


RECEIVED

By Liv Rickman at 3:08 pm, Jun 19, 2023

ROBERT GREEN

Newfort House
Porth oo
St Mary's
Is es of Sci y
TR21 ONE



18th June 2023

Re : Planning Application P/23/036 - Holgates Green, Change of Use - Resubmission of application P/22/056

Dear Lisa

As there is no significant changes to the previously refused application as noted above, I do not feel that my comments need to be ammended greatly and therefore find below my objections as previouusly stated (some edits).

Firstly, on a point of principle. The hand drawn diagram (Layout Plan With Dimensions) should not be accepted as a formal element of the planning application. It is not to scale. It does not include scale bars. It is demonstrably unclear and open to interpretation. A much clearer, scaled drawing should be included. As such the applicattion should not have been accepted in its current format.

Secondly. I wholeheartedly object to the planning application in its entirety.

Historically, since the demolition of the Hotel, Holgates Green has been an open space, enjoyed by all members of the community without restriction. I feel that the inclusion of food concessions, Lily's Kitchen will not be the only one if this is allowed to happen, will fundamentally destroy the relaxed nature of its setting.

The curb will be damaged by the constant ingress and egress of vehicles, the grass will be destroyed also, especially during the wetter months as well as by the general foot-fall to the area.

It will, in reality, take up anywhere in between $\frac{1}{5}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$ of the available space on the Green as residents and visitors enjoying the space will need to accommodate people ordering and waiting for food, as well as the sound and smell of a petrol/diesel generator, which will be unpleasant regardless of the amount of shielding provided. This will greatly restrict the current seating area and the enjoyment of the green space.

The unit is towable and relatively small, why can't it be parked kerbside at the bus stop facing Holgates Green instead. I assume the timings don't clash with the bus timetable.

Or alternatively, relocate the glass and tin recycling 'bells' to free up space on the hardstanding behind the public conveniences.

On other practical matters, what happens when there are events held on the Green? Are the concessions told they are not allowed to trade? Does the event have to include the concessions? What is the legality of the situation?

I understand that there are difficulties in locating new and much needed food concessions in Hugh Town, and I commend the applicants for their venture. Holgates Green, however, is not the solution.

My suspicion is that this is tied in with the Town Hall re-development and the potential removal of food concessions on Porthcressa. Firstly, the Town Hall plan is not set in stone. There is much work to do on the detail of this scheme. My own personal view is that the area between Silver Street and Ingrams Opening, including the area behind the TIC, needs to be re-designed to accommodate a wider choice of food concessions, together with the appropriate power supplies required (rather than relying on noisy and polluting generators).

It should also include for better seating provision to cater to the needs of the clientele.

Yes, this takes investment, but it is required to maintain a healthy thriving small trader economy. If planned correctly the Porthcressa site would become an even more thriving space than it already is during the summer months and the inclusion of supported small venues would (in my personal opinion) improve the funding chances for the Town Hall as it will benefit a wider community and tourist audience. Supporting small business and allowing for growth and expansion of opportunity.

This proposed solution, I am afraid, looks like the easy way out. It simply does not deal with the main issue of lack of investment in the island infrastructure, both for residents, keen entrepreneurs like Lily's Kitchen, or the improvement of provision for holiday makers. All of which we desperately need to keep this economy thriving.

I have been told that the previous submission had roughly 50/50 support, for and against. This analysis is flawed as my breakdown below confirms.

Of the 73 representations to the previous, refused submission, it would appear that there are more in favour.

The breakdown being 40 in favour and 32 against. (I've considered one application as neutral)

This does not provide a fully representative picture of views on St Marys.

Of the 40 in favour :

12 live on St Mary's and are therefore directly affected.

12 live on Tresco. A surprising number to be interested in an application which does not directly affect them.

16 are mainland dwelling. Also a surprising representation.

Of the 36 against :

26 live on St Mary's

6 are mainland dwelling.

From these figures I would suggest that there is a greater number of St Mary's residents against this application than for, by a degree of 2 to 1.

Regards

Robert Green

