

Porthcressa St Marys Isles of Scilly TR21 0JQ. Tel: 01720 422431

E-Mail: ian@sibleysonscilly.com

S. Whitehouse Esq, Monitoring & Enforcement Officer, South Downs National Park

By E-Mail: <u>Sam.Whitehouse@southdowns.gov.uk</u>

7th April 2025

Dear Mr Whitehouse,

Bryher Boatyard: P/25/016/COU

Thank you for your time on the phone last week.

I have now had the opportunity to consider the Consultation Responses and to discuss the matter with my client.

In the light of the flood risk response in particular, you advised my client to withdraw the application and re-submit on a different site. Because time is of the essence in securing essential staff accommodation for the current season this is not a practical proposition. We therefore propose re-positioning the accommodation pods away from FZ3 if the mitigating proposals detailed below are not considered sufficient.

Environmental Impact

We note that Bruce Forrest has no objections on ecological grounds.

Flood Risk

We make the following observations:

- 1. By their very nature, the pods are moveable. In the (highly unlikely) event of flood risk from predicted storm surge the pods could be moved for the duration of the risk period. Weather forecasting is extremely reliable, allowing ample warning of potential storm surge conditions. Given the nature of my client's business (boat hire) any conceivable risk of storm surge would be acted upon in good time. Electricity, water and sewerage connections will be "quick release" and relocation of the pods could be effected within several hours.
- 2. We are not aware the proposed location of the pods has ever flooded, and given the short-term and seasonal nature of the pods we question the need to consider the impact of climate change.

3. My client would be happy to have a condition attached to a planning permission restricting occupation of the pods from 1st April to 31st October, when the notional risk of storm surge is de minimis.

We therefore consider that, in context, the flood risk is minimal and that the mitigation measures proposed are proportionate and reasonable.

However, in order to secure this much needed consent, my client is prepared to move the pods away from FZ3. Two possible sites are identified on the attached plan.

Option 1: In the adjoining field to the North-West of the septic tank, and;

Option 2: In the storage area adjacent to the chandlery building.

Either site can be appropriately screened / fenced to minimise any visual impact.

Please advise which of these sites is preferred and we will amend the application accordingly.

Drainage

It is incorrect to state that there will be an additional two people using the existing system. Those staff members currently use the wc and shower facilities at present, camping nearby to sleep only.

The existing soakaway is working satisfactorily and already accommodating usage by the two staff members hoping to occupy the snooze pods

Water

Water supply will be from the existing metered supply serving the boatyard business.

Visual Impact

I would make the following observations:

- 1. The pods will be appropriately screened to minimise any visual impact.
- 2. It is very typical for portacabins such as these to be located in working boatyards for office / storage purposes, and to my knowledge these do not need planning permission. Such units would not require screening and would therefore have a greater visual impact than the proposed accommodation pods.
- 3. I note there is currently a planning application for approximately 24 accommodation cabins in a field in Old Town, St Marys. These are directly visible from the road, currently unscreened and opposite residential accommodation. Given that the assessment of visual impact is an inherently subjective matter, can you please advise how the two sites will be assessed to ensure consistency across various applications?

ı	IOOK	forward	tΛ	nearing	trom v	VOII
	IOOK	ioi wai a	·	IICUI IIIE	110111	vou.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Sibley

Ian Sibley MRICS