

Liv Rickman

From: Planning (Isles of Scilly)
Subject: FW: Application number: P/24/011/FUL
Attachments: View.jpg

From: stuart.moore Moore <PROVIDED>
Sent: 01 April 2024 12:18
To: Planning (Isles of Scilly) <planning@scilly.gov.uk>
Subject: Application number: P/24/011/FUL

CAUTION: This is an **EXTERNAL** email which was sent from outside of Cornwall Council's network. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. Do not provide any login or password details if requested.

Dear CIOS planning dept,

I am writing in response to the planning application for ten houses at Telegraph

I have a number of issues I would like to raise which are as follows....

1. The CIOS Local Plan talks of the need for affordable housing.

This proposal is not for affordable housing.

the application states that these houses are for an "intermediate" market.

It states on page 6 of the Design, Access and Planning Statement that these homes are for "intermediate and market rental homes". Who determines the rent? As far as I can see, affordable homes are deemed to be 20% below the market rent, and intermediate between the two, but how is the market defined, particularly given that the Duchy control a significant amount of the housing stock? Will there be any mechanisms to ensure that these properties don't become open-market rentals?

Why aren't these affordable homes? Given the Duchy's privileged status and position, why should it leave a cash-strapped Local Authority or housing association to provide affordable housing? If there is no formal control implemented here, we may have 10 new homes which locals cannot afford.

In addition, page 11 of the Design, Access and Planning Statement talks of "attracting younger workers and households in order to slow the trend of an ageing population." Does this mean that those who already live and work on the Islands will not be given priority in allocation of any new houses? If this is the case, and the idea is to attract people to the Islands, then this development will solve nothing of the current housing problem.

2.The Local Plan correctly reflects the need for the Islands' economy to diversify. It also states in paragraph 315 within "Building a Strong Working Community" that supporting agriculture is critical to the Islands' future. Behind every greenfield site there is both an environmental and an economic story; in this case, from an economic view, this field is part of our farm and equine enterprise which supports between 8-10 local full time working people and additional seasonal staff. Once a field is lost to development it is gone forever

3.One of the main themes which quite rightly runs through the Local Plan is the preservation and enhancement of our environment. In addition, it mentions the fundamental link between the environment and the economy of the Islands: paragraph 302 states that "the quality of the environment underpins the economy." Losing another greenfield site and building out of the main settlement areas risks degrading the environment, adding additional traffic and more hustle and bustle away from the more developed areas

4.Promoting a Sustainable Scilly section states: "...development should be directed towards brownfield sites wherever possible." Nothing has visibly happened to the museum site and so far nothing to either the Carn Thomas old primary or secondary school sites. I accept that building here is difficult and expensive (as is all building on Scilly), but if we really value our environment and our green spaces as is stated in the Local Plan, this is where we should be developing. Given the privileged position the Duchy exists in, the public grants it has accessed to improve its infrastructure (for example the quay extension and improvements and the recent sea defences), and the manner in which it acquired most of its Estate, I find it hard for the Duchy to argue that projects are too expensive. Why hasn't the Carn Thomas old primary school (which as far as I know is owned by the Duchy and has been empty for a significant period) been developed? If this site is too difficult for the Duchy to develop then surely it should sell the site to a developer or housing association who will develop these sites within the framework of the Local Plan. It would seem to me that building on a greenfield site in Scilly (more than anywhere) should be a last resort. In the case of the proposed application, it would appear this is being done because it's the most convenient and cheapest option.

5.In addition to the above, I feel we need to make better use of the housing stock we already have. The Duchy of Cornwall currently has a number of empty properties – some of which are substantial in size and have been empty for a considerable time. Surely before we build new, we should be re-using these empty buildings? I accept this will be expensive, but as mentioned above, the Duchy is a £1 billion estate and many of its assets it has never bought or built but assumed at for example the death of a tenant or the end of a lease. As an organisation. it should be investing and doing so in an imaginative and sustainable way. It would be a travesty if permission was granted for this development only for the Duchy to then convert its currently empty properties to high-end tourist accommodation. Categorical reassurance should be sought on this prior to any contemplation of planning permission being granted.

6. Please see the attached photo, this is the view that is going to be lost to housing, housing which is not designated as 'affordable'

There are plenty of other sites in and around town that could be utilised for this project leaving the area of Telegraph as it is.

In fact the DoC could pull down one of its many empty and expensive to renovate properties and rebuild new housing on the same site and then recycle the previous building materials

7. What the plan does not state but the DoC have said to me is that they intend to use the building Fourwinds (currently leased by BT property) as the site accommodation for the builders they intend to bring over from the mainland, which would mean that my residence at Southmead would be surrounded on three sides by building work/builders 24/7 plus all the additional traffic etc this would cause in an already small close of properties

7. Also the the plan was proposing a path through my back garden in order to connect this development with Newford Lane, this would serve no purpose

Yours sincerely

Stuart Moore

Southmead,

Telegraph,

St Mary's

