

## Walton,Lisa

---

**From:** Barry Coupe <barrycoupe@btinternet.com>  
**Sent:** 02 November 2016 14:45  
**To:** Walton,Lisa  
**Cc:** Georgia May  
**Subject:** Roanoke P/16/101/FUL

Dear Mrs Walton,

I have read the various letters submitted to the council in response to the above application. On behalf of my client, Adam and Georgia May, I am responding to comments made.

1. It should be understood that Georgia May comes from a family which has had it's roots on Scilly for generations, and she and the rest of the family are wishing to remain on the islands. My client has considered various options for a new house on Scilly with the appropriate accommodation for a growing family. However, the cost of moving was a major consideration against moving from Roanoke, and so it was concluded that they would apply for planning permission to extend their current house. This decision was taken following a Pre-App application, which you were generally supportive of, bearing in mind the precedents already set.
2. Much has been said in some of the letters with regard to "loss of sunlight." I would draw your attention to the fact that little or no sunlight ever gets into the gardens of either Porthcressa Road and Church Street, because of the density and close proximity of the buildings. I would also say that the Right to Light to the rear of these properties has been somewhat extinguished due to the many extension added over the past 20 years or so. In fact, you yourself said in your Pre-App email, dated 13.07.16, "It is considered that some form of accommodation to this scale, could be considered acceptable, given the amount of similar scaled extensions to the rear of properties on both Porthcressa Road and Church Street." Clearly, irrespective of the neighbours comments, the Council have set a precedent where rights to light have no bearing on other neighbouring properties in this vicinity obtaining their own planning consents over the last few years. It is clear that comments made in some of the objectors comments ignore that fact, and totally misunderstand that this extension will have no impact.
3. Comments have also been made about "overlooking." A site visit will confirm that there is already overlooking from all nearby properties. In fact, my client's proposals reduces the number of windows from the current rear extension. In such a location where overlooking is already an accepted situation in such a tightly packed high density community, there can be no reason to allow this to have an effect upon the conclusion to this application. It seems
4. I would point out that the current house does not have a rear door. This point has been covered in the application to have a rear door access into the kitchen, which is situated on the first floor. I am sure you will appreciate that this rear access is not a "viewing gallery" and only follows similar principles to fire escapes found in hotels, flats and boarding houses found on Scilly. The applicant is concerned that their scheme considers means of escape in the event of fire. This application is to extend an existing house, and any comments to turn the house into flats in the future are unnecessary and unfounded in determining this application. If this was a major concern, my client would be happy to consider entering into a legally binding Section 106 agreement to ensure the property would never be changed into flats.
5. I can make it absolutely clear, that the current garage is not currently used as living accommodation, and is used for storage. It always has been ever since my client bought the property. Inspection will confirm the fact, although I don't consider this relevant to determining this application.
6. I can also clarify that there is in place a legally binding right of way along the passageway from front to back of the property. The application is correct in it's description, and that can be proved by conveyancing documents.

7. As a result of 6 above, there will be no problem for construction traffic to gain access to the rear of the property. I have already had discussions with a building contractor to make sure that constructing the proposed extension would not be a problem. My client would accept a planning condition restricting construction within normal working hours. I can also confirm that any works along boundaries will be dealt with via The Party Wall Act, which will make sure all works are carried out in accordance with any planning permission granted, without the need for unnecessary disputes.
8. I would consider that the inclusion of full length doors to create what has been described as a Juliet's balcony, are in effect only windows which can be fully opened. It is not a balcony. This house is not an old property and has always been looked after with pride by the owners. However, it does require some redesign to suit the new scheme proposals; and to that end, contemporary solution would appear to be totally appropriate in this instance.

I shall contact you shortly to discuss the application in more detail. In the mean time, thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Kind Regards

**Barry Coupe**

B D Coupe BA, DipArch, RIBA, ARB

## **Island Architects**

Courtney Cottage, Fairfield Road, Iwerne Courtney, Blandford Forum, Dorset DT11 8XL.

t 01258 269166 m 07887 931513 e [barrycoupe@btinternet.com](mailto:barrycoupe@btinternet.com)

Also at: Porthcressa, St. Mary's, Isle of Scilly TR21 0JZ.

t 01720 422431 f 01720 423334

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachment(s) transmitted with it, is confidential and privileged. It is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this e-mail in error please delete this e-mail immediately and notify us. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you must also not copy or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any person. Unauthorised use or disclosure is prohibited and may be unlawful. E-mail transmissions cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free. Information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late, be incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender does not accept any such liability. If verification is required please request a hard copy version. Opinions, contractual commitments, conclusions and other information expressed within this message are not given or endorsed by Island Architects unless otherwise indicated by an authorised representative.