

Representation about Planning Application P20/090/FUL Five Micro Lodges

- 1.** In the covering letter reference is made to the pandemic. By the time the units are built etc the pandemic will be under control. So, the comments are not relevant.
- 2.** It is unclear what the units are really to be used for.
 - 2.1. The units require people of good mobility to reach the raised bed via the steps and be able to slide across to the other side of the bed, as there is no all-round access to the bed. The units are unlikely to appeal to the elderly.
 - 2.2. The cooking facilities are minimal.
 - 2.3. Are the units adequately heated and sound proofed as they are adjoining units?
 - 2.4. The construction of the units does indicate they will have a relatively short life in this exposed position.
 - 2.5. Solar panels are aligned east to west not to the south. The site is in the shade of the hotel other than in high summer.
 - 2.6. Therefore, are the units to be used for staff accommodation?
- 3.** A statement is made that the lodges will extend the season. No evidence to support this is provided.
- 4.** The hotel has permission for other self-catering units and with the hotel now only offering snacks and drinks and sending out guests to other establishments for breakfast, is Tregarthen's now really a hotel?
- 5.** The units are described as additional hotel accommodation but are separate from the hotel.
- 6.** The kitchen garden is described as derelict, but the term can easily be applied to the rest of the hotel as the attached photographs show (peeling paintwork, missing guttering, Ivy growing up the walls, weeds in guttering etc). This unkempt appearance has developed over recent years due to the lack of maintenance on the hotel. The proposed units will require good maintenance in their prominent exposed position.
- 7.** Part of the application refers to the spoil in the derelict kitchen garden. This spoil around one metre thick, is the debris from the conversion of the staff block which was not removed from site but compacted and covered with a plastic sheet and then with a thin layer of soil and seeded. This has not been a success as the plastic sheet shows though in places.

8. The application form “**10 Trees and Hedges**” says there are no trees or hedges on the site. This is not correct. There are three substantial trees that are not shown on the plans that are extremely close to the units. The loss of trees should be considered. See photographs.
9. In the application mention is made of the flat roofs of the existing hotel and the vista. The staff block conversion approved plans had a pitched roof. The applicant subsequently made an application for an alteration to a flat roof. This is now referred to in the **Addendum Built Heritage Statement 4.8** as the proposed development “*obscure a dominant and unsympathetic part of Tregarthen’s Hotel*”.
10. Given the works proposed, it is considered inappropriate for the construction work period to deviate from the normal Council construction times, dates etc as the works will inevitably be a nuisance to neighbours and visitors alike.
11. The employee numbers for this development are said to increase with this development. Given that the hotel is now operating in a different manner with food and beverage and self-catering, would it not be prudent to review the claimed employee numbers?
12. Scilly is not a low budget destination and it is questionable as to whether this proposal is in keeping with the image Scilly is trying to project. The units are only 12.7m² and given the comments under **2** above it is difficult to see how a visitor would wish to stay in such accommodation even for a few days, never mind a longer period, particularly in inclement weather.
13. In previous times an application P16/055 was submitted to turn the kitchen garden into an outdoor seating and eating area for the hotel. The hotel has limited outdoor seating and none that is reserved for hotel guests. Interestingly a recent application P20/091, which is also before Council, is proposing such an outdoor visitor eating facility.

Conclusion

Self-catering on Scilly is becoming the norm. The proposal is not hotel accommodation, but low budget, cramped accommodation that ultimately will probably be put to other uses than that being proposed.

This application therefore should be refused as being inappropriate. The application also contains factual errors. The development requires the removal of three mature trees. It does nothing to enhance the vista from the quay, the character of the area, the Garrison Walls and most importantly, the Scilly visitor experience. I.e., It is not in keeping with what was originally the premier hotel on St Mary’s.

Given all the planning applications being made by the applicant, it is unclear what is the long-term intention and future for Tregarthen's as a hotel. It is a question that should be asked.

Footnote

Reflecting on the applicant's recent application for the staff block. The roof changed from pitched to flat after approval. There was no west window in the approved plans, but one was fitted. When challenged, we were promised a stained-glass window for our privacy. We ended up with a part clear, part obscure window with a stick-on film that can be easily be removed.

Given the recent history there is considerable doubt as to what is the real purpose of these micro lodges. Cavete, quaeeso!





