

From: [Lisa Walton](#)
To: [Dawn Bradford](#)
Subject: RE: FW: P/21/102/COU Land at Lower Town, St Martins
Date: 06 January 2022 16:44:28
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Dear Dawn,

Thank you for the comprehensive response. I will upload this to our website for completeness.

My original query was in relation to this very specific suggested policy requirement, which the plan does not state.

The need to support an ageing population that require the income from the lets to support their retirement

If you require more time to speak to businesses who are supportive, then please let me know, I would be happy to agree an extension of time.

The key policy is very much policy LC4 in terms of considerations, then we would look at other policies as necessary to assess such an application for staff accommodation. The starting point is 'does the application submitted address and comply with Policy LC4' as you are proposing a unit of staff accommodation. My question about why you didn't include the third shepherds hut when we were considering the two holiday let shepherds huts, relates to (1) a) as it seems like those two units have now provided the justification for this third unit.

LC4 Staff Accommodation

(1) New staff accommodation for businesses and organisations will be permitted where:

a) an appraisal is submitted demonstrating that there is a functional and operational need for the proposed accommodation that cannot be met by existing suitable accommodation available in the area; and

b) the size and type of the proposed accommodation is appropriate to the functional and operational needs of the business or organisation; and

c) on St Mary's the proposed accommodation is within or adjoining an existing settlement unless it involves the re-use of an existing building in accordance with Policy SS3; or

d) on an off-Island the proposed accommodation is located within an existing building or adjacent or well related to the existing business consistent with Policy LC7.

(2) All staff accommodation permitted will be subject to occupancy restrictions. In addition to the above, seasonal staff accommodation will only be permitted where it:

a) is located in an area that relates well to the business where possible, with the exception of the re-use of buildings; and

b) does not cause harm to residential amenity through staff working unsociable hours.

(3) Where staff accommodation is required for a new business, the development will only be supported where it is demonstrated that the business is viable in the long term, supported by a business plan for a minimum of five years.

Thanks

Lisa

From: Dawn Bradford <info@stmartinselfcatering.com>
Sent: 06 January 2022 14:52
To: Lisa Walton <Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: FW: P/21/102/COU Land at Lower Town, St Martins

Dear Lisa

Thank you for your queries regarding my application for a staff accommodation unit on our field in Lower Town. I note both your statements and queries and would respond as follows.

Context.

1) You queried our reference to the ageing population and the 'economic' impact on them through a lack of seasonal staff due to a paucity of suitable staff accommodation.

I am close to retirement age, my husband is 5 years past it. As is referenced in many, many parts of the Local Plan the demography of the island is irrevocably getting older. I quote a few:

Para 54: *'Economic success will also require changes to the current declining trend of the working age population.'*

Para 55: *'The working-age population, which refers to those between the ages of 16 and 64, is set to decline from the current 65% of the population to 54% by 2030. This decline may have implications for the availability of people to fulfil key roles within the community and economy.'*

Para 66: *'Recent population decline has changed the longer-term growth trend, and any ongoing decline in the available workforce (working-age population) could have significant impacts on wider aims to adapt and improve the local economy.'*

Para 66: *'The economy of the Isles of Scilly is vulnerable, as it is unusually self-contained, dominated by a few business sectors such as tourism.'*

Para 67: *'The ambition is to work proactively with applicants and investors to secure developments that improve the economic and social conditions of Scilly.'*

Para 75: *'Additionally, there is a need to capitalise on and strengthen the quality and value of tourism, given that it will continue to dominate the islands' economy over the plan period; whilst recognising its vulnerability to transportation, climate change and financial shocks...Economic success will also require changes to the current declining trend of the working-age population.'*

Para 76: **'Fundamental to this challenge is recognising that a rapidly ageing population will have implications for the types of homes that must be provided, and the availability and access to social and health care services. There will be workforce-related requirements that continue to support an older population, which are linked to the housing aspirations of this Local Plan.'**

Response 1:

Therefore Lisa, we see that the Council's Local Plan clearly identifies the problems of an ageing population both in terms of social need and the economy. Over 80% of Scilly's economy is tourist based. The majority of the businesses are owned by an ageing population, the revenue income is their pension. The readily identified problem of seasonal workers to support these businesses is writ large in the Local Plan also. We commend the Council's perspicacity in this matter. You will forgive me for

saying it would be obtuse to observe that my paraphrasing the Council's own words in the application can not be evidenced by reading the Plan itself.

Our application is that we want the staffing accommodation to support the current and established

SMILE business, the new opportunities coming, which align perfectly with the Council's own aspirations for entrepreneurial initiatives in the Tourism Sector; and prepare for our retirement with an expanded revenue stream, strengthened tourism offer and accommodation for a reliable seasonal workforce recruitment.

2) You queried the reference to the constraints of available land and the reference to LC1 in our application.

In justifying the Council's position on the economy, demography, tourism, seasonal workers and their accommodation, social care and housing, reference is made throughout the Local Plan to the challenges to be faced and the solutions that may be sought.

Para 285: **'As there is a finite amount of land for new development, which is heavily constrained by multiple designations, coupled with affordability issues for the local community..'**

POLICY LC1, Isles of Scilly Housing Strategy to 2030, states clearly its relationship to staffing accommodation in the first paragraph, vis:



Source: Page 79 Isles of Scilly Local Plan 2015-2030

Response 2: The Isles of Scilly Planning Portal provides a helpful link to the Communities and Local Government Planning Aid. This states that the first Material Planning Consideration in determining permission is: **'Local, strategic, national planning policies, and policies in the Development Plan.'** Applicants are encouraged to give as full a description and justification for their submission as possible.

Therefore, our fully referencing the Local Plan is directly in line with encouraged practice. This is a new Local Plan and we have therefore been as thorough as we can be in understanding the Council's intent, direction and meaning; all of which clearly supports our application. Policy LC4 supports the staffing accommodation *criteria*, whereas Policy LC1, very clearly supports the *justification* for the application, namely;

'provision of...b) appropriate staff accommodation to support the continuity and viability of businesses and organisations, in accordance with Policy LC4.'

The reference to land is very apposite as it is limited. Our site will support a further hut easily. We are fortunate to have the land, opportunity and finances to consider this application. Others are not necessarily as fortunate. Some islanders that have approached us with an interest in shepherd's huts

are, not unreasonably, more interested in an affordable form of holiday let that will increase their income, as indeed were we.

3) You queried the business model behind our thinking regarding staff deployment on both our own business and for neighbouring businesses. You asked a supplementary question regarding the calculation and deployment of possible man days. In addition, you referenced the statement in LC4 d), regarding the proximity of the staff accommodation to the business so supported, vis:

d) 'on an off-Island the proposed accommodation is located within an existing building or adjacent or well related to the existing business consistent with Policy LC7.'

Para 286 Staff Accommodation; **'As a small island-based community, there is a need for Scilly to retain a balanced workforce. Clearly, staff accommodation needs cannot be met outside the islands, due to the expense and logistics of commuting to and from the mainland. Where the skills are not available in the local community, there is a need to recruit to the islands from elsewhere. Policy LC4 recognises that additional staff accommodation may be required for businesses or organisations. Such accommodation could comprise small-scale seasonal workers' accommodation to meet the particular needs of agriculture, fishing or tourism, as well as a range of longer-term accommodation for businesses and organisations that require staff to relocate to the islands on a permanent or semi-permanent basis. Longer-term staff accommodation may need to cater for families, unlike shorter-term accommodation for more transient staff.'**

Para 287; **'Due to the small scale of the islands, it will be possible for workers in most occupations to live anywhere on the island and be within reasonable distance of the business location. However, very occasionally the nature of a business may make it essential for someone to live on, or in close proximity to, the business premises. All staff accommodation should be commensurate with the needs of the business.'**

Para 296: **'Off-Island Homes. During the plan period any future homes required to meet the housing needs of the off-island communities will be delivered through windfall development, rather than on sites specifically allocated for housing. This flexible approach will ensure that new homes are permitted on the off-islands in response to the needs of off-islands communities in accordance with Policies LC1 and LC7.'**

'POLICY LC7 Windfall Housing

(1) Proposals for new homes, including custom and self-build, will be permitted: b) On the off-islands where new homes are required to meet a Local Housing Need specific to that off-island.

(2) All new homes will be required to meet Local Housing Needs in accordance with Policies LC1, LC2 and LC3.'

Response 3,

First, it is clear that the Council's Local Plan has linked Policies LC1, LC4 and LC7 in their relationship to the need, and criteria, for Staff Accommodation. Our reference to those policies is therefore, in our view, manifestly justified; we are relating our plan to the policies clearly outlined above.

Second, Planning Application P/21/075/COU was a stand alone application based solely on the growing demand for accommodation to our existing business. It was inspired by the Vineyard application that demonstrated a new affordable category of tourist accommodation that also clearly

linked to the new growing demand for 'off grid' and environmentally friendly green holiday experiences. In turn, these harmonise with the Duchy and the Council's own view regarding the environment of Scilly. The land at our disposal is ideal, does not impact on local amenities and will provide an excellent example of off grid holiday experience.

Third, we have a redundant building that was granted planning permission for conversion to a small holiday let (P/18/013FUL). There were logistical problems, including CV19, in starting the work which fell into abeyance. However, we are looking at that property again and have had an exchange with the Duchy re the same. In reviewing the business and properties moving forward we have:

- 1) Teania,
- 2) Crow's Nest,
- 3) Appletree Cottage,
- 4) Shepherds Hut 1,
- 5) Shepherd Hut 2,
- 6) Potential Converted Packing Shed

Currently, my husband and I attend to the cleaning, changeovers, general maintenance, shopping, meet and greet plus the external maintenance of the properties and grounds. So, currently, with the new holiday lets we will deploy 6 man days across Teania, Crows Nest, the Shepherd's Huts and Appletree cottage, per week.

Fourth, the reality is that even finding accommodation for builders during projects is difficult, made more so by the CV19 restrictions from time to time. When we considered the Shepherd Hut projects it is clear that the landscaping and site development would benefit from additional labour in the first few years to bring the site rapidly to maturity. Thus, when looking at the packing shed project also, we saw a case for employing staff to assist in the current running of the business. It led to the concept of an additional hut for staff that would assist the current business and also lead in time to my being able to step back in due course and, in the current time, my husband being able to enjoy some retirement at the age of 70.

Fifth, this led to a realisation that if a staff accommodation was built at the same time as the current project, efficiencies at all levels would arise and minimise any future disruption to the proposed site and enable the site to mature harmoniously.

Sixth, discussions with neighbours and local businesses ensued as to their views were we to put a proposal forward. All of the immediate neighbours and businesses saw no objection and it led on to discussions as to the wider need for staff accommodation on the island. In Lower Town, the hotel and the pub are constantly in need of staff during the peak periods and other smaller businesses that diversify with fishing, diving and farming, in addition to running chalets, are also in need of extra staff when available. It was these discussions, plus the recognition of such a solution, as illustrated above, from the Local Plan, that led to the suggestion of additional man days being available for other local businesses. This does not infer we wish to start some kind of 'Employment Agency,' far from it.

Every year the social media pages of Instagram and residents' groups are awash with either young people seeking seasonal work in Scilly and local people looking for casual employees and/or spare accommodation to house them.

Therefore, to be clear, the staff accommodation is required for SMILE and will utilise 6 days per week. It is the nature of seasonal workers to try and hold down as much work as they can, with day jobs and then evening catering and cleaning as they find it. They work very hard for 5 to 6 months, save their money and then move to warmer climates during the winter, or go on well deserved backpacking holidays. The estimate we gave you was for man days **per week**.

Conversely, we are clear that our business is the priority and we can fully deploy staff in support of the SMILE business and in preparing the environment for the ecology site. We are conscious that our tenant neighbour has also applied to locate a shepherd's hut on an adjacent field so, if successful, we can work in harmony to bring the entire location up to a high standard in as short a time as possible.

If you think it is unhelpful to include the possibility of our potential staff supporting other businesses then we are content for you to remove it from the application at your discretion.

Seventh, the LPA, in initial discussions, helpfully suggested this application may be included with the previous application P/075/COU in a similar vein to the Tresco application, you also suggested that it may reduce the fees accordingly. However, we felt, unlike the Tresco application, this was sufficiently different to warrant an individual application. We were not just adding an additional shepherd's hut but a completely different class of use. It is appropriate to use a shepherd's hut as it blends perfectly with the others and the locale, bringing harmony to the site and a lovely rustic appearance to the site as it matures.

Eighth, you asked whether we could provide supporting statements from local businesses. Sadly, this wasn't raised in our initial discussions with the LPA and the consultation period had passed. If we had had more time we may have considered this, but as this is a democratic process it is important that our community feel free and able to express their views on planning applications as they see fit, rather than be cajoled into support. Normally, the converse is true as you know and we felt the application should stand opposed, or not, by our island community. You will note that as before, no one has objected via the portal.

Conclusion: We hope that we have addressed your enquiries and answered, clearly with references, why we so fully detailed those aspects of the Local Plan in our application that seemed to be both relevant and to support the Council's vision and policies for the island community.

We perfectly understand that the LPA can control the use and enjoyment of the accommodation by enforceable measures attached to the granting of permission and these are also clearly expressed in the Local Plan Policies and, as before, give us no cause for concern.

Therefore, to address your request for a statement with regard to Policy LC4 can you accept the following amendment.

In applying for staff accommodation on land South of the Barns at Lower Town, subject to a previous successful application P/075/COU, we reference Policy LC1. This states that new homes that make a positive contribution to the island community and economy through the provision of, 'appropriate staff accommodation to support the continuity and viability of businesses and organisations, in accordance with Policy LC4', **May be permitted.**

LC4 Staff Accommodation

Our St. Martin's Island Letting Enterprise is a vibrant business in Lower Town. Along with other local businesses we can expand our business but suffer a lack of support staff to help cater for the expanding business opportunities. Local businesses, whilst supportive of each other, annually compete for the seasonal staff that come to the islands and the off islands have less suitable spare capacity to house the staff that are required. In that we are not alone, but have both the land opportunity and the means to develop if we can attract more staff.

Having reviewed the land and logistics, with regard to our current project for shepherd's huts, there is an opportunity to locate a further hut at the same time to accommodate 2 seasonal staff, subject to usual conditions being applied. The advantage of applying at this time is that shipping, ground works and disruption are kept to a minimum and labour resources for erecting the huts is optimised. We are also conscious that we are part of the ageing demographic that own and run businesses on Scilly. Recruiting staff at this point will allow a sensible and timely withdrawal into retirement in due course as the mature business runs with staff support to provide our retirement funds.

The accommodation will comfortably house 2 people, will not put additional stress on the local amenities and blend harmoniously with the existing huts and local barns that are shielded to the north. The hut will be located in a large field that has comfortable capacity to accommodate one further hut without significantly intensifying the capacity of the site.

Its location on the site will provide immediate support to guests and visitors and also, in the early years of site development, additional labour to help mature the environmental improvements and ecological developments planned for the site. The accommodation is in the immediate vicinity of the other buildings that will be supported and add no requirements for transport or resources in line with Policy LC7.

Ultimately Lisa, it is a democratic process and we can accept the outcome after scrutiny. Everything is written down and open to interpretation. Hopefully, you can now appreciate why we were so thorough in applying the Council's Policies to our application, but if you have need of further clarification may I suggest you give me a call so we can clear the matters up over the phone. We appreciate how difficult your job is and don't wish to add to the burden, nor spend any more time and money than we have already in preparing documents.

Best Regards and Happy New Year

Dawn Bradford



On Wed, Jan 5, 2022 at 5:45 PM Lisa Walton <Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Dawn,

I'm wondering if you have any further responses to the below questions?

Additionally can you elaborate on the 10 man days? Is that per month? So the two adults you propose to employ would work for you for 5 days a month each?

From: Lisa Walton

Sent: 04 January 2022 12:59

To: Dawn Bradford <info@stmartinsselfcatering.com>

Subject: RE: P/21/102/COU Land at Lower Town, St Martins

Dear Dawn,

I am in the process of writing the committee report for the third shepherds hut at this site. You state this will be required for staff accommodation. The relevant policy here would be Policy LC4 which states:

LC4 Staff Accommodation

(1) New staff accommodation for businesses and organisations will be permitted where:

a) an appraisal is submitted demonstrating that there is a functional and operational need for the proposed accommodation that cannot be met by existing suitable accommodation available in the area; and

b) the size and type of the proposed accommodation is appropriate to the functional and operational needs of the business or organisation; and

c) on St Mary's the proposed accommodation is within or adjoining an existing settlement unless it involves the re-use of an existing building in accordance with Policy SS3; or

d) on an off-Island the proposed accommodation is located within an existing building or adjacent or well related to the existing business consistent with Policy LC7.

(2) All staff accommodation permitted will be subject to occupancy restrictions. In addition to the above, seasonal staff accommodation will only be permitted where it:

- a) is located in an area that relates well to the business where possible, with the exception of the re-use of buildings; and
- b) does not cause harm to residential amenity through staff working unsociable hours.

(3) Where staff accommodation is required for a new business, the development will only be supported where it is demonstrated that the business is viable in the long term, supported by a business plan for a minimum of five years.

You have suggested the below is relevant but I don't agree that it is.

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

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

I'm not entirely sure why you note the first or third bullet points as these are not referenced anywhere in the plan and as such I do not agree that the submitted Design and Access Statement sets out the salient points to address. The key policy is the above referenced staff accommodation policy. I note that you reference approaching retirement age, but can you clarify whether the permission to grant to shepherds huts for holiday let use (P/21/075/COU) has specifically generated the need for the staff accommodation shepherds hut now proposed? If not what staff solutions have you previously relied on and why are these no longer available.

Please can you list all of the properties (you reference 5).

Can you let me know how many employees there are at SMILE before the two adults you would like to employ to develop the ecological environment of the site and the cleaning and maintenance of the Shepherds' huts for visitors. You reference two workers will provide 10 man days with a possibly additional days via overtime.

From the submission documents it would appear that the proposal is more aimed at a general staff accommodation issue for St Martins, over and above your business needs. As you note there may be spare capacity for the staff to provide services to other businesses close by and that you have discussed this with other island businesses who are eager support for such a scenario. Are you able to provide supporting statements from other business owners, on their own staff accommodation shortages. Its unclear to me how a shepherds hut for two adults sharing, would have capacity for the management and cleaning of the self-catering accommodation of SMILE (on a seasonal basis) in addition to providing staff accommodation for other businesses. Are you able to set out how you envisage this working?

Please can you ensure you address the specific policy requirements of Policy LC4 in addition to the questions noted above.

Thanks
Lisa

From: Dawn Bradford <info@stmartinselfcatering.com>
Sent: 24 December 2021 15:40
To: Lisa Walton <Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk>
Cc: Keith Bradford <keithbradford1@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: P/21/102/COU Land at Lower Town, St Martins

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:*

- o *The need to support an ageing population that require the income from the lets to support their retirement*
- o *The need for scaled and localised staffing accommodation on a seasonal use basis*
- o *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



On Wed, Dec 22, 2021 at 3:05 PM Lisa Walton <Lisa.Walton@scilly.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Dawn,

Further to the submission of the above application. I writing to advise you that your application will be presented to Full Council on Thursday 20th January 2022. At the present time the meeting is still intended to be held at the Old Wesleyan Chapel at 09:30am.

Regards

Lisa

Lisa Walton *MRTPI*
Chief Planning Officer
Council of the Isles of Scilly

Email: lisa.walton@scilly.gov.uk
Tel: 01720 424456 (Voicemail only currently)
Mob: 07871 982537 (mobile phone signal dependent)
Reception: 0300 1234 105



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 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.

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 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.