

From: Planning (Isles of Scilly)
To: JohnandMary Whapshott
Subject: RE: Planning Application Representation; P/18/075

-----Original Message-----

From: JohnandMary Whapshott <provided >
Sent: 13 November 2018 16:51
To: Planning (Isles of Scilly) <planning@scilly.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Representation; P/18/075

As regular visitors to Bryher, we are naturally pleased that the new owners of Bank Cottage want to live on that wonderful island. However, we object to the proposal on the following grounds.

The current Local Plan (2005) states that 'planning decisions must ensure that proposals are in character with the islands' and that 'the design of a proposal should be based on a thorough and caring understanding of the place and context.' This final word is particularly significant in this case. The Planning Design Statement (PDS) makes little mention of the context in which the proposal has been made, i.e. the surrounding properties. It does say that 'Bank Cottage sits among a cluster of modest stone buildings...' . The plans show that the roof ridge of Bank Cottage will be raised by 1.2m, which hardly maintains its modesty. Additionally, and more importantly, this increase will inevitably block most of the natural light for the kitchen and bedroom above it in Atlanta opposite. It is easy to see how this reduction in natural light can be the cause of potential loss of income for the owners of Atlanta, Glenhope and Glenhope High: those who love Bryher may wish to stay in accommodation with better natural light.

In addition, the significant increase in the size of the buildings shown in the plans will adversely affect the landward view from Great Porth, and from the upstairs windows in Glenhope and Glenhope High. The plans therefore take no consideration of visitors and residents in this part of Bryher.

The proposals also go against the Draft Local Plan for 2015 - 2030 (DLP) in a number of respects.

1. The DLP states that in respect to new builds, 'the scale, including height... of a building determines its impact on views, skylines and its relationship with surrounding buildings and spaces, as well as on neighbouring and other amenities.' The proposed increase in height of Bank Cottage and the enlargement of the workshop and cottage will, as stated above, negatively impact the surrounding properties and visual environment.
2. The DLP also states that 'Buildings will be required to safeguard the amenity of existing occupiers and create a high quality environment... that addresses issues of privacy, overlooking, overshadowing and/or any overbearing impacts.' Again, the proposals go entirely against this requirement.
3. The DLP states that 'Proposals for new development will only be permitted where they would not cause significant harm to... other perceptual qualities such as... dark skies.' The plan shows that there will be a glass link between the granite building and the wooden clad extension. This will inevitably cause light pollution, which is contrary to Scilly's International Dark Sky Reserve designation.
4. Concerning the proposed increase in size of the workshop and the cottage, the DLP states that such proposals 'can have a significant effect on the neighbours' enjoyment of their property' and that the proposals should 'respect the character of the surrounding area and safeguard the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.' It is difficult to imagine how this can be adhered to when the workshop and cottage will be significantly larger than at present.

Finally, we have serious concerns about the practicalities of the proposed building works. Access to the property is by narrow lanes, and it is hard to see how the surrounding environment will be unaffected by the use of heavy plant, the transportation of scaffolding and building materials, and the disposal of soil and waste materials.

In addition, we wonder when the proposed works will be undertaken: in the spring and summer months, when many visitors use the lanes around the property to access places such as the hotel, Hillside Farm, Great Porth and the nearby properties; or out of season, when the weather can often make external building work difficult, if not impossible, leading to the likelihood of the work overrunning into the tourist season.

For all these reasons, we oppose the proposals.

John & Mary Whapshott
14 Kendrick Close, Westbury, Wiltshire BA13 3QT