



Serena Balkwill
2 Branksea House
Church Road
St Mary's
Isles of Scilly
TR21 0NA

14th September 2015

Senior Officer
Planning and Development Management
Town Hall
St Mary's
Isles of Scilly
TR21 0LW

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Reference P/15/068/FUL

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed planning applications referenced above.

The negative impact I see on Material Planning Considerations are:-

- **Loss of sunlight** –both the flats at Rosevean and the houses at Branksea Close would lose a considerable amount of sunlight. To a lesser extent my own flat at 2 Branksea House would also be negatively affected by this;
- **Overshadowing/loss of outlook** – all the houses on Branksea Close together with my flat at 2 Branksea House would suffer a loss of outlook. The 2 end properties of Branksea Close would also be overshadowed;
- **Loss of privacy** – due to the proximity of the proposed new buildings to neighbouring properties both sited off Rams Valley, Branksea Close and Branksea House potentially a loss of privacy would be created. This also goes against the guidelines stated in the Isles of Scilly Design Guide. When my flat was built the proposed siting of my bedroom window was changed due to Branksea Close residents' objections about being overlooked/loss of their privacy. This now means my small/narrow width bedroom window faces the proposed development;
- **Nature conservation** – all who live in the area of this proposed build are fortunate to enjoy the 'little green oasis' this garden provides in an otherwise built up area. There are many birds, insects and animals who benefit from this garden. The application states *'The garden space which is the proposed location for the block is largely under-utilised and overgrown. Ultimately this application aims to make the whole site more visually appealing as well as making the most of previously unused land'* It is a garden, how are gardens meant to be used? It has been the owners' choice not to tend to the garden and therefore it has become

overgrown. I also cannot agree that 2 hostel blocks would be more visually appealing than a garden, overgrown or otherwise.

- **Loss or effect on trees** – I understand some trees have already been cut down without prior consent in this area. It is unacceptable that there should be a further loss here;
- **Incompatible or unacceptable uses** – the area is primarily a quiet, family residential street and Close. The siting of 2 blocks of staff accommodation is completely out of character of the current buildings and demographic;
- **Highway issues** – Church Road already suffers from lack of residential parking space. There are often works vehicles, a Skybus minibus and Buzzabus parked along this stretch of road. I would envisage Tregarthen's would also add to these vehicles already competing for space along this busy road? They have earmarked their current garage for the storage of bikes etc not for the garaging of vehicles;
- **Physical infrastructure** – I understand both the residents at Branksea Close and Rams Valley have experienced problems with their sewerage drainage. These problems will only worsen with an additional 40 people housed in this area. It would also contradict the DEFRA consultation which identified significant concerns about the fragile condition of the present water and sewerage system on St Mary's;
- **Layout and density of building design** – to have an additional two buildings added to this plot with potentially 40 people housed within the 3 buildings is overdevelopment of a residential site.
- **Noise or disturbance** – there has already been several incidences of noise disturbance from the current property due to staff holding parties inside the current property and in the garden. Several neighbouring residents made complaints at the time to the previous owners and police about these disturbances. Letters of apology were written by both Tregarthen's and Speros management and they kindly provided mobile telephone numbers for anyone to call day or night if they had a problem in the future. There obviously was an acknowledgement of these issues at the time and safeguards were put in place to ensure these problems did not continue at the time – all this for only a handful of staff living in the main house – imagine how hard it would be to police 40 people in the same area. Although I could hear the noise from the main house, the people chatting in the garden late at night was more of an issue for me as my bedroom window faces onto the garden. On the occasions when people were in the garden I had to wear earplugs to in order to get to sleep. I should not be expected to have to do this every night if the planned development goes ahead. It would affect my wellbeing.

On a general note I cannot see how the development will create jobs for the local community. Seasonal workers will be the main inhabitants of this proposed plan and I cannot see why there needs to be an increase in staff generally on the islands if the current hotels/guesthouses are seeing a downturn in bookings. I would also suggest Tregarthen's would benefit from keeping their staff 'on site' in their current purpose built staffing block – this expansion to another part of the islands is totally unnecessary.

I fully understand that the building of affordable homes in the future for local people is a must for the Islands so we can attract key workers and retain our home grown talent. However this development does not serve this purpose.

I would also surmise, as other objectors have alluded to, that the reason the applicant has submitted 3 separate planning applications for this site is in the hope we, the local residents, will be placated by one of the applications being rejected so the others can be approved.

Yours faithfully

Serena Balkwill