “Congestion at Morton Common”.
- “Perowne Way, Sandown is used as a ‘rat run’ and could benefit from a barrier system”.
- The “junction of Morton Road/Avenue Road/ Perowne Way – road layout unable to cope with the variable traffic movements and traffic lights. Re-engineering the junction would provide two lanes at the traffic lights thus allowing traffic heading into Sandown to go ahead and not be blocked by traffic turning right into Perowne Way” (Councillor I Ward)

Sandown Town Councils comments picked up some of the points as those submitted by a private individual but are set in full below for ease of reference:

1. “Shanklin junction of Victoria Avenue and High Street (Issue is volume of traffic with narrow roads – by-pass really only solution)
2. Around Shanklin Bus Station (more an issue of safety than congestion – zebra crossings too close to junction for safety but cannot be moved to sensible position because of current design of bus stops.
3. Lake traffic lights at junction Newport Road (partly caused by positioning of bus stop.
4. Lake traffic lights in High Street (these appear not to be synchronised with lights at Newport Road in Lake and Heights in Sandown and cause back-up of traffic. Are these lights really necessary – most individuals cross road at Zebra crossings by the Fairway).
5. The frequency of road works in Lake, which appears to be almost continuous”

#### **The Bay – Q39: Do you think the current locations of local level recycling facilities are right? If so why, if not can you suggest any alternative locations?**

##### Summary of responses

##### **Private Individual**

There was no overall consensus from the 4 responses of this group, with one response suggesting that recycling facilities should be located inland (not near Sandown), one stating that the facilities are inadequate and one that there have been no complaints with the current arrangements (one respondent made no comments).

**Planning agent / landowner**

Both respondents agreed that the current locations of local level facilities are right; with one stating that they have good access and are well used.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce suggest public car parks and retail sites except tourism car parks as potential local recycling sites. Sandown Forum identified Sandown railway station car park and Yaverland car park as possible additional areas. The (H&IW) Wildlife Trust said that the location of any new facilities should be informed by various environmental assessments, while Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association understanding is that current arrangements are adequate.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

CLr Ward identified Sandown railway station car park as a possible additional location and Sandown Town Council suggest the East Yar industrial estate would make a suitable location, while Shanklin Town Council state that they've not received any complaints about the current arrangements.

**The Bay – Q40: What items do you want to be able to recycle at these local level recycling facilities?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Items identified by this group that they want to be able to recycle at local level facilities are old clothes and shoes not suitable for charity shops.

**Planning agent / landowner**

The only response from this group stated that the existing local facilities seem appropriate, well used and with good access.

**Interest group / organisations**

The general consensus of this group of respondents was that the existing facilities are adequate, however the Chamber of Commerce did make suggestions of clean recyclables, a swap facility and that more interesting policy and strategies are required.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Shanklin Town Council feel that the current facilities seem adequate, but suggest that the containers could be emptied more frequently, particularly the clothes banks. Sandown Town Council state that there is a requirement for a 'full recycling service that ensures recycled goods are not then amalgamated at the next level'. CLr Ward supports the existing provision and suggests an addition of skips for larger items that people find difficult to take to Lynnbottom Tip.

**The Bay – Q41: To what extent, if at all, should there be more local waste facilities in the Bay?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

The general consensus of this group was that no more waste facilities are required in the Bay, with a number citing the wider waste facilities provided at Lynnbottom Tip being appropriate, while one respondent did state that there should be no facilities that cause any more air pollution.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There were conflicting views from the two responses in this group with one stating that the current local facilities seem ok, while the other stated that Shanklin is deficient.

**Interest group / organisations**

The Chamber of Commerce suggested facilities for swap and clean recyclables and that more interesting policy and strategies are required. Sandown Forum state that as Sandown has the sewage treatment works for the whole Island the Bay should not be expected to have any more waste facilities. The Shanklin Hotel and Accommodation Association feel that current waste management arrangements work well.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

CLr Ward mirrors the views of Sandown Forum, i.e. as Sandown has the sewage treatment works for the whole Island the Bay should not be expected to have any more waste facilities. While Shanklin Town Council feels the existing facilities work well, Sandown Town Council state that there is a requirement for a 'full recycling service that ensures recycled goods are not then amalgamated at the next level'.

**The Bay – Q42: Or would you prefer to see a larger, appropriately located, waste management facility that would be capable of dealing with most of the Island's waste?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a general consensus from this group that the current waste facilities for the Bay are adequate and that the arrangements and location of facilities at Lynn Bottom are appropriate.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the two responses there were opposing views of no versus local facilities seem more appropriate and sustainable.

**Interest group / organisations**

While Sandown Forum agreed that they would prefer to see a larger, appropriately located facilities, capable of dealing with most of the Island's waste, the Chamber of Commerce prefer a smaller scale approach perhaps combined with signage (particularly with regards to tourists). The Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Associate state that the current arrangements appear to work well.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

While CLr Ward agreed that he would prefer to see a larger, appropriately located facilities, capable of dealing with most of the Island's waste, Sandown Town Council state that there should be full recycling service that ensures recycled goods are not then amalgamated at the next level. Shanklin Town Council feel that the current waste management arrangements are sufficient and don't need to be changed.

**The Bay – Q43: What, if any, types of renewable energy technologies would you like to see on new developments?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was a general consensus from this group for the use of solar panels/pv and that wind turbines should be discouraged.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Of the two responses received one supported pv, while the other suggested a flexible, open approach as it is important not to pre-judge what may be available in the near future and to strike a balance between renewable resources and potential impacts.

**Interest group / organisations**

The overall consensus of this group of respondents has been support for both smaller scale technology and solar panels/pv. The Chamber of Commerce prefer small scale technology while Sandown Forum support solar panels and micro-generation on new builds. The (Hants & IW) Wildlife Trust suggested implementing energy efficiency measures such as the highest BREEAM standards, and the RSPB also energy efficiency, ideally including solar panels or pv, whilst avoiding wind turbines. Shanklin Hotel & Accommodation Association support solar panels/pv and has been disappointed with the results from heat pump technology and find wind turbines can be noisy, unsightly and harm birds. There was support for small-scale communal heating systems for existing buildings in addition to district heating as set out in Core Strategy policy DM1. He states that new infrastructure (both above and below ground) will be required at a neighbourhood level to provide low carbon heating solutions for the existing stock, 80% of which will still be around in 2050. He requested a statement he drafted be included in the plan (see full response).

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Both Cllr Ward and Sandown Town Council support the use of solar, with Cllr Ward also supporting micro-generation on new-build property. Shanklin Town Council believe that technology should be appropriate to the site, but as a generalisation support solar and if likely to be effective ground and air pump schemes, while they feel wind turbines should be discouraged due to impacts.

**The Bay – Q44: In addition to the sites listed in paragraph 19.4, are there any other buildings or sites that you are aware of that you would like the council to consider taking action on?****Summary of responses****Private Individual**

Respondents from this group identified the following sites for the council to consider taking action on;

- Old Sandown CofE school (now council buildings)
- The pier (repair & maintenance)
- Waste Water Works (avoid ongoing nuisance)
- Spa site
- Empty plot on corner of 5 ways junction at top of Hope Road
- Baileys site on High Street
- Victorian 'Swiss Chalet' Cottage in Rylestone Gardens
- Empty premises on High Street
- Number of Charity Shops on Regent Street

Also requested not to refer to the site listed in paragraph 19.4 as the Rivoli Cinema.

**Planning agent / landowner**

Respondents from this group identified the following sites for the council to consider taking action on;

- The Zoo
- The lift at Shanklin
- Lake at Culver

Also suggested that the restoration of historic structures can provide a catalyst for wider enhancement and economic regeneration.

**Interest group / organisations**

Respondents from this group identified the following sites for the council to consider taking action on;

- Sandown Barracks Gardens/Sandham Raceway area
- The Zoo
- Lake ancient fort monument
- The lift at Shanklin
- Seagrove Hotel
- Zoo car park
- Yaverland Sailing Club cliff
- Beach huts at Driftwood
- Former Kebab House High Street
- Complete sea front and defences
- The plot on the junction of Hope Road and Queens Road
- Baileys site on the High Street
- Empty premises on the High Street
- Swiss Chalet in Rylestone Gardens

Other comments included support for a review of the current Conservation Area in Sandown, and that Sandown Heritage Buildings and Conservation Area should be protected and expanded where appropriate.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Cllr Ward stated that the current Conservation Area for Sandown does little and had little to conserve and identified the following sites as in need of consideration;

- Seagrove Hotel
- Zoo car park
- Yaverland Sailing Club cliff
- Beach huts at Driftwood
- Former Kebab House, High Street
- The complete seafront and sea defences

Sandown Town Council has no other sites to add, but support the review of Sandown Conservation area.

Shanklin Town Council identify the following sites in Shanklin;

- Spa site

- Empty plot on the corner of 5 ways junction at the top of Hope road
- Baileys site on the High Street
- Swiss chalet cottage in Rylestone Gardens
- Empty premises on the High Street
- Number of charity shops on Regent Street

**Bay Q45 - Do you support the council in putting in place a more pro-active approach to empty and derelict sites?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

There was support for this approach with additional comment made that there needed to be conditions with penalties re site condition and completion dates of building work. Further comment was made that the council should try to involve the Ethical Property Co. Ltd to take on one or two buildings that might be suitable for community and small business enterprises.

**Private company**

There was support for this approach.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was support for this approach.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was support for this approach with additional comment made that hoardings with an agreed design could be used and encourage art, tourism and tidying site. Additional comment was made that the focus of this activity should be around Sandown High Street / Culver Parade and Station Road with further comment that the BAAP should propose that repair notices for these sites are issued in the near future. The last comment made appropriate mechanisms are put in place to protect ecology as part of redevelopment proposals.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

There was support for this approach with further comment made that the legal work for implementation should be contracted out to appropriately qualified legal practitioners.

**Bay – Q46 - What are your views on the use of Local Development Orders to enable economic development? What areas in particular do you think the council should consider?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comment was made that some assistance in management and support might help, and try to involve the Ethical Property Co. Ltd to take on one or two buildings

**Private company**

Comment was made supporting the use of Local Development Orders

**Planning agent / landowner**

Comment was made that further work was needed to consider which areas were appropriate but other comments were made stating "Further work – let the private sector progress"

**Interest group / organisations**

Sites identified were:

- Esplanade Shanklin,
- Sandown High Street,
- around the Dinosaur Museum including former boating lake

Further comment was made that a tourism and leisure boundary should be drawn up, to include town and seafront retail outlets, available attractions, accommodation and facilities. This will focus attention for future planning, protect the area and attract investment and include adequate safeguards for the historic environment.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Sites identified were:

- The former boating lake area
- the Sandown Industrial area.

Comment was made that if a site for a major new tourist attraction could be identified within the Bay it might be appropriate to issue a Local development Order for the site to make the development as attractive as possible to potential developers.

**Bay Q47 - Do you think that the council should introduce a requirement for the appearance of development sites to be maintained to a reasonable standard?**

Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

Comment was made that historical appearance should be maintained wherever possible.

**Private company**

There was support for this approach.

**Planning agent / landowner**

There was a split of views with one comment in support and the other stating that this is unenforceable.

**Interest group / organisations**

There was support for this approach with further comment that this should be part of planning conditions with potential fines for failure to comply. Further comment was made that funds should be set aside by those with an interest in a development to maintain a site from the inception of a planning proposal to completion. Other comments made supported this approach but also commented that the condition would need to satisfy the tests for conditions, including preciseness (what would be the definition of "reasonable"?).

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Support was given to this approach as long as it was backed up by real enforcement powers and the ability to actually enforce standards and carried out within a specific timeframe. Further comment was also made that this should also apply to vacant sites where planning permission has not been sought.

**The Bay – Q48: Is there any planning matter not covered in this document that you think the council needs to consider within The Bay Plan?**

## Summary of responses

**Private Individual**

In summary people commented that they would like to see the following:

- The historical appearance and restoration of old buildings maintained, instead of modernization of the island
- Minimising traffic congestion
- Taking a proactive approach to improving Sandown
- Consider infrastructure requirements with new development

**Planning agent / landowner**

One planning agent responded and they suggested that:

- Housing numbers should be increased in the Bay Area for housing by 150 units
  - A more diverse offer of housing should be provided including multiple occupancy as affordable housing which could be provided by RSLs or the private market
- An expansion of the business centre at Lake should be centred around the area at Morrisons and Sandown Airport

**Interest group / organisations**

General comments on planning matters that respondents think the council need to consider are summarised below.

- Protect existing sports pitches from future development
- Increasing housing numbers to 150
- Development of Bay masterplan.
- Development of attractions.
- Development of marginal holiday accommodation i.e. caravan sites, to allow for a more diverse offer.
- Expansion of business area in Lake, particularly around Sandown Airport.
- Encouragement of diverse accommodation.
- Define protected areas
- Map ecological networks
- Refer The Bay AAP to the Isle of Wight's relating to Public Health, Health and Wellbeing, Culture, and Highways
- Address the historic environment in Sandown and Shanklin and conserve and enhancing the special character of the town and conservation area and positively conserving, enhancing and promoting access to heritage assets in the town.
- Consider LDOs for certain energy efficiency improvements to existing properties which currently require planning permission.

- Investigate the issue of illegal dredging in the Bay

Suggest that as all of the Island's sewage is pumped through the Sandown Works, the Bay plan should require that any planning application by Southern Water anywhere on the Island should be conditional upon addressing the sea-water quality on Shanklin Beach. Alternatively ban locating sewage works and outflows into the sea in the Bay area.

**Parish / Town Council / IW Councillor**

Respondents suggested, in response to this question, the following:

- Ensure that development and housing is of a high quality
- Consider development of a marina
- Provide policy for the flood plain and rainwater
- Consider challenging housing targets
- Focus on creating jobs
- Target higher education