Comments for Planning Application 23/01165/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01165/FUL

Address: Pilot House Embankment Road Bembridge Isle Of Wight PO35 5NR

Proposal: Demolition of dwelling & commercial building; proposed replacement dwelling (C3 (a) Dwellinghouses) & 19no. industrial units (B2 General industrial & B8 (storage or Distribution)

Case Officer: Maria Bishop

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Holman

Address: Houseboat Myosotis, Embankment Road, Bembridge, Isle Of Wight PO35 5NS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Bembridge Houseboat Owners Association

This is an objection to planning application 23/01165/FUL on behalf of the houseboat owners living opposite the proposed site.

Flooding

We know that the marshes behind this proposed development are at risk of flooding and have been predicted as flooded by 2050. https://coastal.climatecentral.org/map/13/-

1.0799/50.7047/?theme=sea_level_rise&map_type=year&basemap=roadmap&contiguous=true&e levation_model=best_available&forecast_year=2050&pathway=ssp3rcp70&percentile=p50&refres h=true&return_level=return_level_1&rl_model=gtsr&slr_model=ipcc_2021_med

Yet here we have a planning application with no flood risk analysis. As others have said, this application cannot go any further without a serious and detailed assessment.

And one would expect to see such an assessment have concerns about swimming pools well below the flood levels as well as many aspects of drainage.

Drainage

This area has no public sewer. Most current alternative treatment systems will not meet the criteria needed for this site that neighbours such sensitive areas. We have on the one side the saline marshes with rare breeds depending on water purity. And on the other a harbour already under serious pressure from pollutants from both the river, marine traffic and incoming tidal streams. This application should prove beyond doubt it will do nothing to add anything negative to any surrounding area.

Contamination

As others have pointed out, we know this area to be severely contaminated.

This application needs to include a detailed analysis of what is under the ground together with comprehensive plans on how to deal with it in an effective and ecological manner.

Only then can the application even be considered.

Ground stability

Works need to show how proposed building improves the areas ground stability and fits in with the Environment Agencies work on seepage through the embankment.

Overlooking residential properties

Opposite the development are a number of residential houseboats that this proposed house will overlook. Having balconies and upper level viewpoints will seriously impact on houseboat privacy and should have views restricted to a lower level such as at present, or have side facing windows and no open balconies.

Ecology

Strangely there is no Ecological Report with this application. This makes it difficult to take it seriously and not just a wild punt.

We don't need to detail the safeguards this area is meant to enjoy as others have adequately done so.

But to have an application that does not have detail how this development would take into account the sensitivity of the surrounding area is ridiculous.

It of course needs to take into account how the works would not interfere with nature as well as the finished product and its everyday use. Not least as it is difficult to see how this would be achieved to a satisfactory level.

Traffic and pollution

Again, others have pointed out, this application needs to be clear about how it would meet current standards expected both in terms of getting in and out with adequate visibility splays. (This road is already subject to numerous concerns re traffic speed and the difficulty local people have crossing.)

As well as how it could manage run off from new tarmacked areas. Previous restrictions from IOW planning in the area have unfortunately not been enforced. This time we really need to ensure this is adequately managed with proper drainage and filtration systems.

Overdevelopment and out of character

We are concerned that this proposal creates a further development of an area that joins up the developments and businesses along the embankment.

We have new development at the St Helens end. New development in the middle and now this at the Bembridge end leading to precedents being set to in fill the rest. The area has always been prized as having and maintaining the views over both the harbour and marshes. Detailed in such documents as the conservation area plan.

Marine use

Whilst it can be argued the area needs to be used for marine related use, we know these units will not be all marine use. Indeed, many will be other use not harbour or marine use and therefore inappropriate for the area.

Derelict buildings

We have seen on the island the planned pressure put on the planning process by leaving buildings to become derelict and with ensuing public pressure to get something done, leading to greater leeway for applications normally thrown out immediately.

This one lacks so very many of the fundamental components and considerations one would expect for a proposal in this area it doesn't warrant any deliberation whatsoever.

Footpath

The footpath to the rear of the proposal is of significance. We agree this needs formalising and indeed extending to join up not only with the path closed off by the rspb, and currently subject to a rights of way appeal, but also continuing along the old railway line. As far as we know, this is owned by BIL, the Bembridge Investments Ltd and no permissions have been granted to allow this to be used by the public. This should form part of an application together with a plan to continue the path as a public path up to the embankment road through the site.

Finally, we agree with the parish council that this proposed development would benefit from being split into 2 separate applications to aid proper discussion.

In short, this application is so flawed as to not warrant serious consideration and should be refused outright.