

# TOTLAND PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Full Council** meeting of **TOTLAND PARISH COUNCIL** held on **Monday 9th February 2026** at **6:00 PM**, at Totland Village Hall, The Broadway, Totland.

---

Those present :

Chairman : Cllr G Wyre

Vice-Chairman : Mrs J Cave

Councillors : Cllr S Blamire, Cllr V Fennell, Cllr C Jarman, Cllr C Johnson, Cllr C M Pipe, Cllr E Smith

Officers : Mrs H Gibbs

\* Attended remotely

## **177/25 PUBLIC FORUM**

*There will be up to 15 minutes available for members of the public to speak, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, copies of which are available at meetings or on the website.*

*At the Chairman's discretion, members of the public may be invited to speak on specific items during the meeting, but this is not a given.*

*Please note that Parish Council meetings are not public meetings, however, members of the public have a statutory right to attend meetings of the council as observers only. Public have no legal right to speak unless the Parish Council Chairman authorises them to do so.*

*Neither Councillors or the Clerk are under pressure to respond immediately to comments made during the public participation other than those which relate to items on the Agenda. Members of the public do not have a right to force items onto the Council Agenda.*

*One member of public in attendance from a neighbouring Parish Council and attended as he wanted to hear the Parish Council views on the West Wight Heritage Centre.*

## **178/25 APOLOGIES**

*To receive and accept apologies for non-attendance.*

*Councillor Jan Cave - apologies were accepted.*

## **179/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

*Councillors are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest which they may have in an item of business on the agenda no later than when the item is reached.*

*Unless dispensation has been granted, you may not participate in any discussion of, or vote on any matter in which you have a pecuniary interest.*

*You must withdraw from the room when the meeting discusses and votes on the matter.*

*None.*

## 180/25 MINUTES AND UPDATES

*To receive for approval minutes of the Parish Council meeting (s) as below:*

Full Council Monday 12th January 2026 - **RESOLVED**.

The minutes were accepted and approved as a true record of the meeting and the Chairman signed the minutes. Proposed Councillor Fennell, seconded Councillor Jarman all agreed.

Updates from the January meeting:

The dead tree on Colwell Common has been removed and Councillor Blamire is sourcing a replacement along with others that need replacing.

The Christmas tree has been planted on Colwell Common and has been supported.

Email addresses: Updates - Councillors' Jarman, Wyre, Smith, Pipe are now using the gov.uk email addresses with Councillors; Blamire, Fennell, Cave, Johnson still to be set up.

The Precept request has been forwarded to the Isle of Wight Council confirming 0% increase.

## 181/25 FINANCE AND GRANTS

*a. To approve payments to 9th February 2026*

**APPROVED** and **RESOLVED** to make payments by banks transfer/cheque/direct debit/debit card as below:

Proposed Councillor Jarman, seconded Councillor Fennell all agreed.

£120.00	Mr A Moscoff - repairs to the Village Hall plaque
£200.31	Biffa Waste - Office and open space waste
£2186.44	Brightstone Landscaping - Maintenance
£58.38	Business Stream - Village hall utilities
£920.43	Clarke's Mechancial - Village hall, boiler pump replaced, Hive install, call outs.
£1075.20	Edge IT Systems - Finance & Admin software
£60.00	Ms H Fry & Ms P Glover - Village hall, curtains shortened
£24.00	High Glass - Office window cleaning
£729.00	ICS - Public toilet cleaning
£8.71	Lloyds Bank - Charges
£600.00	NDLE - Colwell Common Christmas tree installation and management
£170.40	PPL PRS Ltd - Village Hall music licence
£2617.06	Public Work Loan Board - repayment
£105.60	R & R Containers - container hire
£132.18	Ricoh UK - Photocopier rental and usage
£172.50	Mr R Nelson - Maintenance works
£80.00	West Wight Gardening Services - Village Hall strimming and clearing
£16.03	Wight Computer Ltd - Subscriptions
£45.00	Wight Computer Ltd - Email set up assistance
£168.00	Wight Computer Ltd - Web Hosting and SSL Certificate
£93.60	WightFibre - Office and Hall WiFi

*b. VAT reclaim for 1st April 2025 to 30th November 2025 has been submitted.*

The amount £6419.58 had been claimed and received 29th January 2026. **NOTED**.

*c. To consider a donation to the Planet Aware - Plastic Pollution on our Beaches Campaign.*

The Totland Parish Council logo would be added to the posters. Councillors agreed £100.00 towards this. Proposed Councillor Fennell, seconded Councillor Wyre, all agreed. **RESOLVED**.

d. To consider the purchase of tablets for Parish Council use only - cost £1200.00 for 8.

Some Councillors do not have up to date equipment and this has caused them a problem when trying to set up the new emails. This would be a one off cost and the tablets would remain Totland Parish Council property and used for Parish Council business only. Councillor agreed for the Clerk to purchase 4 Lenovo tablets at a cost of £129.00 each. These will be set up and given to Councillors. A loan document and IT Policy will be signed by the Councillors on receipt.

Proposed Councillor Wyre, seconded Councillor Pipe all agreed. **RESOLVED.**

**182/25**

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS, DECISIONS, APPEALS & TREE WORKS**

a. To consider Planning Applications

[Variation of condition 2 on 25/00203/HOU to allow for a revised design](#)

Former Country Garden Hotel Church Hill Totland Bay Isle Of Wight PO39 0ET

Ref. No: 26/00122/RVC | Received: Thu 29 Jan 2026 | Validated: Thu 29 Jan 2026 | Status: Registered  
No Comment

[Hybrid Application; Full planning permission for partial demolition of existing school buildings; proposed 4 affordable dwellings; alterations, extension and conversion of school building to form a dwelling; associated access and landscaping works; Outline application for construction of 11 custom build dwellings with associated landscaping](#)

Weston Academy Primary School Weston Road Totland Isle Of Wight PO39 0HA

Ref. No: 25/01846/FUL | Received: Tue 23 Dec 2025 | Validated: Thu 15 Jan 2026 | Status: Registered

Comments:

### **Introduction**

This representation does not object to the principle of redevelopment of the former Weston Academy Primary School site. The redevelopment of previously developed land within the settlement is accepted in principle, and a sensitively designed scheme could represent a positive opportunity to regenerate the site, secure new housing and better reveal the site's historic assets. All comments within this response were made at the meetings held.

However, the proposal submitted fails to achieve this. The scale, layout and structure of the scheme reflect an over-intensive approach that prioritises development quantum over contextual response, design quality and long-term functionality. The result is a proposal that gives rise to avoidable harm to heritage assets, the character and appearance of the Totland Conservation Area, highway safety and functionality, residential amenity and the quality of the public realm.

Importantly, many of the impacts identified are not inherent to the site itself, but arise from the particular form, density and layout of development proposed. A different approach — one that retained and celebrated the historic school building, reduced overall intensity and established a clearer, street-facing layout — would be capable of delivering development without the level of harm identified.

It is therefore the quality, scale and design of the scheme, rather than the principle of redevelopment, that is objected to.

### **1. Overdevelopment of the Site (Cumulative Harm)**

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, density and intensity, represents an overdevelopment of the site that exceeds its physical, functional and contextual capacity.

This overdevelopment is not evidenced by density figures alone, but by the consequences that flow directly from the quantum proposed, including:

- sub-standard parking dimensions that do not meet minimum adopted standards;
- the inability to accommodate refuse vehicles safely within the site;
- reliance on reversing manoeuvres on a steep gradient;
- back-to-front dwelling orientations that turn away from the public realm;
- erosion of spatial qualities within the conservation area; and
- the loss of the principal historic building on the site.

Each of these impacts arises because the scheme seeks to accommodate a level of development that the site cannot reasonably support. While some impacts may appear modest in isolation, when assessed cumulatively they result in a congested, compromised and poorly functioning form of

development that fails to operate effectively as a safe, coherent and high-quality place.

The proposal therefore fails to respond positively to its context and conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on high-quality, well-designed places and Local Plan policies requiring development to be of an appropriate scale and intensity.

## **2. Harm to a Non-Designated Heritage Asset and the Conservation Area (with Internal Contradictions)**

The proposal would result in the demolition of the historic school building constructed in 1880 as a National School for poor persons, with associated residence for a schoolmaster or schoolmistress, together with its 1898 extension providing a cooking classroom, infants' room and undercroft. These elements collectively comprise the principal historic fabric of the site and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Totland Conservation Area.

The school and attached mistress's cottage were conceived, designed and historically used as a single functional and architectural entity, representing an important phase in the social and educational development of Totland. The historic plans and drawings held by the Parish clearly demonstrate the original form, layout and architectural intent of the building, evidencing its heritage significance and the extent to which it was purposefully designed as a civic and communal structure.

While the site also contains later post-war single-storey classroom additions, these elements are of no architectural or historic significance and do not contribute positively to the conservation area. Their careful demolition would present an opportunity to reveal and reinstate the prominence of the historic school building within the street scene, enhancing the legibility of the site's historic development and its contribution to the conservation area.

The proposal fails to pursue this opportunity. Instead, it seeks the wholesale loss of the principal historic school building, while retaining only the ancillary mistress's cottage. This approach would sever the historic and functional relationship between the elements, resulting in a diminished and misleading understanding of the site's original purpose and evolution. Retaining an ancillary building while demolishing the principal historic structure causes greater heritage harm, not less, through the loss of legibility, group value and communal significance.

This harm is compounded by internal contradictions within the applicant's own submissions. The planning documents rely on the retention of historic elements to justify redevelopment and assert that the proposal responds positively to the conservation area. However, the Design Code expressly limits its scope to the new housing and excludes the heritage conversion element, thereby removing the most historically significant building on the site from meaningful design control. At the same time, the school itself is downplayed within the heritage narrative, despite being the principal historic component of the site.

As a result, the application simultaneously:

- Relies on heritage to justify redevelopment,
- Excludes the historic school from the Design Code, and
- Proposes its demolition as a matter of convenience rather than necessity.

This inconsistency undermines the credibility of the heritage case advanced.

Given the availability of original plans and drawings, the historic school building is demonstrably capable of being sensitively restored and repurposed in accordance with its original conception, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework's objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. A scheme that removed later unsympathetic additions and re-sited new development to respect and reveal the historic school would be capable of preserving, and potentially enhancing, the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposal does not demonstrate that the loss of the historic school building is necessary or unavoidable, nor that reasonable alternatives have been fully explored. The identified heritage harm has therefore not been minimised, and no clear or convincing public benefits have been identified that would outweigh that harm.

The proposal is consequently contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly its requirements to conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings, and to relevant Local Plan policies. It also fails to satisfy the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Totland Conservation Area.

## **3. Highways, Parking, Junction Safety and Real-World Functionality**

The Local Highway Authority has raised an objection to the proposal under DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) in relation to parking provision, refuse vehicle turning and drainage. These concerns are supported. However, the submitted highways assessment and the applicant's response fail to fully capture the real-world impacts of the proposal on the immediate street environment and adjacent junction.

### **Junction Safety and Pedestrian Environment**

The site lies immediately adjacent to a constrained three-arm junction serving multiple roads, with no formal pedestrian footways or crossing facilities. This junction already operates as an informal shared space, with pedestrians, vehicles and parked cars competing for limited carriageway width and visibility.

While the submitted highways information focuses on vehicular capacity and manoeuvring, it does not adequately assess how additional vehicle movements, servicing activity and parking displacement would interact with this junction in practice. Increased turning movements, reversing activity associated with servicing, and on-street parking pressure would exacerbate existing conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, reducing safety and convenience for all users.

National policy requires developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users, not simply to demonstrate that junction capacity is technically acceptable. In this case, the lack of pedestrian infrastructure means that even modest increases in traffic and parking pressure have a disproportionate impact on safety and legibility, particularly for children, older residents and those with mobility impairments.

### **Loss of Existing Parking Capacity**

The proposal would result in the loss of approximately 5–6 existing on-street parking spaces located along the frontage of the site. While these spaces may not be formally marked, they function as established and relied-upon parking provision.

Importantly, the dwellings opposite the site have no off-street parking and depend on this frontage parking for day-to-day use. The applicant's assessment underplays the significance of this loss, and it is not explicitly accounted for in the Highway Authority's response.

In reality, the frontage parking is already at capacity, with spaces fully occupied during evening and overnight periods. The surrounding streets are also close to saturation, leaving little or no spare capacity to absorb displaced parking.

The removal of this parking would therefore lead to:

- displacement into already congested surrounding streets,
- increased circulation and searching for spaces,
- additional informal parking close to the junction,
- further obstruction of pedestrian movement and sightlines.

These impacts are cumulative, predictable and unavoidable.

### **Cumulative Parking and Network Impact**

Although the proposal may meet numerical parking standards within the site boundary, this does not reflect the net parking position when the loss of existing spaces and reliance by neighbouring properties are taken into account. Planning decisions must consider actual conditions on the ground, not simply compliance with minimum standards in isolation.

The combined effect of sub-standard on-site parking dimensions, the loss of established frontage parking, the inability of surrounding streets to absorb displacement, servicing and refuse collection constraints, and a constrained, footway-less junction environment demonstrates that the proposal would materially worsen parking stress and safety conditions in the immediate area.

### **Planning Conclusion**

These impacts are not minor or theoretical. They arise directly from the scale and intensity of the development proposed and illustrate that the local highway network and street environment cannot safely or conveniently accommodate the scheme.

The proposal therefore fails to provide safe and suitable access for all users, would exacerbate parking stress and pedestrian conflict at a sensitive junction, and relies on an overly technical assessment that does not reflect how the area functions in practice. It is consequently contrary to

the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policies relating to highway safety, inclusive movement and high-quality design.

#### **4. Poor Layout, Back-to-Front Development and Inadequate Amenity Space**

The proposed layout includes a row of dwellings adjacent to Weston Road whose principal elevations face inward toward the site, with rear elevations and private garden areas presented to the public street.

This back-to-front arrangement represents poor urban design and fails to establish an appropriate public-private interface. Rear gardens are not designed to function as public-facing frontages and, over time, inevitably accommodate domestic structures and paraphernalia such as sheds, play equipment, bins and informal boundary treatments. These outcomes are predictable and cannot be realistically controlled through planning conditions.

The result would be a visually cluttered and poorly defined street edge, undermining enclosure, legibility and natural surveillance. This harm is particularly acute within a conservation area, where the relationship between buildings and the public realm is fundamental to character and appearance.

In addition, the constrained site layout results in limited and poorly configured private amenity space for many dwellings. Several gardens are narrow, overshadowed, or compromised by their orientation and proximity to access routes and parking areas, limiting their usability for day-to-day outdoor activities. The quality of private outdoor space is therefore sacrificed in order to accommodate the scale and density of development proposed.

In particular, the constrained nature of outdoor space is inconsistent with the provision of family housing (the likely target of this the of development) and undermines the ability of residents to use outdoor areas safely and meaningfully.

The scheme also fails to provide any formal communal outdoor space to compensate for this shortfall. In developments of this scale and density, communal space plays an important role in supporting residential amenity, social interaction and the overall quality of place. Its absence places further pressure on already constrained private gardens and reinforces the perception of a cramped and over-intensive layout.

These deficiencies arise directly from the quantum of development proposed and cannot be resolved through minor layout adjustments or planning conditions without a fundamental reduction in scale. The proposal therefore fails to provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity and a high-quality living environment, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policies requiring development to create safe, attractive and well-designed places.

#### **5. Inappropriate Hybrid Application and Lack of Design Certainty**

The hybrid structure of the application, with a substantial proportion of the development proposed in outline as custom-build plots, defers critical matters of appearance, fenestration, detailing, boundary treatments and landscaping to later reserved matters applications.

In a conservation area and heritage-sensitive context, these matters are fundamental to the assessment of impact and acceptability and must be understood at the point of decision. The submitted Design Code does not provide sufficient certainty or binding control to guarantee a coherent outcome. Despite claims that there should be “no deviation”, the Code explicitly allows purchaser-led choices in prominent elevation components including brick types, cladding, roof materials, windows, doors and detailing, creating a “menu” approach rather than a fixed design framework.

This internal contradiction undermines the applicant’s assertion that high quality and cohesion will be secured. High quality design does not equate to superficial historic pastiche, and the Code’s reliance on decorative motifs rather than disciplined massing, proportions and fixed fenestration increases the risk of visual clutter and incoherence over time.

The proposal relies excessively on future conditions and reserved matters to resolve issues intrinsic to the scheme’s acceptability. Conditions cannot remedy fundamental problems of scale, layout and design certainty. As a result, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character of the area or deliver the quality of development required by national and local planning policy.

#### **6. Failure to Deliver Policy-Compliant Affordable Housing**

The proposed development fails to deliver the level of affordable housing required by the Isle of Wight Local Plan. The scheme provides four affordable housing units within a development of 15 dwellings, equating to approximately 26–27% affordable housing, which falls materially below the 35% policy requirement.

The application does not demonstrate, through a robust and transparent viability assessment, that the delivery of policy-compliant affordable housing would render the development unviable. Nor does it show that the shortfall arises from unavoidable site-specific constraints that could not be addressed through a reduced scale or alternative layout.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the Isle of Wight Local Plan affordable housing policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, which require development to meet identified housing needs and to deliver affordable housing in accordance with local policy unless robustly justified otherwise.

### **Conclusion**

When assessed as a whole, the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site that fails to respond positively to its physical constraints, historic significance and sensitive conservation area context. The cumulative impacts identified — including unjustified heritage harm, erosion of conservation area character, highway and parking deficiencies, poor layout and inadequate amenity provision, lack of design certainty, and failure to deliver policy-compliant affordable housing — demonstrate that the scheme exceeds the site's capacity to accommodate development of this scale and form.

These harms are not incidental or technical in nature. They arise directly from the chosen development strategy and cannot be adequately addressed through planning conditions or minor amendments. The proposal therefore fails to deliver the high-quality, well-designed and contextually responsive development required by national and local planning policy.

The objection should not be read as opposition to redevelopment of the site. Rather, it reflects the view that this particular scheme is a missed opportunity. A reduced-scale, heritage-led approach — removing later unsympathetic additions, retaining and restoring the historic school building, and establishing a layout that addresses the street and provides adequate amenity — would be capable of delivering development that preserves and potentially enhances the character of the area.

For the reasons set out above, the application is respectfully requested to be refused, with the encouragement that any future proposal adopts a more proportionate, coherent and heritage-responsive approach to the redevelopment of this important site.

### **[Lawful Development Certificate for proposed change of use of former HM Maritime Coastguard Rescue Service Station to a commercial art gallery; associated alterations to building; roof mounted solar panels; landscaping](#)**

Needles Station Lanes End Totland Bay Isle Of Wight PO39 0BE

Ref. No: 25/01836/CLPUD | Received: Mon 22 Dec 2025 | Validated: Mon 02 Feb 2026 | Status: Registered

Comments: Support

### **[Proposed replacement and alterations to roof; combination of four dormers to form one dormer; replacement windows and doors; cladding to all elevations; extension to porch canopy; detached summerhouse](#)**

Solent Vista Heatherwood Park Road Totland Isle Of Wight PO39 0EL

Ref. No: 25/01698/HOU | Received: Mon 24 Nov 2025 | Validated: Thu 15 Jan 2026 | Status: Registered

Comments: No objection

- b. To receive Planning Decisions - None
- c. To receive Tree Work Applications - None

d. To receive Tree Work Decisions - **NOTED**

### **[G1; Mixed evergreen species including cypress, yew, bay - Lift from ground level to approx. 6m and reduce bay in height back to previous pollard points. Reason: Maintain hedgeline.](#)**

Aston House Church Hill Totland Totland Bay Isle Of Wight PO39 0EU

Ref. No: 25/01624/TW

Decision: 27th January 2026 - No Objections

- e. To note Appeals

**Demolition of garage; proposed detached bungalow (revised scheme)**

Beach Combers The Mall Totland Totland Bay Isle Of Wight PO39 0DR

Ref. No: 26/00003/REF | Received: Thu 29 Jan 2026 | **Status: Appeal Lodged**

Application No: 25/01400/FUL

Location: Beach Combers The Mall Totland Bay Isle Of Wight PO39 0DR

Proposal: Demolition of garage; proposed detached bungalow (revised scheme)

Decision: REFUSED: 20/11/2025

f. Enforcement - None

**183/25**

**REPORTS**

To receive reports as follows:

a. Isle of Wight Councillor for Totland & Colwell - Councillor Chris Jarman

Emailed to Councillors. Time has been focused on Finance at the Isle of Wight Council.

b. Open Spaces

Areas remain wet.

2 sign posts, 1 Turf Walk the other Stokes Green have posts that have rotted and need re installing. Clerk to ask maintenance team.

Clerk will also ask the maintenance team if they could level the new path from Stokes Green to the Esplanade. This has been closed for a long time now with difficulty finding a contractor to take on what is a small job. Councillor Blamire will forward the surface materials required for this job.

c. Clerk

Surface issues have been identified on the unadopted section of Kendal Road. Island Roads is unable to take any action as this section is not part of the adopted highway network. Councillor Jarman advised caution, noting that if the road were deemed not fit for purpose, it could be formally signed as such, potentially preventing service vehicles from accessing the area.

Madeira Road flooding - the ditch needs clearing and is on Island Roads lists, currently every time it rains the area floods.

Toilet windows at Colwell have been damaged. JOB Property will permanently glue these in.

I attended a meeting at ChristChurch to update the Committee on the Parish Council plans for the Village Hall. They were most pleased with all the plans and that the hall will be used for the Community.

I attended the Public Realm meeting online: Repair and maintenance works continue on the sea wall path between Colwell and Totland. The Sully was spoken about again and the Isle of Wight Council representative welcomes support from the Parish Council. A letter to our MP for supporting the one piece of legislation that could be used and serve notice on the original owner to remove their property - the legislation is clear about ownership - failure to comply can be a fine upto £50K. Environmental Agency have confirmed no pollution issues. Councillors supported a letter be sent to the MP.

d. Memorial Hall

Quotation/works

We are still waiting for the quotation that Freshwater Parish Council have arranged. This was also discussed at the Memorial Hall meeting. Other matters have risen with the mechanism on one of the doors needing to be replaced. The Hall Manager will contact Freshwater Parish Council Clerk for an update.

e. West Wight Heritage Group

The Parish Landlord has agreed for the group to move into the meeting room area. The group would like to start moving cabinets next door therefore the room needs to be cleared. The large table and chairs could go on the stage out the way for now. Filing cabinet could be moved to the office along with the wooden storage. Screen could go to the hall for hiding the table tennis tables.

Other cabinets could also go to the hall or donated.

A quotation to be obtained for moving the larger/heavy goods.

The member of the public thanked Councillors for their support with this group and he himself had also been trying to support them by printing posters etc. for them to sell. He would like to work with both the group and Totland Parish Council to support them and their future.

f. Criminal Damage/Harassment around the Village.

Hurst Point View management company had contacted the Police, Ward Councillor and Clerk along with others regarding this harassment. This involves door kicking and stone throwing which has resulted in windows smashing. Lanes End has also had problems.

Police had carried out surveillance over the weekend, no updates have been received on this.

## **184/25 TENDERS AND CONTRACTS**

*To receive tenders for the Grass Cutting Tender for 2026-2029.*

A report was circulated to Councillors for consideration. Three tenders were received by email for the main cutting (Tender 1), and two tenders were received by email and post for the smaller areas (Tender 2).

Contractor names were removed from the circulated report. Following consideration, Councillors **RESOLVED** to accept Tender 1 from Contractor B, Brighstone Landscaping, and Tender 2 from Contractor B, West Wight Gardening & Power Tool Services.

Councillors thanked the remaining contractors for their interest and the time taken to submit their tenders.

## **185/25 MEETING DATES & TIMES**

*To agree the meeting dates & times March 2026 to March 2027.*

a. Ordinary Parish Council meetings: 2nd Monday of the month commencing 6pm except - August, October and December. **AGREED** and **RESOLVED**.

b. *Annual Parish Meeting - Monday 30th March 2026 and Monday 29th March 2027 commencing 6pm.*

It is possible to hold the Annual Parish Meeting of the Parish Council on the same day as the ordinary monthly meetings. These Annual meetings are held for the public and the Agenda is generally reports from the Chairman, Open Spaces, Memorial Hall, and receivers of donations. Questions can be asked of the Parish Council. The Parish Council Annual meeting will be held in May.

Councillors agreed for the Annual Meeting to take place on Monday 9th March at 6pm and the Ordinary monthly meeting would follow. Next year would be looked at a later date.

## **186/25 VILLAGE HALL**

a. *To receive the updated plan from EMRC for the extension, with the view to approve for planning.*

Councillors raised questions and requested amendments to the plan. It was agreed that the Clerk would invite EMRC to attend a meeting at the hall to discuss these matters further. Although finances for the extension are very tight, Councillors emphasised the importance of ensuring that the plan would be suitable for the future use and long term viability of the hall.

b. Water Leak in the foyer area has been dealt with. There is still water leaking somewhere within the toilet area and at this point I think when the building works commence this will be resolved.

c. Bookings: several enquiries received with bookings for parties. The Craft Market went well and this was the first of the last of the month. Councillor Wyre thanked the Clerk with the setting up of the hall for the market and cleaning the toilets. The Clerk equally thanked Councillor Wyre for planning the layout and putting out the tables.

General: The chairs have been put out the back with the stage being used for some storage. The table tennis tables have been moved back in to the hall in order that

both toilets have been cleared and clean ready for use for all events. Curtain Up spent Saturday morning clearing under the stage and suggest a skip maybe required.

The Clerk is registering for Premises Licence and the ratable value is in discussion. The Music Licence has been approved and we are on the minimum tariff £142.00 + VAT. This is based on income being no more than £5000.00.

Energy Supply - Octopus are having problems locating the meter information - no bills have been received since March 2025. The Clerk is now giving monthly manual meter readings.

Plaque returned completed by Boris - ready to be installed.

**187/25 CORRESPONDENCE**

*To receive correspondence and agree responses as required.*

1. *Query received regarding the size of the beach huts on The Promenade*

A resident contacted the Clerk regarding the size of the huts along with the materials being used, this has been forwarded to Planning Enforcement.

2. *Flooding around the War Memorial last week - What can the Parish Council do?*

Councillor Jarman would ask Island Roads to clear the drainage area along with the ones of Church Hill.

3. *Annual Isle of Wight Marine Plastic Meeting - Wednesday February 11th 2026, 11am - 1.30pm*

Plastic polluton on our Beaches.

Cllrs Pipe and Johnson attending, packs have been given to both Councillors and they will report back next month.

**188/25 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

*No decisions can be made under this item, however, Councillors can bring any matters up at this point that do not appear on the Agenda.*

*If a decision is to be made this will be added to the next Agenda.*

Councillor Pipe - Concern was raised regarding the emphasis on financial benefits in the recent article from the Community Connector regarding Blue Badges. Councillors noted that the purpose of the scheme is to support accessibility and inclusion for people with mobility difficulties, rather than to provide financial advantage. It was further noted that, as funders, the article could be perceived as reflecting the Parish Council's views, which is not the case.

Councillor Smith - None

Councillor Blamire - Could we arrange for the cable to be encased from the door in the hall to the stage.

Councillor Jarman - I spoke on the Jeremy Vine show for 2 minutes regarding the cliff erosion in Totland and Colwell.

Councillor Johnson - None

Councillor Fennell - None

Councillor Wyre - None

Clerk - None.

Meeting closed 8.05pm.

Signed Chairman .....

Date .....