



COUNCIL OF THE ISLES OF SCILLY

Planning Department
Town Hall, St Mary's, Isles of Scilly, TR21 0LW
☎01720 424455
✉planning@scilly.gov.uk

Mr Mike Bradbury
Mike Bradbury Design
Studio St Ives
4 Gabriel Street
St Ives
TR26 2LU

Email only: mikebdesign@btinternet.com

12th September 2023

Dear Mike,

PLANNING REFERENCE P/23/046/HH
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED: Removal of hipped roof and construction of new roof incorporating first floor accommodation and internal alterations.
LOCATION: Bishop View, Porthloo, St Mary's, Isles Of Scilly, TR21 0NF

Further to the submission of the above application, my letter of the 18th August and our subsequent meeting. Thank you for sending through the photomontage of the proposed elevations and the amended design and access statement.

I note the reference to the existing property being structurally sound but in need of improvements and there being no intention to rebuild any part of the existing property other than the re-roofing. I note the reference to the property being unincumbered/open market with a potential to use it as a permanent home (as the applicant intends) but that it could be used as a holiday home or Air B&B. I am aware that an existing home (a C3 dwelling) could occasionally be let out as a single dwelling, without a change of use. I would always advise anyone to check with the LPA before making such arrangements on the basis that if the use is primarily short-let holiday accommodation, then such a use could constitute a material change of use requiring planning permission.

I have now considered the additional information provided and whilst I recognise the proposed design has sought to minimise the increase in scale (by using the roofspace as opposed to constructing a two storey house), in terms of the wider landscape impact, the proposal remains well above the space standards controlled in Policy LC8. I note that the applicant is local and has a large family, but this is a modest family sized home currently and will be increased by over 80% above the minimum space standards. The policy seeks to ensure homes are no larger than 30% above the space standards, without adequate justification. The justification in this case, requiring additional space for visiting family is noted, but I am not persuaded, however, that this justification is adequate when weighed against the harm that would result through the significant increase in value of this property.

Although our calculations differ from those submitted, I have used the calculations provided in the application. This notes that the resulting dwelling will be a large two storey, three bedroom house with integral garage. The proposal will result in a home that has 184.5m² (excluding the garage) of gross internal floorspace. This is 80% above the minimum space standards for a property of this size. I appreciate that the metric used to guide this is generally used to gauge the size of new housing but it has been agreed and adopted by this Council in the Local Plan, following an independent examination in public, in both policies for new homes (LC3) and residential extensions (LC8). It was at the local plan examination that the issue of including a maximum space standard was raised by the Inspector, on the basis of the extraordinarily high house prices on the islands, and the issues this has for retaining an island population. The inclusion of the maximum figure of 30% above the minimum was recommended as a main modification by the Inspector and subject to public consultation before the local plan was adopted. I refer you to paragraph 34 of the Inspectors Final Report:

34. On the other hand, many modestly sized homes on the islands have, in the past, been extended substantially or replaced by much larger dwellings. This has significantly reduced the supply of modestly-sized, less expensive market homes which are affordable to local people. Consequently, the principle of the plan seeking to limit the floor area of new, replacement and extended dwellings is justified in order to ensure that the islands' housing stock is suitable to meet local residents' needs. However, the wording of policies LC3, LC5, LC8 and LC9 in respect of this matter lacks clarity and consistency between the policies and consequently for the policies to be effective MM14, MM15 and MM18 are necessary. These modifications merge policies LC8 and LC9 to ensure consistency.

It would appear that the ground floor could comfortably deliver a self-contained 2-bedroom unit of accommodation (for 4 people sharing) at around 103 square metres of floorspace, and the upper floor could comfortably deliver a self-contained 1-bedroom unit of accommodation (for 2 people sharing) at around 83 square metres. If this was proposed, then the application could align with the local plan. Given the declared housing crisis I would like to explore whether the applicant would like to reconsider the proposal in this respect?

I have discussed the proposal with the Lead Member for Planning and on the basis of this significant increase in scale as one single dwelling as submitted, I am referring the proposal to be determined at Full Council in October, which is agreed with the Lead Member. In light of the conflict with Policy LC8 it is my intention to recommend this proposal for refusal. If you wish to amend this proposal, either to scale down the size of the works or to propose a change of use, then I would request that it is withdrawn.

Yours sincerely



Lisa Walton
Chief Planning Officer