

From: [Keith Bradford](#)
To: [Planning \(Isles of Scilly\)](#)
Subject: Re: P/21/102/COU Land at Lower Town, St Martins
[image001.png](#)
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

On Fri, 24 Dec 2021 at 15:40, Dawn Bradford [REDACTED] > wrote:
Re Planning Application P/21/102/COU, Applicant Response to Member's 'Call in'

Dear Lisa,

Thank you for the early indication that Councillor Dan Marcus, Portfolio Holder for Planning has yet again, 'Called in' our application for a Shepherd's hut. There have been 4 applications for Shepherd's huts on St. Martins since the new Local Plan was published and came into effect this year. They are:

P/21/075/COU Bradford, P21/102/COU Bradford

P/21/099/COU Davis, P/21/105/COU Perkins

It is curious and somewhat perplexing that 50% of these have been 'Called in', and both are mine. I am pleased to note however that this time the Planning Protocol has been followed, unlike on the previous occasion (**P/21/075COU**) when the 'Call in', initiated by the Portfolio Holder for Planning was made some two weeks **after** the end of the consultation period.

Whilst it is very reasonable to 'Call in' applications, it would be reassuring for Islanders to see that their applications, and indeed the agency responses had been read and carefully considered. As members of the public are not allowed to speak at the Full Council, I am writing to you to clarify some erroneous statements made in the 'Call In' paper, in the hope that Members will hear my voice alongside that of Councillor Marcus when arriving at a decision. Planning Law as we all know, is governed by 'Material' issues and not ones of speculation, or apparent bias.

Call In Written Statements:

Councillor Marcus Wrote: *'Public interest in development, because 1 new unit of accommodation required in addition to two already approved within the same field. Unclear why this has come in as a separate application after the Council granted two for holiday let use and why it wasn't considered as part of the previous application, if the applicant can't operate the two approved without somewhere for staff use.'* [please note, **'as a separate application after the Council granted two for holiday let use'**, the Council actually granted **'Change of Use for the Land.'**]

We were **specifically** advised by the LPA to apply for Change of Use of Land and not building permission, email exchanges clarify this. Furthermore, we were **specifically** advised by the LPA not to include the Staff Accommodation application with the letting Shepherds Huts application, email exchanges also clarify this.

Our application stated: *'The Local Plan 2021, (LC1 and LC4) in addressing the issue of Staff Accommodation', it identifies:*

- *The need to support an ageing population that require the income from the lets to support their retirement*
- *The need for scaled and localised staffing accommodation on a seasonal use basis*
- *The constraints of available building plots to accommodate potential demand'*

We then provided the following rationale:

'The proprietors of the business are passed and approaching retirement age. The application is designed to increase the availability of suitable accommodation to enable the seasonal employment of 2 workers to support the St Martin's Island Letting Enterprises business. There are 5 properties for which cleaning and maintenance services are now required. The employment of 2 workers would provide 10 man days with a possible 2 additional days via overtime. There may therefore be spare capacity for the staff to provide services to other businesses close by. Having discussed this with other island businesses there is eager support for such a scenario. A particular advantage of this would be the available man days would not require any further accommodation to be found. There are numerous people already living on the islands in poor quality accommodation seeking both work and accommodation. We hope that this Staff Accommodation may provide an opportunity for locals in that situation.'

So, having achieved the first permission, we are now looking ahead to the point where full retirement occurs. Of course, we could apply for planning permission at that near future time, but there are compelling reasons for doing so now:

1. All the groundworks and infrastructure works will be completed now, minimising future disruption.

Local businesses across the island have welcomed the idea of accommodation and spare man days that can be utilised. The off island businesses often just require 1 or 2 days extra help per week, in season. The problem is housing staff. Applications such as ours and P/21/105/COU provide much needed accommodation to help alleviate these problems. Not all island businesses can afford to provide staff accommodation and, were they to do so, it would lead to a possible proliferation of accommodation across the islands when a cooperative approach may be much better.

2. Shipment of materials and connectivity to 'Off Grid' utilities would be achieved in a cost effective manner and reduce disturbance to the community as everything would arrive at one time.

3. Our tenant neighbours, application P21/099/COU are planning to purchase their hut at the same time. Should their application be successful it means all works carried out to the Land South of the Barns at Lower Town would occur at one time and minimise disruption to the local community.

Councillor Marcus secondly wrote: 'Concerns about the impact upon residential amenity'

The delegated powers' questions Councillor Marcus and Lisa Walton must address are:

Amenity YES OR NO (***our italics***)

- a. Is the proposal acceptable with regard to any significant overlooking/loss of privacy issues? (***There are none***)
- b. Has the proposal been designed to respect the amenities of neighbouring properties avoiding unreasonable loss of light or an overbearing impact? (***Yes***)
- c. Is the proposal acceptable with regard to any significant change or intensification of use? ***There are no guidelines for this, but the plot is appreciably larger than that for the Tresco Estate application P/21/085/COU, deemed a caravan park by the applicant's agents, Llewellyn***

Harker Lowe, in their 'Fire Strategy' submission and was acknowledged as such by Natural England in response to said application.

We addressed this matter in our Planning Statement, page 4 of the application.

Quote: In consideration of the density of building for this site we have considered the density of units on the Tresco workers' caravan park: P/21/085/COU

- o 'Outline Fire Strategy, Context (license issues); 'Government guidance indicates that a license is not required **for a caravan site** used for this purpose.'
- o Natural England Response: 'Planning Consultation for the **provision of 7 no. static caravans.**'
- o Additionally, we would point to the clustering of the storage barns to the north of the proposed site which is far denser than currently proposed in this application.

Councillor Marcus thirdly wrote: 'Concerns about other impacts.....Over development of site, lack of detail in previous application re staff need.'

Clearly, as shown above, the site is far from at risk of over development with 1 additional shepherd's hut. It is in a very secluded and spacious location, far more so than the approved Tresco site. As for, 'lack of detail in previous application re staff need', we were applying for change of use of land under LPA advisement. This is a separate application, based on the success of that application, and a positive communal response to staff accommodation requirements. Should the LPA feel we are approaching a comfort zone re density of mobile huts on site, we are quite accepting of the fact that a condition of permission is that; 'no further applications for mobile huts on this site would be accepted'. We understand the pressures on the LPA and the need to balance applications against the islands' ability to absorb development. However, we are a small off island where staff are few, and available high quality staff accommodation even less so.

Councillor Dorrien-Smith **had** every right to expect that his application for a caravan park to accommodate temporary staff, P/21/085/COU, would be fairly treated.

James Francis **has** every right to expect that his business's application for staff accommodation, P/21/107/FUL, will be treated fairly.

Fellow islander Terry Perkins **has** every right to expect that his application for staff accommodation, P/21/105/COU, will be treated fairly.

May I, Dawn Bradford, application for staff accommodation, **P/21/102/COU**, have the same expectation?

Our local Councillor Toby Dougan did not call this in. It seems obtuse that a St. Mary's Councillor has done so, even if he is the portfolio holder. What material matters justify this?

Every single issue raised in the 'Call in' paper has already been fully addressed in our original application and in some detail, and there are no Material Planning reasons for this 'Call in'.

The delegated decision on planning application P/21/023/COU - Parting Carn for two static Shepherds Huts gives pause for thought; should the same criteria be applied to this application? We all need confidence in fair representation and decision making at Council meetings.

Councillor Mumford asked a question of the Chairman at the **Full Council** meeting on 16th of November 2021; In a discussion relating specifically to my previous planning application, she asked: **'What's the point of rules if we bend them?'**. I believe the populace of Scilly would agree with her and I hope, as do we all, for a fair hearing and consideration of my application.

And finally as it is Christmas Eve, I would like to wish everyone at the LPA a very Happy Christmas.

Dawn Bradford

