

**From:** [Ian Sibley](#)  
**To:** [Lisa Walton](#)  
**Cc:** [barrycoupe@btinternet.com](mailto:barrycoupe@btinternet.com)  
**Subject:** RE: P/21/041/FUL Land at Porthcressa, St Mary's  
**Date:** 04 July 2022 18:12:36  
**Attachments:** [Land at Porthcressa - PEA.pdf](#)

---

**CAUTION:** This is an **EXTERNAL** email which was sent from outside of Cornwall Council's network. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. Do not provide any login or password details if requested.

---

Dear Lisa,

Barry has forwarded me a copy of your response.

Addressing each of the points in turn:

1. We have considered the proposed buildings in the context of their surroundings, and in fact measured the heights of nearby cottages as requested by Nicola Stinson following our site meeting. We accept that the site is sensitive – hence the final design was, in our opinion, a sensible compromise between the site's constraints and the requirement to provide decent living accommodation for local families. Barry advises me that there may be scope to further reduce the ridge heights, but we are reluctant to spend more of our client's money re-drawing only to be turned down on other issues.
2. Is there any planning reason why it matters how the plots are developed? As already agreed, any consent will be subject to a S106 planning obligation restricting occupation to those meeting the Council's SLN criteria.
3. The perspective is to scale, showing the building heights relative to the surrounding terrain. Is this therefore necessary?
4. I understood we had agreed that the SDMs and SWMP could be conditions of a planning permission? Is this not correct?
5. I submitted a Preliminary Ecological Assessment in May. Have you not received it? Copy attached. Specifically, Section 5 of the PEA provides an assessment of the ecological value of the habitats, the potential to support protected species such as bats, and consideration of other ecological receptors - this addresses all of the points raised in the previous inspector's report. Section 6 also provides specific recommendations for mitigation measures and steps to avoid/minimise the risk of harm to ecological receptors which are present.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

*Ian Sibley*

**Ian Sibley BSc MRICS,**  
Island Architects,  
Porthcressa,  
St Marys,

Isles of Scilly TR21 0JQ.  
Tel: 01720 422431.  
Fax: 01720 423334.  
E-Mail: [ian@sibleysonscilly.com](mailto:ian@sibleysonscilly.com)



Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Lisa Walton <[Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk](mailto:Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: P/21/041/FUL Land at Porthcressa, St Mary's  
**Date:** 4 July 2022 at 15:07:27 BST  
**To:** Barry Coupe <[barrycoupe@btinternet.com](mailto:barrycoupe@btinternet.com)>

Just going through my letter of July 2021 (attached):

Have you given any consideration to lowering of the height, as submitted they were rather high at 4.8m high eaves and 6.68m high ridge – have you compared this to heights advocated in our design guide or the heights of surrounding buildings? Do you know if the plots will be sold as ‘self-build’ or will the applicant build them to sell on or will the applicant build them to rent. You did confirm that a S106 would be entered into, I just wondered if there was any further information to inform the committee report?

The submitted ‘perspectives of the landscape’ are in place of the LVIA  
Can you provide section drawings and site levels data?

Do you have a Statement of Sustainable Design Measures  
Do you have a Site Waste Management Plan.

We have no baseline biodiversity value of the site. Ideally the scheme should be supported by an assessment of any potential effects on biodiversity and habitats. Members did reject a scheme close to this site. That was subject to an appeal where the reason for refusal, in relation to unknown impact upon biodiversity, was upheld and the scheme was rejected. That was for development in a private garden, smaller than the proposed site, and policy OE2 has now been adopted since this 2018 appeal decision and the inspector noted:

*The Council’s reason for refusal refers to the Framework and also to Policy OE2 of*

*the emerging Draft Isles of Scilly Local Plan<sup>3</sup>. However, this emerging plan has not yet been submitted for examination and is therefore in the early stages of its preparation. I cannot be confident that the Policy relied on would be adopted in its current form and I therefore give it little weight.*

*I have had regard to the modest number of trees to be removed, the size of the appeal site and its position within an urban area and consider that its biodiversity value may be limited. Nonetheless, there is a potential that the site hosts some habitats of value or is used for foraging by species, including protected species, i.e. bats. The assessment of any potential effects on biodiversity usually requires the submission of a biodiversity survey which sets out the baseline position and the likelihood of any effects. No such survey was submitted with the appeal application although reference was made to the retention of as many trees as possible within the submitted Design and Access Statement.*

*There does not appear to be any details of specific measures could realistically be implemented within the limited area of site to remain undeveloped to achieve a contribution or enhancement in biodiversity terms. Whilst the appellant has agreed that a condition would be accepted in this regard, this does not provide comfort that any impacts on the biodiversity value of the site or protected species could be avoided or sufficiently mitigated through appropriate enhancement measures that would be necessary to accord with the precautionary approach advocated by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.*

*As such, in the absence of information to the contrary, the proposal would harm the biodiversity value of the site and would therefore conflict with Local Plan Policy 1 and the provisions of the Framework.*

That development was refused and the Council's decision was upheld at appeal. It may therefore be advisable to address this issue.

Can you confirm whether you have contacted SWW (Developer Services Planning [DeveloperServicesPlanning@southwestwater.co.uk](mailto:DeveloperServicesPlanning@southwestwater.co.uk))?

Thanks

Lisa

---

**From:** Barry Coupe <[barrycoupe@btinternet.com](mailto:barrycoupe@btinternet.com)>

**Sent:** 04 July 2022 14:46

**To:** Lisa Walton <[Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk](mailto:Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Re: P/21/041/FUL Land at Porthcressa, St Mary's

**CAUTION:** This is an **EXTERNAL** email which was sent from outside of Cornwall Council's network. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. Do not provide any login or password details if requested.

Thanks Lisa, as far as I'm aware, we have now supplied you with all the additional items you requested.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Very Best

Barry

On 4 Jul 2022, at 12:24, Lisa Walton <[Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk](mailto:Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dear Barry,

Thank for submitting the attached, I will upload these to the website. Please can you advise if there are any further submissions to this application before we undertake further public consultation?

Thanks  
Lisa

---

**From:** Barry Coupe <[barrycoupe@btinternet.com](mailto:barrycoupe@btinternet.com)>  
**Sent:** 04 July 2022 11:35  
**To:** Lisa Walton <[Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk](mailto:Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Ian Sibley <[ian@sibleysonscilly.com](mailto:ian@sibleysonscilly.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: P/21/041/FUL Land at Porthcressa, St Mary's

**CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email which was sent from outside of Cornwall Council's network. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. Do not provide any login or password details if requested.**

Dear Lisa,

Attached please find both a black and white and colour photomontages supporting the above application.

In producing this montage, I have managed to use a photograph taken from the same place as the black and white historical photo you sent me. Both the old photo, and the current day one were printed at exactly the same scale taking landmarks appearing on both. That was important in defining the correct size and scale of the proposal. Another important factor was understanding where the original left hand building was located on the old photograph against our site survey, and plotted on the new photograph. Checking other site constraints between the two, including dimensions of heights relevant to buildings in close proximity enabled the final montage to be accurate.

If you have any further queries, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards