



Fairlawn  
McFarlands Down  
St. Mary's  
Isles of Scilly  
T21 0NS

28<sup>th</sup> August 2012

The Chief Planning Officer  
Mr Craig Dryden  
Council of the Isles of Scilly  
St. Mary's  
Isles of Scilly

Dear Mr Dryden

Re: Planning Reference P/12/084/FUL

We wish to make the following objections to the above planning application.

1. As stated in the enclosed estate agent's details, the applicants purchased a detached two-bedroomed bungalow with a void in the loft space, contrary to the submitted plan which claims the existing roof space contains bedroom 3 plus storage/bedroom 4. This isn't the case as there is no staircase access to the loft.
2. The footprint of the bungalow is fairly small but the proposals are to develop this bungalow out of all proportion to its original size, i.e. increasing from 2 bedrooms to 6 bedrooms plus study/bedroom. This amounts to an increase from 2 to 7 bedrooms. 5 of the 7 bedrooms plus extra bathroom are to be situated in a massively extended roof space. We believe this large increase in bedrooms from 2 to 7 is unreasonable overdevelopment and would be out of keeping with the existing size of the plot and the rest of the properties in the row. We estimate that given the extra number of bedrooms plus the extra study/bedroom and bathroom, the accommodation within this property will increase by more than 3 times its original size leading to over-development of the plot and the property. The number of bedrooms should therefore be reduced.
3. Many families with very young children expect children to share a bedroom in the early years. It would therefore be a number of years before the applicants' children would require separate bedrooms, during which time the opportunity may arise for this family to move to a larger house having secured a major development and a relative increase in the value on their investment.
4. In order to achieve this significant increase in bedrooms, it is proposed that the roof ridge is raised by 2 metres and the front building line is extended by 3 metres. Our concern is that the new roof would significantly block our coastal

view which we have enjoyed for nearly 30 years and take some of the light from our north facing 1<sup>st</sup> floor bedroom. This magnificent coastal view, including brilliant sunsets, was a major reason why we bought our property. As we live in the beautiful Isles of Scilly Councillors should respect the fact that our sea view is of significant importance to us and feel that the Council Planning Office should recognise this as a right in any planning development application. We would object to the loss of a large part of our only sea view.

5. Windows. We totally object to the 2 top windows and the roof light on the South Elevation which will look straight into our bedroom. We would want these removed. Frosted glass on opening windows would not be acceptable to us. The applicants have however a number of roof-lights facing east and west to which we do not object which in our view should provide adequate light and if of the right size and design should be able to be used as an upper floor roof fire escape. It should be safer to crawl out on to a sloping roof rather than to drop from a first floor window. Fire alarms especially for large young families should be obligatory.
6. Drainage. There will be a major increase in the amount of water used including soakaways and cess-pits which will put considerable pressure on drainage of the adjoining properties. This is potentially a major problem, particularly at times of heavy rainfall, bearing in mind that sewage, if flooded, could contaminate the garden surface water where later children may play. Also, a large increase in the surface area of the roof will increase run-off to the front and rear garden and affect properties down the road.

In conclusion. We would therefore request that the vertical position of High Pine's roof ridge remains in the exactly the same place in line with the properties down the road. We would request that the ridge height and position be recorded and that the extension of the proposed ridge height of 2 metres is reduced by one metre and that the extension to the front West Elevation of the property of 3 metres is also reduced by one metre to moderate the impact upon our property and our coastal view. We would object to any extension to the buildings footprint on the south elevation.

We do not believe that these restrictions are unreasonable given the otherwise enormous increase in the size of the property called "High Pines".

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Ray and Linda Wornes