

# Steve & Rosemary Smirke

"Castinicks" Rams Valley, St. Mary's, Isles Of Scilly TR21 0JX

12<sup>th</sup> September 2015

Planning Officer,  
Planning Department,  
Council of the Isles of Scilly,  
Town Hall,  
The Parade,  
St. Mary's  
TR21 0LW

RECEIVED BY THE  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
14 SEP 2015

Re: Planning Applications Nos: P|15|068 – P|15|067 – P|15|066

We are writing to register our objection to the proposed developments at Men a Vaur.

We are very concerned and shocked by this proposed huge overdevelopment on a residential site.

On the planning application it states that the 2 proposed staff blocks are in keeping with the surrounding property heights. This is not the case, our property is only 1 storey with a pitch roof so they will both be an additional storey higher with all the windows on both blocks overlooking our property thus destroying any privacy we have and also blocking our light. The ground levels on the plan show the ground sloping down to our property making the buildings even higher. In the Isles of Scilly Design Guide it states that the distance between opposite living room windows should be 21 metres – these blocks are approximately 12 metres only from our property. There is only 4 metres between each block with at best a 1 metre walkway for access. The IOS Design Guide also requires an unbroken line of 45 degrees from the centre of the nearest living room window to the proposed buildings. As far as we can see this is broken by both blocks.

At the moment our plot is bordered by hedges and trees which they cut earlier this year to the chain link fence on their side, leaving us with only half of the hedges and trees intact, so we could see through, which destroyed our privacy. The proposed blocks will be higher than the existing trees and as they appear to be tight to the boundaries on either side we are concerned that any damage to what is left of our hedges, etc. will destroy further our privacy as the plans show no provision other than a 1 metre chain link fence. If they cannot access the sides and back of the property there is also a question of maintenance?

Looking at the floor plans compared to the elevation plans, on both blocks, the entrance doors don't correspond. They are in two different places on each plan. There is also no indication on the site plan which is the front and rear elevation to each block, making it impossible to see which side the doors are on. The site plan shows the roof of block 2 with all the windows and the front door to be facing either our property or Branksea but there doesn't appear to be sufficient room for access.

The plans also state that the shed at the far end of the site will be used to house staff bikes. This shed is derelict and completely overgrown and it is unclear how access will be gained as the blocks appear to go to either boundary and Rams Valley is a private road with no public access.

There are also concerns over water (the pressure is already low) and sewerage (the drains are not coping now) and as all rooms are en-suite and there is a kitchen in each block with presumably washing machines, etc. the demands are going to overload the already stretched infrastructure.

We understand that there have already been noise issues from the main house and to put a further 25 bed spaces in the blocks alone, as well as 13 in the main house, is only going to make this a bigger issue. The blocks appear to be accessed by a small walkway so how emergency vehicles could attend is also a concern.

It is also stated in the planning application that this garden is currently derelict but this is only due to lack of any maintenance from the owners and occupiers, it was only cleared for the measuring of the plot earlier this year as previously stated. In the Planning Application section 15 Trees and Hedges the question asked "are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character?". They answer "no" and we would dispute this as we have trees and hedges forming the boundary between our garden and the proposed development site.

We understand that there is already underused staff accommodation at Tregarthens and we feel this should be used for the purpose intended and not converted and staff blocks built elsewhere.

We are also concerned what will happen in the future, should this be passed. At present the property is sub- let for other businesses staff accommodation so what restrictions would be in place regarding this or any further redevelopment in the future particularly into the pitched roofs.

We would ask all the planning officers and councillors to visit our property and see the impact this proposed development would make from our side of the site.

Yours sincerely