

By email

Copy Nigel Wolstenholme by email

June 4, 2018

Lisa Walton
Senior Officer
Planning and Development Management
Isles of Scilly Council
Hugh Town
St Marys



Dear Lisa,

Tregarthen's Hotel – Application P/18/031/FUL

I refer to the objection to the above application that you have received from local residents I will deal with the points in turn.

1. Concern has been expressed that independent houses are to be built rather than the development of an integrated unified apartment/hotel and that the proposal is not part of a coherent plan and it would compromise the old cottage and sea front area and guest sea views from the hotel.

The application before you is part of a comprehensive scheme as you are aware which has been set out in the pre-application package that deals with the remainder part of the site. The pre-application request was submitted along side the formal planning application, so you can understand this is part of phased redevelopment and upgrading. There is no possibility of building independent houses as this is not permitted under planning policy and this is not proposed in this application. The scheme has been designed very carefully to protect the integrity of the cottages Gibson and Hendra; these are let for self-catering guests and their privacy is important. The design uses the natural topography of the site with the new cottages at the lowest point. The proposal will not compromise views from the hotel rooms given the natural topography and scale of the proposal. The sea views are an essential part of the appeal of those rooms. The scheme has been designed to respect the conservation area and will not interrupt views of the protected monument.

2. The objections suggest that the proposed new cottages dominate the site, particularly when viewed from the quay. It is also alleged that the proposed new cottages also dominate the old cottages and obscure the staff block.

It is very difficult to see how the proposed cottages will dominate the site given their limited footprint and scale and the natural topography of the area. Care has been taken with the design to respect the 'terracing' effect of properties in this part of Hugh Town that cascade down the hillside towards the bay.

3. It is suggested that the new buildings will also compromise the outlook from Gunner's Well by restricting part of the view to the Mermaid/quay area and affecting Gibson/ Hendra in respect of their natural light and long-established views to the west.

There is no right to a view that is set out in either National or Local plan policy or guidance. The view from Gunner's Well will change, but the assessment must consider harms to the conservation area and AONB and any harm to amenity. The proposal will not cause loss of light or dominate the amenity of Gunner's Well or Gibson / Hendra, the former given the significant separation distances the latter in particular due to the orientation of the cottages and the lack of windows to the west.

4. The objection suggests that the new cottages also take away the proposed garden under the approved plans, which would have been returned to what was once a well-maintained garden used by hotel guests, rather than being a rubbish dump and problems with vermin.

The proposal retains gardens for private use in association with self-catering units. This follows the requests from customers and will allow appropriate planting and landscaping to help create an appropriate landscape setting for the new units. The intensity of use will be more limited than that previously permitted.

5. The objection suggests significant interest to the archaeologist, being so close to the old quay and the Garrison Walls.

This is not an objection than can be sustained as the applicant has produced a desk-based assessment as a response to the Site's potential and recommends a programme of archaeological works. This would comprise archaeological monitoring and recording during groundworks, secured by an appropriate condition on any consent. This would be appropriate to meet the levels of archaeological potential that the Site holds.

6. The objection suggests that the proposed balcony on the original main building will be of little use if the proposed new cottages are built, as the balcony view of the sea will be blocked by the roof of the staff block. It will also compromise privacy, as guests will be able to overlook our home and garden from this building.

The applicant has considered impact on amenity. There are no balconies as such proposed. The proposal creates outdoor amenity areas with balustrades over existing flat roofs. These are located over 30m from the objector's property. This is well in excess of accepted privacy distances of 21m for rear to rear elevations for suitable for privacy between dwellings. In addition the cross section I on drawing P120 shows the privacy will not be compromised.

7. The objection suggests that the lighting should be rejected as unnecessary and not being in accordance with the Local Plan.

The applicant has considered this point and agreed to withdraw the lighting proposal from the lettering in the current scheme at the rear facing Garrison Hill. This will leave just the lettering applied on the rear elevation to match that on the front elevation. With regard to lighting on the front elevation this is to reinstate the previous lighting (the wiring is still in place). As confirmed we will provide details of the light fittings with cowls to prevent light spill and the applicant is willing to accept conditions limiting the hours of operation to those when the hotel is open.

8. Concern has been expressed about the proposed location of the replacement flagpole. There is a suggestion that this would harm amenity.

The original flagpole was located very close to the proposed new site; this could be reinstated without consent as only the top of the mast was lost through storm damage. This remains a material fall-back position. No issues of amenity were raised with regard to the previous location. The impacts on residents would be the same.

I hope these responses are helpful when assessing the objections that have been made to the application. Overall they do not demonstrate that there are significant harms that would impact on the assessment of the overall planning balance of the proposal. However, if you need further information or would like to discuss any points in more detail please contact me.

● Page 3

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L Jackson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lisa Jackson MA BSc MRTPI