

GARFF PARISH DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

Monthly Meeting of the Commissioners

The Meeting took place by Virtual Attendance

Minutes of the Meeting

in Private Section: Wednesday 21st April 2021, 7.00 pm - 7.15 pm

Public Section: Wednesday Commences 7.15 pm

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Present: | Mrs M. Fargher (MF) (Chair), Mr N. Dobson (ND)(vice-Chair), Mr T. Kenyon (TK), Mr P. Kinnish (PK), Mr L. Miller (LM), Mr A. J. Moore (AJM), Mrs J. Pinson (JP), Mr J. Smith (JS). |
| In Attendance: | P. Burgess (PB) Clerk, M. Royle (MR), Deputy Clerk, Mrs J. Mattin (JM) Housing Manager Apologies: Two Members of the public had issued requests to join the meeting and were admitted for the duration of the public session. |
| 7.00 pm | Private Session – Sheltered Housing Matters |
| 7.15 pm | Public Session - Preliminary Matters for consideration <i>The Zoom session was opened up to the public at 7.11pm.</i> |
| a) | To open the meeting and request that Members consider this agenda and declare any interest that they may, or may be perceived to have, in its business. <i>This was noted without further comment.</i> <i>ND advised that the Election and meetings Act 2021 had received Royal Assent and that decisions now made on-line. In the light of this ND proposed that the decisions provisionally made at the virtual meetings on the 17th March 2021 & 7th April 2021 be formally approved and enabled as they had been recorded in the minutes. This was seconded by MF and Resolved.</i> |
| 57/21 | Planning Matters |
| | Planning Applications |
| a) | 21/00308/B The Old Vicarage Church Road Maughold, Replace existing timber sliding sash windows/french windows with uPVC sliding sash windows/uPVC french windows. <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| b) | 21/00361/B Westroyd Ramsey Road Laxey, Installation of a heat pump. <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| c) | 21/00336/B Shore Hotel Old Laxey Hill Laxey, Alterations and erection of a two-storey extension to existing public house to create hotel to provide a 42 person restaurant, guest accommodation and staff manager accommodation with associated increase in car parking. <i>This application was discussed in detail. An amendment to the description of the application was noted from the above to: "Alterations and erection of a two-storey extension to existing public house to provide restaurant, hotel accommodation and staff manager accommodation with associated alterations to existing car park." The implications of the proposals on parking in the vicinity were discussed. JP expressed particular concern about an increased demand for on-street parking which may have consequences for residents and a business in the immediate vicinity. PB stated that there was currently space for the parking of 21 cars. AJM stated that he had consulted the architect and had been informed that 2 disabled spaces and 2 staff spaces would be created which would be an addition to the current provision. In this respect there would be additional parking provision. There followed a discussion of the amount of additional parking requirement that operation of the restaurant had potential to bring. MF and JP felt that written clarification should be sought from the architect as to the precise increase in parking provision. It was noted that the time for submissions had been extended until May 14th 2021. AJM advised that the right of way through the car park had been accepted and confirmed by the agent and owner of the property. PK asked a question about what would be done with the river wall and the grassed area beside the river. AJM advised that this could not be established until MU came forward with the flood defence proposals they were to implement on this section of the river. ND summarised the current consensus stating that the Board had no objection to the development in principle, however there was a feeling that clarification of the proposed number of</i> |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| | <i>parking spaces should be requested from the architect. The clerk's were instructed to obtain the latter clarification re. parking provision.</i> |
| d) | 21/00340/B Thallo Queen Cottage Glen Mona Loop Road Glen Mona, Maughold, Erection of a two-storey rear extension and erection of replacement front porch. <i>The size and scope of these proposals were noted and the visual impact discussed. It was noted that the increase in area would be in excess of 50%. The extension was to the rear and it was considered that the visual impact would be minimal.</i> <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| e) | 21/00341/B 31 All Saints Park Lonan Laxey, Erection of a two-storey extension to side of dwelling. <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| f) | 21/00351/CON Shore Hotel Old Laxey Hill Laxey, Registered Building consent for demolition elements to PA 21/00336/B. <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| g) | 21/00388/B Ballaskeig Croit E Quill Road Laxey, Erection of a conservatory to rear elevation. JP & TK declared an interest and withdrew from the virtual meeting. <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| h) | 21/00389/B Thie Gamman Beg The Crescent Baldrine, Installation of a flue. <i>There were no objections to these proposals.</i> |
| | Approval Notices (DEFA Planning Committee) |
| | Refusal Notices (DEFA Planning Committee) – |
| f) | <i>The following refusal was noted. MR advised that an appeal had been lodged.</i> 20/01434/REM Reserved Matters application in association with PA 20/00894/A for erection of dwelling and extension of residential curtilage, Land North West Of Ballaragh Old Farmhouse Ballaragh – <i>Refusal notice issued 01.04.21.</i> |
| g) | Appeal Notices (DEFA Planning Committee) <i>It was noted that an appeal had been initiated by the applicant in regard to the refusal of PA 20/01434/REM as indicated at item f) above. Further details to be issued by Cabinet Office in due course.</i> |
| | Withdrawal Notices |
| | Planning Enforcement |
| 58/21 | Approval of Minutes |
| a) | Approval of minutes of the meeting of the 7 th April 2021. JP asked for an amendment to item 51/21.d in regard to ownership and maintenance of the Pinfold Hill telephone box. This was agreed. With this amendment the minutes were agreed to be a correct record. Proposed LM . Seconded JP . Resolved. |
| 59/21 | Matters Arising & Other Business |
| a) | Feedback from the bands in regard to the Laxey Brass Band Festival regarding a date for the event. <i>MR advised that the bands had been consulted about holding the event as planned on the 2nd of May. The majority had favoured postponing until the 30th of May to permit rehearsal time. It was agreed that the event would go ahead on the 30th of May 2021.</i> |
| b) | MF referred to a planning application which had been mis-assigned when circulated by the Planning Authority and had consequently not received comment from the Board. Members had submitted comment to the office and this had been forwarded to the Planning Authority. The details of the application were as follows: <i>"21/00230/B Cable Cottage Port E Vullen Maughold IM7 1AP Proposal: Alterations, erection of a two-storey extension to provide additional living space and ancillary living accommodation and formation of a balcony with glazed balustrade. The Commissioners note that this property is in very close proximity to other properties and any alteration within the group could impact greatly on adjoining dwellings. Members have some concern in regard to the installation of extensive windows/glazing/balconies as indicated in the proposals and the potential for increased visual impact in this sensitive location above the beach and public slipway. Members request that the Planning Officer also considers the potential for 'overlooking' issues that may have an effect on the privacy of the two properties below. The Commissioners wonder if the neighbours have been consulted in regard to the proposals."</i> |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| c) | <i>It was noted that the Planning Authority had been advised of some development that was currently being undertaken in the vicinity of Agneash. The Planning Authority had indicated that it would investigate whether there was a need for planning permissions to be obtained for the development that was taking place. The Commissioners and local residents would be advised once the Planning Authority had made an assessment.</i> |
| 60/21 | General correspondence |
| a) | Resident – regarding the provision of ‘roll-out’ wooden path matting on Laxey Beach. JP & PK spoke in support of investigating the provision of such matting. ND asked the officers to look at the viability and cost of such a scheme. This was agreed. |
| b) | Resident – regarding the loss of bathing water sampling by DEFA in Laxey Bay. <i>It was noted that sampling would continue to take place as recently requested by the Commissioners. No further action at this stage.</i> |
| c) | Hon Geoffrey Boot Minister DEFA – to discuss the response from the Minister in regard to the approval of development at the Berwyn site, South Cape, Laxey. <i>Correspondence between the Commissioners and the Minister in regard to the Minister’s decision to support the Planning Inspector’s reversal of the Planning Committee’s refusal of this application had been circulated, was noted and discussed. The Commissioners had strongly opposed the proposals and were very unhappy with the manner in which the Minister had made his decision. It was noted that the planning process had been exhausted once the Minister had made his decision. It was noted that the Inspector had been unable to visit the site and had used video/photographic evidence on which to base his judgement. It was also noted that the Minister had not visited the site before making his decision. The available options were discussed including a petition of doleance and referral to the Tynwald Commissioner. It was agreed that a second ‘open’ letter be issued to Mr Boot that would be made available to the press. This letter to be approved by the Chair prior to release. AJM proposed liaison with the affected residents. This was agreed, but MF added that there were also important wider negative implications that affected the wider community. There followed a discussion of the difficulties of highway access to the property. PK asked if a copy of the letter could be sent to a senior officer at Highways. This was also agreed.</i> |
| 61/21 | Committees & Boards – by Exception |
| 62/21 | Operational Reports |
| a) | Cooil Roi – <i>It was noted that JM had had internet connection issues. ND referred to JM’s written report which had been circulated earlier in the week. ND confirmed that as ‘Lead Member’ for housing he had met with JM on Tuesday 20th April. ND advised that Sheltered Housing matters continued to be scheduled to be discussed at the mid-monthly meeting, although matters could be raised at any meeting if necessary. The ‘Lead Member’ would now meet with the Housing Manager on the Thursday in advance of the mid-monthly meeting. That meeting would be minuted and copies circulated to all Members. MF referred to the previously approved project that was on-going to replace doors at the Cooil Roi complex. ND advised that the next batch of doors would be replaced ‘like for like’ in similar colour but in uPVC. It was confirmed that monies had previously been approved and that replacement of these doors could go ahead. ND also advised that JM had suggested that the ‘lattice’ doors on the balconies which provided storage space could also be replaced. JP stated support for replacement of these lattice doors at the same time as this would minimise disruption. This was agreed to be a sensible proposal. This was noted. ND asked if approval of the lattice doors could be reserved until JM was present to outline the costs and the availability of funds in the maintenance budget at the complex. TK referred to the possibility of training for Commissioners’ which had been suggested in JM’s report. JP suggested that courses be run in conjunction with the Municipal Association. ND proposed that further discussion of the matter be reserved until the mid-monthly meeting on the 19th of May. MR reported that JM had also advised that a letter was being issued to residents on the 22nd of April in relation to the lifting of the lockdown and precautions, etc that would remain in place and reviewed on an on-going basis.</i> |
| b) | New Road – Campsite reopening. PB advised that it was planned to open the camp-site for camper vans initially. Tents would be permitted as the health situation became clearer. The recent announcement of several un-known origin cases was noted. The situation would be monitored. A Member raised a staffing matter during the discussion of this item which is reported in the Private Section of the minutes below. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| | <i>PB confirmed that the camp-site was not currently being widely advertised but plans were in place to implement a campaign in association with IOM Advertising once the health situation had become clear. 'Special Offers would be offered as part of the marketing campaign This could be implemented very quickly particularly using social media, etc.</i> |
| c) | Health & Safety – <i>MR</i> advised that the maintenance team had reverted to 'normal' operations now that lockdown had officially ended. The health situation would be monitored on a daily basis and any necessary actions and changes implemented. There were no incidents or other observations to report. <i>JP</i> asked if thanks could be passed on to the maintenance team for the excellent job they had done in cleaning the Laxey Promenade pavements. This was agreed. |
| 63/21 | Any Other Business <i>(to be submitted in writing by mid-day the previous Tuesday to the date of the meeting).</i> |
| a) | TK - Request to investigate fortnightly green waste collection in Garff. TK had submitted a statement: "Lonan and Maughold are predominantly rural areas with many medium to large gardens, creating a considerable amount of green garden waste. It is not therefore often practical for residents to take the garden waste to the ECA in Douglas. I would like therefore to propose that a green waste bin be provided for those residents who require such a service, as long as a contractor could be employed to remove the waste". <i>TK</i> advised Members of the green waste collection services he had observed that were offered in England. He felt that there would be great benefits to the implementation of such a service for residents who wished to participate. <i>JP</i> stated that she supported the idea of recycling green waste, but asked how it was envisaged the 'doorstep' service might be administered and how it would actually work. <i>TK</i> advised that in England the collections took place every two weeks at a cost for those who participated of around £40 for a six-month duration. <i>MF</i> proposed that further discussion be reserved until an investigation had taken place as to how a scheme could be implemented and costed. <i>JP</i> suggested that contractors could be approached with a view to such a service being implemented privately and separately from the Commissioners refuse service. It was agreed that these matters should be investigated and that the current refuse contractor be consulted to advise on the viability and possible cost of the service. <i>PB</i> stated that he felt that investigation would take some time and it would be unpractical to have any scheme running during the coming summer. |
| b) | Garff Regional Sewage Treatment Consultative Group. JS/PK to report. <i>JS</i> briefed Members on the report he had circulated earlier. Members confirmed that it had been received. The deadline for the call for sites was at close of business on Thursday 22 nd April 2021. The B4Laxey group had submitted three sites for consideration to MU. These were noted. <i>PK</i> expressed concern that the 'call for sites' process had been during the lockdown when access to view sites was more limited. <i>ND</i> suggested was that it was landowners who would normally put forward their own sites. <i>JP</i> expressed concern about how the call for sites was advertised. It was noted that the advert had been published in the newspapers, on various social media, and on radio. <i>JP</i> asked why the advert could not have been placed when the rate demands were sent out by Treasury. <i>ND</i> pointed out that MU had fulfilled their obligations and advertised the site as they were required. <i>PK</i> stated that the process had not been good enough and expressed concern that MU had already made a decision on which site and method of sewage treatment they preferred. <i>JP</i> reiterated that in her view MU should have been more pro-active in advertising the call for sites. <i>AJM</i> added that we don't know if MU had made direct approaches to landowners. <i>JS</i> stated that MU had probably gone beyond their legal obligation and concurred that they had probably approached owners of land that they felt could be suitable anyway. <i>JS</i> doubted that any potential site had been missed. <i>JS</i> confirmed that he and PK would be informed of the sites that had been put forward at the next meeting of the Consultative Group. This was noted. <i>TK</i> asked how many sites that MU were looking for. <i>JS</i> stated that this was unknown at present and the idea was to determine what land was available for either a pumping option or a treatment 'in Garff' option. Several possible sites were discussed by Members. <i>JS</i> confirmed that some site visits had already taken place to land which had been proposed at which both he and <i>PK</i> had attended. <i>JS</i> advised that Sarah Corlett was retiring and leaving the Planning Authority. <i>MF</i> proposed the Commissioners write in recognition and thank Sarah for her services to planning over the years |
| c) | <i>JP</i> asked if the distinction between the Garff local authority constituency and Garff Tynwald constituency could be clarified. <i>JP</i> also asked if clarification could be issued of the roles and responsibilities of a Commissioner and of local authorities. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| | PB advised that the official Timetable had not been issued by the LGU and that they would be issuing information for potential candidates which the Commissioners would publish and add additional information. |
| 64/21 | Matters in Private – |
| a) | End Café site – Correspondence received in regard to the southern end of Laxey Promenade. Circulated 9 th April 2021. <i>A discussion took place.</i> |
| b) | Call for Sites Details – There was a discussion of this matter. |
| | |
| | Meeting Closed at 8.58pm |
| | Date of next meeting: 5 th May 2021 |