

Pera, Bryher, Isles of Scilly T12230PR.

22nd December 2017

Ms. Lisa Walton.

Senior Officer Planning

and Development Management,

Council of the Isles of Scilly.

RECEIVED BY THE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

05 JAN 2018

Dear Ms. Walton.

Reference: P/17/109 FUL

Extension to Pine Trees, Bryher.

With regard to me above I refer to yours of the 7th December, I have examined the plans and in respect of the closing date of 28th December for receipt of observations, I was verbally assured that receipt within a few days of that date would still be accepted because of the Christmas period intervening and the fact that access from Bryher to St. Mary's was not possible on 14th December due to the boat service being suspended and did not operate due to severe adverse weather conditions.

The application refers to and appreciates the uniqueness and value of the view of St. Mary's and Samson from the proposed extension, however it fails absolutely to make any comment about any effect the proposed extension may have on the view of Bryher from various vantage points - on Bryher from Church Quay, from the road up from the Church, from the coastal path, the hill by the Fire Station - and of course from St. Mary's and Samson! The views from these and other vantage points will be impaired due to the extraordinarily large floor to ceiling - and wall to wall continuous glazed frontage - particularly with this very large glazed area reflecting as it will during most of the day, bright sunshine - it will have the exactly opposite effect of buildings on St. Mary's which during sunset hours reflect the sunset - the Terminal building at the Airport, The Mermaid and The Garthens and various buildings along the Strand - all look as if on fire!

The views from Bryher are all obtuded on and have to be experienced to fully appreciate the effect. I consider the impact of such relatively large areas of unobstructed glazing introduced on Bryher to be undesirable - or even allowable! A jarring note would be introduced which ought to be avoided - a jarring note not wanted - and one which would extend during most of the daylight hours.

It isn't clear from the application whether the extension is mainly for family occupation or for holiday lets - but it does seem somewhat strange on the face of things in respect of access - and especially to Bedroom No. 2 - this appears to be via the new living room and thence in front of fully glazed bedroom No. 1 and via what appears as a balcony!

The proposed extension will bring resident or holiday accommodation significantly closer to

Pera than currently, from Pinetrees, it will quite extra ordinarily increase the apparent bulk of Pinetrees and I suspect possibly exceed the normal $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of existing area for allowable extension?

If the proposed extension does not offend that criterion - then extension on a North/South axis would not have so severe an effect on appearance although there would not be the same unobstructed view from both apartments.

The provision of two ensuite bathrooms each adjacent to each other seems slightly sub-optimal for Buyer - and in view of water conservation rather over the top!

The proposed extension will be hardly visible from the roadway and with the restraints on materials employed will not visibly obtrude on or change the existing. This is important as with the single exception of "Hillcrest" the Town has by and large retained a Silly Off-Island

vernacular appearance which it is important to preserve - but from the south the proposed extension will dramatically enlarge and alter the appearance of Pine trees as a fairly typical farmhouse

The proposed extension seems hardly the sort of extension appropriate to the Islands!

Can I inter-termination suggest that it might be useful to search out and dust off the Jellicoe

Report - which advocated no new building on the Off-Islands.

Yours sincerely,

