

King, Andrew

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

Sent: 28 December 2016 13:03

To: Planning

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

Submitted on Wednesday, 28 December, 2016 - 13:03

Full Name: Stephen Cooper

E-Mail Address: *PROVIDED*

Your Address:

An Treath

11 Porthcressa Road

St Mary's

TR21 10J

Representation:

Planning Application P/16/121

Proposed rear three storey extension and changes to the front elevation to Roanoake, 9 Porthcressa Road, St Mary's Isles of Scilly (Affecting setting of a listed building)

We are writing in connection with the above application to build a substantial extension to the rear of 9 Porthcressa Road, a property adjoining our own house.

Having examined the plans, we feel we must object to the rear extension on the following grounds:

1. Precedent.
 - (a) The proposed extension goes beyond the established building line to the rear of the properties on the north side of Porthcressa Road. If this application is approved it could be used as a precedent to support applications for similar extensions to other properties in Porthcressa Road;
 - (b) Houses on Porthcressa Road back on to properties on the Parade, most of which are listed. Although many of the properties on the Parade have extensions, none of them are three storeys high and all of these properties retain significant garden space.
2. Overdevelopment of the site
 - (a) The proposed extension would result in the loss of much of Roanoake's external space leaving it with a tiny yard area insufficient for the size of the proposed dwelling;
 - (b) The proposed extension would lead to a level of housing density that should be considered undesirable in a Conservation Area;
3. Overshadowing and overbearing

- (a) The proposed extension would result in a three storey wall being built within 1.2 meters of our first and second floor windows (2.4 meters at an angle of 45 degrees). This would result in considerable loss of daylight as well as providing a very unsightly outlook from both floors of our property;
- (b) The impact on our ground floor neighbour, Mrs Roma Griggs, would be even more extreme; she would find herself living in the shadow of an overbearing three storey wall and the rear rooms of her flat would be cast into almost perpetual twilight, as would her carefully tended garden.
- (c) Wingletang would suffer considerable overshadowing which would be further exacerbated by the lower ground level of that property.

4. Loss of Privacy

The properties to the West (Auriga) and North (Shearwater, Trevesa and Wingletang) would all suffer a considerable loss of privacy as a result of the proposed extension. Although properties in Porthcressa Road and the Parade are already essentially “back-to-back” in nature, the extension to Roanoke would result in the rear garden and conservatory of Auriga being directly overlooked; the rear boundary of Roanoke would move to within just a few metres of Wingletang and afford a view directly into their second floor bedrooms, as well as into their garden and those of Trevesa and Shearwater.

5. Other issues

Although we understand that not all of the following issues will be considered relevant to the planning application we nevertheless wish to raise these additional concerns:

- (a) Boundary encroachment: it appears from the plans as submitted that the eastern facing wall will be constructed over (ie beyond) the established boundary between 9 and 11 Porthcressa Road (which we believe runs approximately down the middle of the dividing wall between our gardens). In any event, the foundations for the extension would have to be dug out on our land, an issue which has not been raised nor agreed with us.
- (b) Access to the site during construction would be extremely difficult as the garden to the rear of Roanoke can only be reached via a narrow alleyway between Roanoke (9) and Auriga (7). We have not received any request to grant construction workers right of way over our land (ie the alleyway between An Treath and Roanoke and the garden at the rear of our property), nor to allow the erection of scaffolding on our land which would be essential for completion of the project.
- (c) We anticipate that building materials will need to be stored to the front of Roanoke, in Porthcressa Road within a few metres of the Tourist Information Centre: this is likely to cause considerable disruption to locals and visitors alike;
- (d) Line of drains. We believe that it is proposed to build the extension across the line of drains serving several properties in Porthcressa Road (including our own) and are concerned about the impact of such a substantial extension on the patency of the drains. The proposed extension will be built over at least one existing manhole cover.
- (e) Impact on local businesses (tourism). Although we would one day like to retire to Scilly we currently let our property out to visitors for around 30 weeks each year. Auriga and Trevesa are also let out to visitors, Shearwater and Wingletang operate as Guest Houses. The impact of a lengthy construction project on each of these businesses would be severe and the resulting development would be likely to result in loss of bookings and income.

In summary, we are very unhappy with the proposed plans which we believe constitute an overdevelopment of the site which is not in keeping with the character of the immediate vicinity nor its’ status as a conservation area that includes listed properties.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Cooper & Sue Smout

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<http://www.scilly.gov.uk/node/2755/submission/821>