

**Walton,Lisa**

---

**Subject:** FW: Form submission from: Planning application: P/16/121

Sent: 17 March 2017 12:55

To: Planning

Subject: Form submission from: Planning application: P/16/121

Submitted on Friday, 17 March, 2017 - 12:54

Full Name: Stephen Cooper and Sue Smout

E-Mail Address: PROVIDED

Your Address:

An Treath

11 Porthcressa Road

St MARY's

Representation:

Dear Mrs Walton,

Planning Application P/16/121

Resubmission of plans for a proposed 3 storey extension to the rear of Roanoke,

9 Porthcressa Road

We are writing to confirm our continuing objections to the plans to build a 3 story extension to the rear of our neighbour's property. As previously explained the proposed extension represents – in our opinion – a massive overdevelopment of the site and would result in an overbearing structure producing a hugely detrimental impact on our amenity space.

Roanoke and the adjoining properties are situated in a conservation area. At the last meeting of the Planning Committee at least one councillor expressed the view that the properties in Porthcressa Road are of no architectural value but this surely cannot be taken as justification for allowing the overdevelopment of the site with an extension which in itself has no obvious architectural merit. Furthermore, the properties backing on to Roanoke are listed buildings and the proposed extension would clearly have an adverse impact on those properties. Members of the Planning Committee will, we are sure, be fully aware of their overriding duty to “preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and to protect features of special architectural or historic interest.”

The owners of at least 5 of the neighbouring properties have registered objections to the proposed extension, citing its overbearing nature and the detrimental impact that it would have on their amenities (loss of light, outlook and privacy). We believe that the proposal is therefore contrary to the design guidelines which have been adopted by the Council which require that “development should not harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of having an overpowering effect.” The proposed development would also appear to be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to “secure a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings”

At the last meeting, several members of the Planning Committee also expressed a desire to “help a local family.” Whilst it is not difficult to have sympathy with this sentiment the status of the applicant should have no bearing on

the planning decision. If it was to be inferred that, for example, a second-home owner submitting plans to build such an extension would receive less favourable consideration by the Committee then it could be argued that this is in clear breach of the Council's own Equality Policy. It should also be noted that Roanoke has been available on the open market for some time so if the planning application were granted the eventual beneficiaries might not be the "local family" who are making the application.

Members of the Planning Committee also stated that they found the original plans very difficult to follow and noted that they were missing key information such as dimensions (a fact which, in itself, would be sufficient grounds to turn down the application). We note that the revised plans are every bit as difficult to follow and still fail to provide overall dimensions of the planned extension. Members also expressed serious misgivings about the proposed second floor to the extension but these concerns have not been addressed in the revised plans. Indeed, insofar as we are able to ascertain, the only change that has been made to the plans which were previously rejected by the Committee has been a slight reduction in the size of a second floor dormer window.

Which leads to an important point of procedure. At the meeting held on 21 January 2017, members of the Planning Committee voted to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Officer by rejecting the planning application. Subsequently there was a supplementary vote to defer the decision to the next meeting. However, this second vote was surely unnecessary and redundant since members had already made their determination on the application: they had voted to reject it. Clearly Mr and Mrs May have the right to appeal against the decision to turn down their planning application but unless such an appeal is made (and we have not been informed of any such appeal) or unless the application is being resubmitted with significant changes to it (which it is not) then, constitutionally, we believe that any reconsideration of the decision properly arrived at on 21 January 2017 brings with it the risk of a charge of maladministration and a referral to the Local Government Ombudsman.

In summary, we believe that Mr and Mrs May have failed to address any of the concerns raised by their neighbours, the Planning Officer or members of the Planning Committee and we therefore urge the Planning Committee to follow the professional advice it has received by rejecting this application.