

IPS visions and objectives - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 18:45:57

Name/Organisation

FBRA - FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What IPS vision and objectives policy are you commenting on

Policy CC1 Climate Change

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

3.6 on wards

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

- **Building on green fields opposes the policy of protecting our UNESCO status, the Solent from sewage, our Carbon neutral plan and other key environmental factors directly impacted through exponential property development.**

BY REMOVING GREEN FIELDS AND BUILDING HOUSES AS DICTATED WILL MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO BECOME CARBON NEUTRAL BY 2030

- **Carbon Neutral Pledge: The IoW Carbon Neutral plan. In the Climate Environment Strategy 2021-2030 it is stated: “The Isle of Wight has a stated aim to achieve net zero emissions by 2030, in both the council’s own activities and the wider Isle of Wight environment.” The IoW Council has declared an aspirational goal of being Net Zero by 2030 but this development will contribute to additional CO2 through the build, increased household CO2 emissions and removing greenfield sites that absorb CO2 being destroyed forever once developed upon.**

- **If the council were to offset (plant trees or create new woodland, for example) the entire 2017 carbon footprint, approximately 2.5 million trees would have to be planted. If the council were to eliminate 85 percent of emissions by 2030, and offset the further 15 per cent approximately, 760 hectares (or 760 rugby pitches) worth of tree coverage would need to be planted.**

- **How will the Council meet these demands, and which spaces have been allocated to fulfil this requirement? With an increase in development, will it realistically be feasible to achieve this when there will be fewer areas where planting could take place due to the finite nature of our Island?**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To represent our community in Freshwater

Community Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 18:55:59

Name/Organisation

FBRA FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Community policy you are commenting on

General Comments for Community

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

The whole section

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

- **West Wight has been allocated a disproportionate number of houses in relation to our available brown field capacity, social, medical and utility infrastructure. The accommodation of these numbers has been facilitated by the SHLAA process allocating large sites outside our existing settlement boundary.**
- **The Council must consider the implications of urbanising a treasured rural landscape and the impacts this will have on the tourism economy as these are intrinsically linked. Large scale developments will have the greatest of impacts and the greatest risk of negative impacts on both the landscape, biodiversity and tourism. Sensitive and small developments should be prioritised on brownfield sites, that are in need of improvement, and have the least risk of detrimental impacts.**
- **"Freshwater is a rich and highly diverse rural area, offering considerable potential for growth with regards to landscape and eco-tourism. The local environment, flora and fauna must be protected as it is this rural tranquillity that residents and visitors appreciate [...] Conserve and, where possible, enhance the views referred to in the evidence document "Most Valued Views". Any development within these areas must ensure that key features of these views can continue to be enjoyed' Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan (2017 - 2027)**
- **Freshwater developed the Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan - FNP (2017 - 2027) in consultation with the community outlining their desire for the future of Freshwater including housing needs. IPS disregards FNP.**
- **"The Community wishes to see development prioritised to brownfield sites. The Parish is rural in character and is defined by its green spaces...Future developments should co-exist with the green open spaces." "The Parish values all rural landscapes as they form an important part of the character and definition of the Parish." (Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan)**
- **West Wight Landscape Character Assessment: "No development in the parish should have a jarring effect from the iconic viewpoint the Down's" [...] "Consultation with the local community highlighted concerns over suburbanisation of the area, loss of rural and village character, decline in farming, loss of hedgerows and increase in horse paddocks. Golden Hill Fort, Moons Hill, Farringford and Dimbola Lodge were valued as landmarks". Landscape Guidelines: Conserve the sense of a rural, small-scale landscape of winding lanes and small settlements."**
- **DIPS states that '51 per cent of the homes allocated are on sites that contain brownfield land'. This wording has changed since the previous DIPS, where there was a 60% allocation of home on brownfield sites, not on 'sites that contain brownfield land'. Regardless, this is not the case for West Wight where our precious green fields (one of which is grade 2 agricultural - a scarce and valuable source on the Island) have been 'allocated' for housing**
- **Island-wide there are many abandoned buildings/sites and areas which require regeneration, these have not been incorporated in IPS. Building on fresh green field sites may be easier, and definitely more lucrative for developers, but we should utilise and clean up areas which already exist, regenerating for local needs.**
- **The West Wight Landscape Character Survey (2005) describes 'Freshwater Isle' as: 'The Settled Farmland landscape [...] Gently rolling landscape [...] Highly settled but with areas of pasture and arable cultivation [...] Intricate network of rural lanes, some sunken [...] remnants of Medieval open field cultivation still evident [...] Strong literary associations and distinctive identity as Freshwater Isle.' This must be preserved for future generations and our vital tourism industry.**

6 - Growth

- **Freshwater and the surrounding SSSI, AONB and other breath taking beauty spots such as Tennyson Town and Freshwater Bay are major tourist attractions on the Island with recent investments in tourism magnets such as the beautiful renovation of the Albion Hotel, and Totland Pier. The IPS plan seems to want to turn the rural village of Freshwater into a sprawling town filled with residential homes and removing green spaces - which will clearly damage tourism.**
- **"Freshwater is a rich and highly diverse rural area, offering considerable potential for growth with regards to landscape and eco-tourism. The local environment, flora and fauna must be protected as it is**

this rural tranquillity that residents and visitors appreciate [...] Conserve and, where possible, enhance the views referred to in the evidence document "Most Valued Views". Any development within these areas must ensure that key features of these views can continue to be enjoyed' Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan (2017 - 2027)

- The Council must consider the implications of urbanising a treasured rural landscape and the impacts this will have on the tourism economy as these are intrinsically linked. Large scale developments will have the greatest of impacts and the greatest risk of negative impacts on both the landscape, biodiversity and tourism. Sensitive and small developments should be prioritised on brownfield sites, that are in need of improvement, and have the least risk of detrimental impacts.

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To represent our community and report back findings etc... as previously explained on all forms completed.

Environment Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 18:01:50

Name/Organisation

FBRA

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Environment policy you are commenting on

EV2 - Ecological Assets and Opportunities for Enhancement

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

no the whole section

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

EV2 - Ecological assets

- **The plans are contrary to maintaining our UNESCO Biosphere status, and the significance of the landscape in the West Wight is emphasised by the fact that 60% of the area is within an AONB (now known as Isle of Wight National Landscape) and 80% of the coastline is Heritage Coast.**
- **The Council must consider the implications of urbanising a treasured rural landscape and the impacts this will have on the tourism economy as these are intrinsically linked. Large scale developments will have the greatest of impacts on both the landscape, biodiversity and tourism. Sensitive and small developments should be prioritised on brownfield sites, that are in need of improvement, and have the least risk of detrimental impacts.**
- **IPS (2.11) states the Island is a “distinct environment with a wide variety of natural, rural, built and historic landscapes and features. The whole Island has been designated as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve for its environmental significance. The Island has a range of nationally and locally important heritage assets. There are sites of internationally important geology, and the Island is home to a rich variety of important habitats and species, with 70% of the Island protected by UK or European designations**
- **The Island’s biodiversity is very special, with key species, such as: Red squirrels; bats; Dormice; Glanville Fritillary butterfly;**
- **The Island is home to 14 of the UK’s 18 species of bat which need their habitat to be protected including the Barbastelle bat spotted in Freshwater which is very rare, with only 5,000 remaining ...”few breeding sites are currently known in the UK and it is important that surrounding environments of these and winter hibernation sites are maintained. It is thought that they prefer pastoral landscapes with deciduous woodland, wet meadows and water bodies, such as woodland streams and rivers”. (Bat Conservation Trust 2010).**
- **“Freshwater is a rich and highly diverse rural area, offering considerable potential for growth with regards to landscape and eco-tourism. The local environment, flora and fauna must be protected as it is this rural tranquillity that residents and visitors appreciate [...] Conserve and, where possible, enhance the views referred to in the evidence document “Most Valued Views”. Any development within these areas must ensure that key features of these views can continue to be enjoyed’ Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan Include internationally protected RAMSAR sites and SSSI sites as well as AONB**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

Representing FBRA as already detailed

Environment Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 17:37:15

Name/Organisation

FBRA

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Environment policy you are commenting on

EV10 - Preserving Settlement Identity

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

EV10 – Preserving Settlement Identity: This suggested movement of the settlement boundary ignores the neighbourhood community led planning that exists within Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan . The allocation of sites has been changed without consultation and does not serve local community needs. The original settlement boundary for Freshwater should be re-established and hardened, to remove the constant threat to Grade 2 agricultural land (Camp Road, Freshwater), in accordance with the Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan. The Settlement Coalescence Study highlights the gradual erosion of gaps across Freshwater. Specifically, the Settlement Coalescence Study recommends the following:

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

No

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

- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

Retain open views from roads to wider rural gaps: there is negligible separation between settlement areas along connecting roads, but roadside gaps in development, permitting views across the wider gaps that exist away from the roads, make an important contribution to retention of distinctions between different settlement areas.

- **Avoid large-scale buildings: Any new buildings visible from more than one settlement area would diminish the sense of separation between those areas.**
- **Moving the settlement boundary for Freshwater is a significant proposed change which needs socialisation with communities and Parish Councils alike, and if agreed to by the community - approval from proper authority.**

The inherent charm of Freshwater and Totland's green spaces and biodiversity are vitally important to the rural attraction and consequential economic benefits of tourism ie visitors come to this area for its beauty and not its housing developments.

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

Already commented on.

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

Already commented on

Appendices 1-6 - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 19:29:04

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. Which appendix are you commenting on

Appendix 2 – List of Allocated sites

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

It relates to this section in totality

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

The proposal to re-designate areas outside of the Freshwater boundary settlement simply provides more homes in an area without improving employment prospects, amenities or affordability. The IPS makes no proposals to improve transport links nor basic infrastructure. This will simply attract more of an ageing population, thus perpetuating an already unbalanced and ultimately untenable position.

- **The IPS rightly identifies an ageing population but makes little attempt to promote strategies which might rebalance the population. Retaining younger Islanders and attracting skilled incomers with good employment opportunities would seem to be the way forward. This also means providing for younger members of the community with schools, and sporting and leisure facilities. There are no firm proposals on these matters. The IPS appears to be more inclined to promote a strategy of managed decline.**
- **Freshwater is a rural village, with exceptional challenges some of which are caused due to our proximity to the coast, and flooding of the Western Yar, regularly returning us to “Freshwater Isle”.**
- **West Wight has been allocated a disproportionate number of houses in relation to our available brown field capacity, social, medical and utility infrastructure. The accommodation of these numbers has been facilitated by the SHLAA process allocating large sites outside our existing settlement boundary.**
- **By re-designating greenfield land as “urban development land” by way of a quietly introduced hardened settlement boundary. This re-designation seeks to subvert many of the protections given to them by their current designation as “Greenfield Sites” of maybe varying, but significant agricultural and ecological value.**
- **The revised settlement boundary, and the SHLAA process itself perhaps, has not been subject to public consultation, and due process. It therefore cannot be referred to within DIPS as the ‘revised settlement boundary’ and should be changed to ‘proposed’. Scrutiny of this point has been widely misunderstood and overlooked by the communities and local public bodies that you are consulting.**
- **The settlement boundary revisions have not been consulted on and do not factor other options, including ‘Exceptional Circumstances (see NPPF Section 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes: Paragraph 61)’, National Park status and other options which would lead to a lower, more realistic and achievable target for housing growth.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

to report back accurately to the residents group we are representing who may be unable to attend

Appendices 1-6 - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 22:58:12

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION - FBRA

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. Which appendix are you commenting on

Appendix 2 – List of Allocated sites

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

HA005

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

Camp Road development should not be included in IPS

1. Camp Road has a huge frequent flooding problem. We are dealing with an historical water system that can't cope with the mass of sewage and storm water and the result is frequent sewage spills into the Yar. We need to solve this sewage pollution before any new development. This will all take years. A ditch located along the boundary of the site flows northwards before entering a drainage pipe beneath the road adjacent to the Camp Road field gate which ultimately discharges into the Western Yar watercourse. Natural springs run from the Downs under this field & feed into the Marshes (SSSI) to the Causeway/The Yar both being Internationally protected RAMSAR Sites. Development will cause input of Phosphorus and Nitrates into the natural water courses leading to eutrophication. EV9 states Development proposals will be required to: a ensure new development avoids both direct and indirect adverse effects or cumulative impacts upon the integrity of landscapes and seascapes; The underlying clay does not allow for soak away. A further 100 houses would put unsustainable pressure on a very fragile system. The proposed development is the last green field remaining between Tennyson Down and Afton marshes. Planning on this field will destroy a massive vital green wildlife corridor between the two areas, areas that are AONB, important conservation areas and SSSI. The FNP says that developments should "not increase the likelihood of surface water flooding within the village or exacerbate foul drainage capacity problems. Flooding is likely to worsen because climate change is expected to bring more intense rainfall events, and the proposed site would prevent natural soakaway. There has been no site-based survey work during the rainy period upon which the development could be based with complex underlying geology.

2. Harm to Important Heritage Assets Trails & Historical Buildings of Interest Heritage Assets will be compromised - irreversibly and forever. A full archaeological survey hasn't been carried out just a desk based evaluation. A report states there is potential for unknown heritage assets relating to the Bronze, Iron and Roman age, as well as Medieval. Harm to Important Heritage Assets Trails & Historical Buildings of Interest- This proposed development in contravention to the council's EV1: Conserving and enhancing our historic environment Strategic where the council states it will support proposals that positively conserve and enhance the significance and special character of the Island's historic environment and heritage assets. This proposed development would create substantial harm to this area's most important heritage asset and its setting, both visually, economically and environmentally. It severely risks the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of one of the most important island heritage assets known as "The Tennyson Mile". Consideration must be given to the fact that this development will materially detract from the asset's significance, it will also damage its economic viability now, and in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. The public value of the heritage assets is the contribution that they can make to understanding and interpreting our past. The history of this area is an important economic lifeline for islanders and councils alike. For centuries the "Tennyson Mile" area has been an area of inspiration for scientists and explorers, writers, artists, photographers and nature lovers, and it still inspires today drawing many film crews to the area. This proposed development is on a field that is higher than the houses on all the surrounding roads - a development on top will tower above and become a blot on the landscape - highly visible from tourist coach routes on Bedbury Lane and walking routes on Tennyson Down. The Island is dependent on its tourism. This area was the draw of explorers and scientists. The Farringford Historic House and Gardens, grade 1 listed is opposite the proposed site. Any development will create substantial harm to this most important heritage asset. This is contrary to Policy FN6 "The design, location, and layout of all developments should (c) protect, and take every available opportunity to enhance landscape and biodiversity"

This is a farm field that is used by several rare and protected species e.g., newts, slow worms, toads, birds including numerous species of raptor and corvid, and mammals such as foxes, badgers, voles, shrews and dormice. Any building on the field will be ecologically detrimental.

3. Ecology - The latest report from Woodside Tree consultancy has had whole paragraphs blacked out from

their conclusions – obscuring what wildlife is indeed present. It shows that this is a document, paid for by developer and is not impartial.

4. The Council must not ignore the FNP plan it was paid for and requested by the local people of Freshwater. Policy FNP6. Not increase the likelihood of surface water flooding within the village or exacerbate drainage capacity problems. FNP 9 "To ensure the sustainability of the farming sector, including eco-tourism and the promotion of local produce. Other Breaches of Policy FNP6 which demand that all new developments:(a) Be compatible with the distinctive character of the area, respecting the local settlement pattern, building styles, and materials, with reference to the FVDS(b) Conserve and enhance all heritage assets, taking account of their significance(c) Protect and take every available opportunity to enhance landscape and biodiversity, including through the incorporation of landscaping appropriate to the site's context and character(d) Conserve and, where possible, enhance the views referred to in the "Most Valued Views" document. The proposed development is expected to exacerbate congestion, pose unacceptable highway safety impacts, and undermine pedestrian safety. It fails to align with Policy DM17 of the LDP, which mandates sustainable travel and adequate road network capacity. The project threatens valued landscapes, biodiversity, and agricultural land, failing to comply with NPPF requirements and LPP DM12 for landscape and biodiversity conservation. The development's proximity to designated landscapes and its potential to harm the tranquility and night sky aspirations of the NDP are particularly concerning. Biodiversity Risks and Habitat Regulations: The development poses risks to the Freshwater Marshes SSSI. This neglect could lead to unlawful additional discharges and contamination, highlighting a failure to comply with Regulation 70(3) of the Habitats Regulations and the principles outlined in the NPPF: The development threatens to merge distinct communities, eroding the rural character and resulting in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, contrary to the economic, cultural, and natural value placed on such lands by the NPPF. Heritage and Social Impacts: Inadequate consideration of the development's impact on local heritage settings and the pressure on medical, educational, and recreational facilities highlights a disregard for the NPPF's protection of heritage assets and the need for contributions to community facilities as outlined in LPP DM22. Infrastructure-There is a lack of infrastructure to support the scale and size of development, in terms of employment, local services and sewage system. There needs to be investment in sustainable employment first. There is limited NHS with no NHS Dentistry provision in the area.

5. FNP 6 states that housing stock should meet local requirements. The development proposal is not based on local needs but an extrapolation of regional numbers based on targets. We need affordable housing for younger people earning an Island salary. If the houses are not affordable to local people, they will inevitably be sold to people seeking a second or retirement home. Freshwater is the 8th oldest village in England with 40% over the age of 65.

6. The access road to this site is extremely narrow and the junction between Camp Road / Victoria Road and Stroud Road has been identified by Island Roads as an accident black spot. All roads are country lanes and have pinch points at frequent intervals. Cycle routes and pedestrian access with limited pavements for safe passage is also already an issue on both Camp Road and Victoria Road with inadequate visibility and would therefore be contrary to Policies DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) and DM17 (Sustainable Travel) of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy. Policy FNP 7 (Transport) of the FNP states "The design, location, and layout of all developments should"... "provide safer routes to school." There is no post-primary school provision in the West Wight, and the proposed development will cause a sharp increase in traffic.

7. The Camp Road plot is a DEFRA Grade 2 listed site and therefore of high agriculture value. It has recently been used for growing crops. EV8 states: Protecting high grade agricultural land FNP 9 "To ensure the sustainability of the farming sector, including eco-tourism and the promotion of local produce. In the Economy section of the DIPS it states: E4: Supporting the rural economy To ensure a strong rural economy the council will support economic uses in the rural area where proposals are for: a farm growth, particularly in the food production sector; To ensure a strong rural economy the council will support economic uses for rural areas where proposals are for: A farm growth, particularly in the food production sector. Camp Road field is in crop at the moment!

8. We urge the council to ask for Exceptional circumstances for the right type of housing the locals actually need and in the right places.

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

yes, Camp Road Development should NOT appear on this map

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To represent our community who hold very strong view against this development and report back to them the findings of this objection and the results following this consultation.

Appendices 1-6 - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 19:29:04

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. Which appendix are you commenting on

Appendix 2 – List of Allocated sites

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

It relates to this section in totality

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

The proposal to re-designate areas outside of the Freshwater boundary settlement simply provides more homes in an area without improving employment prospects, amenities or affordability. The IPS makes no proposals to improve transport links nor basic infrastructure. This will simply attract more of an ageing population, thus perpetuating an already unbalanced and ultimately untenable position.

- **The IPS rightly identifies an ageing population but makes little attempt to promote strategies which might rebalance the population. Retaining younger Islanders and attracting skilled incomers with good employment opportunities would seem to be the way forward. This also means providing for younger members of the community with schools, and sporting and leisure facilities. There are no firm proposals on these matters. The IPS appears to be more inclined to promote a strategy of managed decline.**
- **Freshwater is a rural village, with exceptional challenges some of which are caused due to our proximity to the coast, and flooding of the Western Yar, regularly returning us to “Freshwater Isle”.**
- **West Wight has been allocated a disproportionate number of houses in relation to our available brown field capacity, social, medical and utility infrastructure. The accommodation of these numbers has been facilitated by the SHLAA process allocating large sites outside our existing settlement boundary.**
- **By re-designating greenfield land as “urban development land” by way of a quietly introduced hardened settlement boundary. This re-designation seeks to subvert many of the protections given to them by their current designation as “Greenfield Sites” of maybe varying, but significant agricultural and ecological value.**
- **The revised settlement boundary, and the SHLAA process itself perhaps, has not been subject to public consultation, and due process. It therefore cannot be referred to within DIPS as the ‘revised settlement boundary’ and should be changed to ‘proposed’. Scrutiny of this point has been widely misunderstood and overlooked by the communities and local public bodies that you are consulting.**
- **The settlement boundary revisions have not been consulted on and do not factor other options, including ‘Exceptional Circumstances (see NPPF Section 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes: Paragraph 61)’, National Park status and other options which would lead to a lower, more realistic and achievable target for housing growth.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

to report back accurately to the residents group we are representing who may be unable to attend

Economy Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 19:16:45

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Economy policy you are commenting on

General Comments for Economy

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

na

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

- **There is very little in the IPS that seeks to promote investment which might provide local employment, dealing with the West Wight where the local economy is not even mentioned, or to provide the infrastructure to support remote working, either for existing residents or for incomers of working age.**
- **Transport / roads / infrastructure is often needed for people to get to their site of employment (if not a remote worker). IPS mention in section 6.7 as a 'multi user route between the West Wight and Newport' providing equestrian, cycling and walking facilities between Yarmouth (not in the Freshwater settlement) to Newport is not sufficient, and increasing the rural West Wight settlement will increase the carbon footprint of the Island by increasing the number of road users, in particular cars.**
- **Grade 2 agricultural land is rare on the Island, as stated in IPS 4.75 'The highest grades of agricultural land are a scarce resource on the island with most land classed as grade 3....an important contributor to the Island's economy and food security'.**
- **Implementation of IPS without removing the proposed greenfield sites will impact these treasured global environmental awards, directly affecting our vital tourism economy through the negative cultural and visual impact on the landscape, one of the main attractions for those who visit the Island.**
- **"Freshwater is a rich and highly diverse rural area, offering considerable potential for growth with regards to landscape and eco-tourism.**
- **The local West Wight environment , flora and fauna must be protected as it is this rural tranquillity that residents and visitors appreciate [...] Conserve and, where possible, enhance the views referred to in the evidence document "Most Valued Views".**
- **Any development within these areas must ensure that key features of these views can continue to be enjoyed' Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2027).**
- **The Council must consider the implications of urbanising a treasured rural landscape and the impacts this will have on the tourism economy as these are intrinsically linked. Large scale developments will have the greatest of impacts and the greatest risk of negative impacts on both the landscape, biodiversity and tourism. Sensitive and small developments should be prioritised on brownfield sites, that are in need of improvement, and have the least risk of detrimental impacts.**
- **Once green fields have been destroyed along with the wildlife / views etc they can never be reversed.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To report back to the community the outcome and represent the Association for those who are unable to attend

Environment Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 17:55:32

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Environment policy you are commenting on

EV4 - Water Quality Impact on Solent Marine Sites (Nitrates)

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

the whole section

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

No

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

- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

- **The plans are contrary to maintaining our UNESCO Biosphere status, and the significance of the landscape in the West Wight is emphasised by the fact that 60% of the area is within an AONB (now known as Isle of Wight National Landscape) and 80% of the coastline is Heritage Coast.**
- **How will developments in DIPS, such as sites in Freshwater that are within risk zones of INTERNATIONALLY PROTECTED RAMSAR and SSSI sites and the SAC at Afton Marshes, impact on these precious habitats? The NPPF states that “development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted”....**
- **The Island gained UNESCO Biosphere status in 2019: "The intimate mix of landscape types, from small hedge-lined fields to wide farmable vistas, is a testament to how the combined forces of nature and man have influenced the Island over time. Here, the development pressures experienced on the south-east of England have had less influence on the Island's natural and cultural heritage."**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

Previously explained.

Housing Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 19:10:48

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Housing policy you are commenting on

H2 - Sites Allocated for Housing

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

IPS 2.5, IPS 2.52 and general comments on these and other paragraphs

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

West Wight has been allocated a disproportionate number of houses on greenfield sites

- **Freshwater is a rural village, with exceptional challenges some of which are caused due to our proximity to the coast, and flooding of the Western Yar, regularly returning us to “Freshwater Isle”.**
- **IPS 2.5 states ‘Over 60 per cent of the Island’s residents live in Newport, Cowes, East Cowes, Ryde, Sandown and Shanklin. Freshwater, Totland and Yarmouth are the main settlements to the west of the Island and Ventnor is the largest town on the south coast. Outside of these main settlements there are around 30 villages and hamlets’ Freshwater and Totland are rural villages, not main settlements.**
- **IPS 2.52 states ‘The location of the major settlements – with Cowes to the north; Ryde to the north-east; Sandown, Shanklin and Ventnor to the south-east; and Freshwater to the west’ now refers to Freshwater as major settlement. Again, it’s a rural village not a major settlement’**
- **Freshwater is also referred to as a ‘secondary settlement’ IPS Growth section 6: G2 : ‘Priority locations for housing development and growth. Secondary settlements: Bembridge, The West Wight (Freshwater and Totland), Wootton, and Ventnor.’ Again, it’s a rural village not a secondary settlement.**
- **The revised settlement boundary, and the SHLAA process itself perhaps, has not been subject to public consultation, and due process. It therefore cannot be referred to within DIPS as the ‘revised settlement boundary’ and should be changed to ‘proposed’ and follow proper consultation to revise the existing Freshwater Neighbourhood Plan. The residents of Freshwater and Totland are strongly opposed to the idea of having the boundaries changed.**
- **One of the ‘allocated sites’ is grade 2 agricultural land which is valued and scarce on the Island.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

to represent our community and support their wishes and report back to them with a clear idea of the outcome

Housing Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 19:05:16

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (FBRA)

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Housing policy you are commenting on

General Comments for Housing

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

The last section

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **not effective**
- **not justified**
- **not positively prepared**

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

Continued pursuit of nationally imposed housing numbers will perpetuate the decline of our young population and accelerate our ageing population. The Island is already 44% older than the UK average, and Freshwater is more than double.

- **Social / affordable housing should be the top priority for IoW Council and yet the track record for delivery is shamefully low**
- **The Island's needs affordable housing (to rent and/or to own) enticing the essential workers we need to move, or move back to, the Island - a key priority**
- **The Island's unique situation lends itself to 'Exceptional Circumstances', NPPF P61 ('unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals') and we ask that the LPA re-examines the approach adopted in calculating the annual housing target in order to arrive at a more realistic figure which takes the above factors into account.**
- **The proposed allocation of circa 450 houses per year (for 15 years), or indeed the governments recent target changes (to over 1100 per year) are not based on the Objectively Assessed Housing Need, but on a more Island realistic housing requirement, but we consider this figure to be an overestimate for the following reasons:**
 - **The housing targets do not reflect local need which is based on a declining population. Instead, they are based on external demand which is a result of internal migration. There is no evidence to support the need to provide for internal migration by sacrificing green fields.**
 - **The Isle of Wight has grown in population by 30% in the last 50 years whilst the UK population has grown by only 20% i.e. the Island is growing twice as fast and needs 'Exceptional Circumstances' to stem this unsustainable growth which is not matched by economic growth.**
 - **House prices on the IoW are below the average for the south-east, making the Island an attractive destination for incomers from the mainland.**
 - **IoW housing completion rate over the last ten years is closer to 350 per year, which is more representative of the long-term need.**
 - **Vacant homes are double the national average (Housing Needs Assessment 2018).**
 - **West Wight has been allocated a disproportionate number of houses in relation to our available brown field capacity, social, medical and utility infrastructure. The accommodation of these numbers has been facilitated by the SHLAA process allocating large sites outside our existing settlement boundary.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To represent our community and explain decisions as previously noted on all sections of comments each time.

IPS visions and objectives - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 18:12:32

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What IPS vision and objectives policy are you commenting on

Section 1 Introduction

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

- **IPS (2.9)**

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

IPS2.9 states that: “There are some fundamental issues the Island Planning Strategy (IPS) has to address and these include protecting our precious environment and landscape”. West Wight housing targets, lack of infrastructure, sacrifice of green fields and grade 2 agricultural land, lack of consultation on proposed settlement boundary changes, lack of provision for social and affordable housing does not address these needs

- **The proposal to re-designate areas on the periphery of the Freshwater settlement appears incorrect. It’s simply providing more homes in an area without improving employment prospects, amenities or affordability. The IPS makes no proposals to improve transport links nor basic infrastructure. This cannot be the way forward to achieve a sustainable community. This will simply attract more of an ageing population, thus perpetuating an already unbalanced and ultimately untenable position.**
- **The IPS rightly identifies an ageing population but makes little attempt to promote strategies which might rebalance the population. Retaining younger Islanders and attracting skilled incomers with good employment opportunities would seem to be the way forward. This also means providing for younger members of the community with schools, and sporting and leisure facilities. There are no firm proposals on these matters. The IPS appears to be more inclined to promote a strategy of managed decline.**
- **West Wight has been allocated a disproportionate number of houses in relation to our available brown field capacity, social, medical and utility infrastructure. The accommodation of these numbers has been facilitated by the SHLAA process allocating large sites outside our existing settlement boundary.**
- **By re-designating greenfield land as “urban development land” by way of a quietly introduced hardened settlement boundary. This re-designation seeks to subvert many of the protections given to them by their current designation as “Greenfield Sites” of maybe varying, but significant agricultural and ecological value.**

The revised settlement boundary, and the SHLAA process itself perhaps, has not been subject to public consultation, and due process. It therefore cannot be referred to within DIPS as the ‘revised settlement boundary’ and should be changed to ‘proposed’. Scrutiny of this point has been widely misunderstood and overlooked by the communities and local public bodies that you are consulting.

- **The settlement boundary revisions are born of a false premise on numbers of houses that need to be delivered and not factoring in other options, including ‘Exceptional Circumstances (see NPPF Section 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes: Paragraph 61)’, National Park status and other options which would lead to a lower, more realistic and achievable target for housing growth.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To represent the community of Freshwater - see previous comments

IPS visions and objectives - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 18:19:58

Name/Organisation

FBRA - FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What IPS vision and objectives policy are you commenting on

Section 2 The Isle of Wight and the issues we face

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

The whole section

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

- **IPS (2.9) states that: “There are some fundamental issues the Island Planning Strategy (IPS) has to address and these include protecting our precious environment and landscape”.**
- **West Wight housing targets, lack of infrastructure, sacrifice of green fields and grade 2 agricultural land, lack of consultation on proposed settlement boundary changes, lack of provision for social and affordable housing does not address these needs**
- **The proposal to re-designate areas on the periphery of the Freshwater settlement appears wrong. It’s simply providing more homes in an area without improving employment prospects, amenities or affordability. The IPS makes no proposals to improve transport links nor basic infrastructure. This cannot be the way forward to achieve a sustainable community. This will simply attract more of an ageing population, thus perpetuating an already unbalanced and ultimately untenable position.**
- **The IPS rightly identifies an ageing population but makes little attempt to promote strategies which might rebalance the population. Retaining younger Islanders and attracting skilled incomers with good employment opportunities would seem to be the way forward. This also means providing for younger members of the community with schools, and sporting and leisure facilities. There are no firm proposals on these matters.**
- **IPS 2.5 Over 60 per cent of the Island’s residents live in Newport, Cowes, East Cowes, Ryde, Sandown and Shanklin. Freshwater, Totland and Yarmouth are the main settlements to the west of the Island and Ventnor is the largest town on the south coast. Outside of these main settlements there are around 30 villages and hamlets’ Freshwater is a rural village, not a main settlement.**
- **‘IPS 2.52 The location of the major settlements – with Cowes to the north; Ryde to the north-east; Sandown, Shanklin and Ventnor to the south-east; and Freshwater to the west’ now refers to Freshwater as major settlement. Again, it’s a rural village not a major settlement.**
- **Freshwater is also referred to as a ‘secondary settlement’ IPS Growth section 6: G2 : ‘Priority locations for housing development and growth. Secondary settlements: Bembridge, The West Wight (Freshwater and Totland), Wootton, and Ventnor.’ Again, it’s a rural village not a secondary settlement.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

To represent FBRA as already detailed in every single one of these forms !

IPS visions and objectives - Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 17:19:11

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What IPS vision and objectives policy are you commenting on

Section 1 Introduction

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

IPS 2.9

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

No

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

- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

It needs Radical Revision - it does not recognise "exceptional circumstances" of the Island. Also the comment form (this one) is far too complicated for normal residents to understand and complete, Majority do not have legal training or degrees to understand this - links to the consultation were missing, very little time has been allowed for the general public to access the correct updated form and complete this the form was not available to complete. No proper consultation. The form was not available on the consultation website.

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

Yes, The Boundries have been adjusted without prior public consultation and now includes greenfield areas as development sites. The Local Residents do not agree to these changes, in fact are very strongly opposed to them. Freshwater and Totland has been included as a primary settlement, yet it is just a rural village and not a main town. Sites have been already allocated as sites for development however planning permission has not been granted - and should not be. See further comments in form

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

In order to provide a full update to our members (FBRA) and to represent a substantial residents group and fully understand any rulings positive or negative and to answer any questions - should there be any.

Transport Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 19:35:47

Name/Organisation

FRESHWATER BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Resident Group

2. What Transport policy are you commenting on

T1 - Supporting Sustainable Transport

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

The whole - including section 6.7

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

No

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

- **No, Failure to comply to Duty to Cooperate**
- **No - not legally compliant**

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

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **Not consistent with national policy**
- **Not effective**
- **Not justified**
- **Not positively prepared**

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

- **The proposal to re-designate areas on the periphery of the Freshwater settlement appears totally wrong. It's simply providing more homes in an area without improving employment prospects, amenities, infrastructure, travel facilities or affordability.**
- **The IPS makes no proposals to improve transport links nor basic infrastructure, making no provision to a more sustainable transport solution. This coupled with the lack of work in West Wight, will simply attract more of an ageing population, thus perpetuating an already unbalanced and ultimately untenable position.**
- **There is very little in the IPS that seeks to promote investment which might provide local employment, where the local economy is not even mentioned, or to provide the infrastructure to support remote working, either for existing residents or for incomers of 'working age'.**
- **Transport is only mentioned in section 6.7 as a 'multi user route between the West Wight and Newport' providing equestrian, cycling and walking facilities between Yarmouth (not in the Freshwater settlement) to Newport.**
- **West Wight is not an employment hub on the Island - its reliant its tourism. By increasing the residential footprint in the West Wight, you are increasing traffic to Newport, a busy stretch of road, which opposes Carbon emission reduction targets by increasing the need for vehicles on the road.**

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

no

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

Yes

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

As representatives of a resident group to fully report back to those who are unable to attend.