

22 Sally Port
St Mary's

4th may 2020

Comments on planning application P/20/022.

Please record these comments as constituting as an objection to the planning application.

General narrative:

I am fully supportive of the transition to carbon free transport within and to these Islands. However any facilitating development needs to be well considered, appropriate in terms of scale and appearance and able to self sustain within the limited market and harsh weather conditions experienced on Scilly. Of course many of these elements fall without the planning process. I do hope our Councilors are providing proper scrutiny and challenge to the non planning issues.

Planing issues:

Confusing documentation.

The generic planning statement shows a mono pitch design whilst the proposed elevations and roof plan show a dual pitch. The documentation needs to provide clarity on the design for this site. For either it would be handy to see the principal dimensions shown on the drawings. For example it is not possible to ascertain the clear headroom under the eaves of the structure, both for vehicles but also for pedestrians.

Equally as the Council are the backstop when it comes to liability I would recommend you ask for full structural calculations – wind loading on this canopy will be extreme.

One other issue is the discharge of rainwater – the application implies this will be directed into our already over capacity sewage system?!

Chargers and cabinets.

The information on this is too vague to allow a decision to be made. I would also draw attention to the badly corroded air conditioning units behind Gleaner House – they are testament to the harsh nature of our climate. I note that there will not be information on the proposed charging units till the end of May. Given that ultimately the maintenance liability for the structure and the chargers will fall to the Council I would personally be very uncomfortable about effectively removing approval of this element from the formal planning process.

Interaction of this site and use with the surrounding area.

Any function that generates vehicle movements must consider the movements to the site, within the site and how these movements interact with the surrounding highway

and its users, particularly vulnerable modes. The documentation submitted does not adequately address these issues.

NOTE: The 'It is existing parking' defence does not hold water – you are making significant changes to the way this site operates. I shall expand on this below.

Interaction between the canopy and surrounding functions:

Electricity sub station

This canopy will effectively block access to one side of the electricity sub-station. What are the implications in terms of access for maintenance but also for access in the case of emergency?

Petrol Station

The canopy comes extremely close to the petrol station forecourt. The application provides no vehicle track / swept path analysis to show that it will be even possible to safely reach the pumps. Equally the implications for emergency vehicle access have to be properly assessed.

Pedestrian movements

Others have raised the levels of use of the pedestrian path running North South on the Western side of the site. I support their concerns.

I shall therefore concentrate my comments on the significant east - west flows of pedestrians. My concern is that the location of the canopy tight against the petrol station forecourt will funnel vulnerable road users into conflict with vehicles accessing the petrol station. This is not acceptable.

Interactions of those accessing the charging bays:

In addition to the effect the placing of a static structure in this location one has to consider the interplay of those accessing the site with people making legitimate use of the surrounding area.

Looking at the information supplied I have a number of concerns that require more detailed investigation.

The layout of the bays and chargers require 'nose in' parking between timber uprights. This will require a wide swing in order to line up before reaching the uprights. This will probably be more of an annoyance rather than a danger to other road users. This said, given the high concentrations of vulnerable road users in this area anything that takes drivers concentration away from vulnerable modes is not ideal.

Exiting the bays is the area that gives me genuine concern.

- We will have people using vehicles that are not familiar to them, therefore fine control of steering or throttle cannot be assumed.

- The vehicle will have to be reversed straight back so as to avoid hitting the uprights (the driver will inevitably focus attention on these and not necessarily on vulnerable road users behind the vehicle).
- The vehicles are very quiet and accelerate strongly.
- For at least the two bays adjacent to the substation Inter-visibility when reversing is totally compromised by the substation itself. You have to reverse blind into an active carriageway and just hope nothing is coming. Not acceptable.

Before any determination can be made on this application a full vehicle track / swept path analysis is required along with a full highway safety audit.

Kindest Regards
Andrew Combes