

From: alan
Sent: 17 September 2015 14:10
To: King, Andrew
Subject: Planning Application Representation; P/15/060

Dear Sirs,

We have already made representations on Tregarthen's planning application P/15/060 and now wish to summarise the reasons under the planning law why the application should be refused.

1. It appears from the Agent's response, that discussions took place between the Council and the Agent which are not in the public domain. From the tone of the Agent's email, it suggests he took away from the discussions, a view that approval may be forth coming. We are sure that in reality, the concept of "renovating" the Tregarthen's Hotel site was viewed favourably by the Council Officers, but subject to the presentation of detailed plans. From the Design Review Panel's response, it appears that the "constraints and opportunities" stage was skipped, maybe in order to achieve a "quick result". In our representation, we noted the plans had not been prepared by an architectural practice, but by a building surveyor. The comments made by the Design Review Panel confirm that the design was lacking in a number of respects, not least landscaping, when due to the density of the proposed building, there is nothing left to landscape.
2. The application declaration has been signed (15 Trees and Hedges) no trees and hedges on the site. This is knowingly incorrect, as the plans show development on garden land. Further the application goes on to say that the area will be landscaped when plainly, there is nowhere left to landscape due to the building density. This untruthfulness leads to suspect as to what other untruths are contained in the Application. The gardens of Tregarthen's were in the past tended by a professional gardener. This is no longer the case and gives the unkempt position we see today.
3. The proposed buildings, by reason of their size, siting and design, would represent an unneighbourly form of development, detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining residential property, particularly by reason of the overbearing effect. No plans have been prepared show the overlooking that may occur to adjacent properties, due to the close proximity of the new builds and it is still unclear how we in particular would be affected.
4. The Layout and Siting, both in itself and relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, is inappropriate and unsympathetic to the appearance and character of the local environment. The development will affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as the building density will eliminate open areas. It is considered the buildings are over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of their appearance compared with the existing development and properties in the vicinity.
5. The Council is under a legal duty to have particular regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and as an Area of

Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal does not achieve this. St Mary's harbour, as one of the three island gateways to the islands will be significantly changed. The impact of the development on the landscape is hence an important factor to be considered, as are the public view points.

6. The new water side build is unrealistically close to the sea wall, as overtopping in this area is an annual occurrence and with the quay works and quay infill, sea surges may or may not be more prevalent. If over topping does occur, it will put the render and timber buildings and sewage/water infrastructure at risk. This includes the fire and rescue service who may be requested to attend.
7. The additional sewage and water demand from the self-catering accommodation (*20/40 extra persons plus individual washing/dishwashing machines*) will place a burden on the existing water and sewage systems which is already understood to be at capacity.
8. The impact on the Garrison walls in the application has not been taken into account and Natural England requires work on this aspect.
9. In our representation the applicant was discussed, which is not normally a consideration. In this case however, the applicant, used the local media to highlight his intentions. Hence, it is only right that others have their opportunity to present views on how the application will effect Scilly and in particular, the intention to build significant housing blocks elsewhere on St Mary's in order to house the seasonal hotel workers displaced from the hotel grounds.

These public intentions when subject to scrutiny, are not in accordance with reality and what was said to the media. This aspect is important for Scilly as the claims being made will affect the tourism industry, the major industry of the islands. Hence, consideration of the applicant's intentions and the effects of this major hotel development on the tourism industry should be considered.

Kind Regards

Alan & Glen Davis

Gunners Well
The Garrison
St Mary's
Isles of Scilly
TR21 OLS