
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 September 2021 08:10
To: Planning (Isles of Scilly)
Subject: Objection to application P/21/045/COU

For the attention of the Planning Department.

I wish to raise several objections to retrospective planning application P/21/045/COU on land at Lawrence's Brow, St. Martin's.

[REDACTED]

My primary objection is one of visual impact on the landscape. Although there was a shuttered concrete shed on the site the footprint of the current dwelling is now significant larger than the original shed. The materials that have been used have significantly changed the appearance of the original building and are in no way like for like replacements. In my opinion the visual impact on the landscape of the new dwelling is greater and it in no way enhances the natural beauty of the area. As this is a retrospective planning application unfortunately no advice was sought on suitable building materials before construction began. The main part of the dwelling is therefore still fundamentally constructed of ancient, crumbling shuttered concrete sitting directly on sand. This is not a structure with longevity that enhances the landscape or that adds good quality, suitable accommodation to the housing stock. A previous application to construct temporary yurts on the site was denied partly on the grounds of visual impact.

Secondly the applicant states that the business is thriving and therefore the dwelling is needed for staff accommodation. The evidence supplied by the applicant to support this claim is very weak. There are no testimonials or paperwork from businesses that are being supplied. There is no official paperwork that shows the current size of the business or any meaningful evidence of a business plan beyond two adjoining fields, previously rented to Karmar St Martin's, having the potential to be used.

Due to this being a retrospective application no bat survey was conducted. I very frequently observe bats within 400m from the site. I therefore find the applicant's assertion that no bats have been observed in the area very surprising.

Lastly there are inaccuracies in the timeline of events supplied by the applicant. The roof of the shed was not damaged to the extent suggested. The roof was removed by the applicant to the point shown in the pictures and this removal was done when building materials had already been delivered to the site. I would also dispute that there is any meaningful evidence, to show that the original shed has been used for accommodation within living memory. It is more likely that the items found there had been in storage as that was, for a long time, the shed's primary use.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]