

## Lisa Walton (Chief Planning Officer)

---

**From:** Natasha Sibley <tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 15 December 2025 21:35  
**To:** Lisa Walton (Chief Planning Officer)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Atlantic View - ref: P/25/091/HH  
**Attachments:** av-02\_03 GF FF plans survey A3 100 WITH AREAS[27].pdf; av-05 Elevs survey A3 100 WITH HEIGHTS [3].pdf; AVcth-P-02-A plans[45].pdf; AVcth-P-03\_A elevs[88].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.

Hi Lisa,

Thank you for your letter and for your continued engagement on this application.

Please find attached the amended plans, which incorporate the following changes in response to the concerns raised in relation to Policy LC8 and matters of character, massing, and scale:

- The proposed design has been amended to reduce the total Gross Internal Area (GIA) to 226.09 sqm, ensuring that the overall floorspace is no greater than that of the existing dwelling. Please refer to the attached floor plan drawings, which clearly illustrate the measured areas in accordance with NDSS.
- Updated elevation drawings (proposed and existing) are provided, with floor and roof heights clearly annotated. These demonstrate that the increase in ridge height is limited to 300mm - the primary reason for this is the increase in thermal detailing required due to current building regulations.
- The dormer on the north elevation has been removed entirely and replaced with a rooflight positioned to sit almost flush with the roof slates, thereby significantly reducing visual bulk/massing.
- The left-hand dormer on the south elevation (serving the master bedroom) has been redesigned to reduce its overall massing and scale. The pitched roof has been removed and replaced with a flat roof, sitting lower than that previously proposed.
- The pitched feature above the right-hand first-floor window has been removed, further reducing visual bulk.

In addition to the above, the drawings identify the existing extensions proposed to be demolished, shown as hatched areas. This illustrates where existing massing is being reduced as part of the proposal. This reduction is a key component of the overall design approach, helping to offset the proposed alterations and ensure that the resulting development is no greater in scale than the existing dwelling. We trust this aspect of the scheme will be given due weight in the overall assessment.

With regard to the garage, we acknowledge the concerns raised regarding the potential for roof voids to be converted to habitable accommodation in the future. While we wish to retain the garage layout as submitted, we accept that a planning condition should be imposed to control its use. However, we respectfully request the amended wording below, which would allow limited flexibility for potential future attic storage space accessed via a loft hatch within the garage, while explicitly preventing its use as habitable accommodation. The inclusion of a floor within this space would also enable a more cost-effective timber frame construction solution.

**Proposed Condition Wording:**

*"The roof void above the garage shall not be used as habitable accommodation. The garage shall be retained for ancillary, non-habitable purposes only, including vehicle and cycle storage, plant room, accessible WC, and utility room.*

*Reason: To ensure compliance with Policy LC8 and maintain a balanced housing stock, in accordance with the Isles of Scilly Local Plan and paragraph 55 of the NPPF."*

In light of the above, we trust that the submitted amendments and supporting drawings address the concerns raised in relation to Policy LC8, as well as those relating to character, massing, and scale under Policies OE2 and SS2. The reductions in floorspace, removal and redesign of dormer elements, clarification of floor and roof heights, and demolition of existing extensions have been carefully considered to ensure that the overall scale of the proposal is no greater than the existing dwelling and that its visual impact is significantly reduced. We hope these revisions demonstrate our commitment to working collaboratively towards a policy-compliant solution and that the proposal can now be progressed positively.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require any further clarification.

Kind regards,



**COLLABORATIVE  
PLANNING**

**Tasha Sibley MA MRTPI**

**Associate Planning Consultant**

**Collaborative Planning**

**E: [tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk](mailto:tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk)**

**W: <http://www.collaborative-planning.co.uk>**

---

**From:** Lisa Walton (Chief Planning Officer) <Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk>

**Date:** Thursday, 11 December 2025 at 14:29

**To:** Natasha Sibley <tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Atlantic View - ref: P/25/091/HH

Hi Tasha,

Thanks for the detailed response. Please find a response for Charlotte and Truan.

Thanks  
Lisa

---

**From:** Natasha Sibley <tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk>

**Sent:** 09 December 2025 22:18

**To:** Lisa Walton (Chief Planning Officer) <Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Atlantic View - ref: P/25/091/HH

**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.

Good evening Lisa,

I hope you are well.

Charlotte and Truan have asked me to review their application and the recent correspondence regarding the proposed amendments to Atlantic View (ref: P/25/091/HH).

I fully acknowledge that the intention of Policy LC8 is to maintain a balanced housing stock. As discussed, the existing dwelling is already significantly above NDSS thresholds, with a current habitable floorspace of 230.69 sqm.

### **Habitable Floorspace**

Following discussions with Charlotte, Truan and their architect, it is possible to reduce the proposed habitable floorspace by 1.5% so that it aligns exactly with the existing figure. We hope this will satisfactorily address your concerns relating to overall floorspace and the policy limits set out in LC8. As such, with regard to increases in habitable floor space, the amended plans will be 'like-for-like' in this respect.

### **Attached Garage**

With regard to your suggestion to detach the garage from the main dwelling, we would appreciate the opportunity to reconsider this point. There are several practical and technical reasons why the garage, as proposed, needs to remain attached:

**Increased visual massing:** Introducing a separate detached garage would in fact *add* to the overall visual massing and built form on the site, introducing a second building envelope in addition to the dwelling. This would increase the perceived bulk when viewed from the road and neighbouring properties and would run counter to the concerns you have raised regarding height and volume. Retaining the garage as part of the main structure enables a more coherent and compact form, with significantly reduced visual impact compared to two separate buildings.

**Integration of the plant room:** The plant room, an essential component of the building's proposed energy-efficient design, is located within the garage and must connect directly to the main dwelling. Relocating this equipment into the existing building footprint would require the loss of internal functional space and significant reconfiguration of the layout.

**Construction and cost implications:** A detached garage would be considerably more expensive to construct, requiring additional foundations, external services, trenching and external works.

**Site constraints:** The plot offers very limited space for a detached structure, particularly to the west of the dwelling, where a standalone building would compromise parking, circulation and the relationship with boundaries and neighbouring properties.

These points demonstrate that the attached arrangement is driven by functional and sustainable design considerations.

Regarding your concern that the roof void above the garage could be converted to habitable accommodation in the future, planning decisions must be based on what is applied for - not on hypothetical future scenarios. To provide certainty, we would be willing to include explicit annotations on the plans and/or accept a planning condition stating that the garage roof void shall remain non-habitable. In addition, I note that if the application is approved, the 'approved plans condition' already seeks to ensure that no development above the garage can take place without further consent.

### **Design, Height and Volume**

After reviewing your design comments in detail, we must respectfully but firmly state that we do not agree with your assessment.

The proposed design has been prepared carefully to reflect the character of surrounding dwellings. Dormers are an established feature along High Lanes, and the proposed elevations sit comfortably within this existing pattern.

The modest increase in ridge height remains entirely consistent with the local context. It is particularly relevant that the adjacent property, Shamrock, has a higher ridge line than Atlantic View in its current form; therefore, the proposed increase cannot reasonably be viewed as harmful or out of keeping.

In addition, the proposals introduce a markedly improved palette of materials - stone and render - that are far more sympathetic to the local vernacular than the existing fabric. When combined with a minor increase in massing necessitated by modern insulation and construction standards, the scheme results in a clear enhancement to both the building and its contribution to the street scene.

For these reasons, we do not consider further amendments to the design, height or volume to be reasonable or justified.

I hope this clarifies our position. The applicants remain willing to work constructively toward a policy-compliant scheme; however, we trust that the above demonstrates that the revised approach on floorspace and the justified retention of the attached garage should resolve the outstanding matters. We would be happy to discuss this further should you consider it helpful.

Kind regards,



**COLLABORATIVE  
PLANNING**

**Tasha Sibley MA MRTPI  
Associate Planning Consultant**

**Collaborative Planning**

E: [tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk](mailto:tasha@collaborative-planning.co.uk)

W: <http://www.collaborative-planning.co.uk>

Please note that the Council may need to disclose this e-mail under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended for the attention and use of

the named addressee(s) and must not be disclosed to any other person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient or are aware that this e-mail has been sent to you in error, you are not authorised to and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it. This email is not (nor forms any part of) a legally binding contract. E & OE. If you have received this e-mail in error please inform [postmaster@scilly.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@scilly.gov.uk) The statements and opinions expressed in this message are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the organisations within the Council of the Isles of Scilly or any of its Committees.