

From: website@scilly.gov.uk

Sent: 14 December 2016 15:55

To: Planning

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

Submitted on Wednesday, 14 December, 2016 - 15:55

Full Name: Sheila & Chris Thomas

E-Mail Address: Submitted

Your Address: Auriga Porthcressa Road

Representation:

Planning application P/16/121

Dear Ms Walton,

It saddens me to see this revised planning application by Mr & Mrs May for a rear extension to Roanoke, 7 Porthcressa Rd, following the withdrawal of their previous application due to the number of objections. The impact of this proposed extension will have a detrimental effect on ourselves and all other immediate neighbours. Once again Mr & Mrs May did not see fit to approach us to discuss their plans, although we are not on the islands at present, we are still contactable by either telephone or by email. We wish to object to this extension for the following reasons-

- 1) The reduction in size of 1.25m will make very little difference to the impact this large 3 storey extension will have on the neighbouring properties, especially Auriga and Pieces of 4. Local Government Planning Guidance states that 2 or more storey extensions are to be no closer than 7 meters to the rear boundary wall - there are no measurements on these plans submitted, but I doubt there is 7 meters to the shared wall with Trevesa. This unacceptably high density of building caused by overdevelopment of the site is known as -Garden Grabbing-.
- 2) This proposed extension will cause us to lose significant levels of sunlight and daylight, the impact of which will be detrimental to ourselves and have a negative affect on our tourism business, affecting the enjoyment of our property by both ourselves and our guests.
- 3) The windows in this proposed extension would result in us feeling much more overlooked and causing us loss of privacy.
- 4) The size of the proposed extension would cause us a greater sense of enclosure and a feeling of being hemmed in, because of its close proximity to our property and because of its height.
- 5) The proposed extension is 2.5 meters beyond the existing line of building to the rear of the houses on Porthcressa Road. If these plans are passed, a precedent will be set which could lead to total overdevelopment of the area.
- 6). The design of the 1st floor Juliet Balcony and the folding doors to the front elevation of Roanoke is completely out of keeping and character with the other buildings on Porthcressa Road.
- 7). By their own admission, as shown on the drawing of their existing ground floor plan, the garage no longer exists, it has already been incorporated into the house as I see there is now a store, an office, a bedroom and a shower room (which has a toilet in situ but has been conveniently omitted

from the drawing). I stand to be corrected but I do not remember any plans for change of use being submitted to the planning office. Also there is a manhole inside the -garage- which serves the both the houses on The Parade and Porthcressa Rd. - there would be no direct access to this manhole if the garage doors are replaced by a brick wall should there be sewerage problems, as were had by previous owners of Trevesa , Wingletang and Roanoke.

8) The land for the passageway between Auriga, (ourselves) and Roanoke belongs to us, with rights of way given to the owners of Shearwater, Trevesa and Roanoke. We allow services - ie dustmen and oil deliveries but will not give permission for builders to access the rear of Roanoke via our passageway. Any building works would be very disruptive and very noisy to both ourselves (our bedroom shares 1 wall of the passageway) and to our guests, (2 of the bedrooms are directly above the passageway), this would once again have a great detrimental impact on our business.

For these reasons we hope that you direct the planning committee to refuse permission for this overbearing extension to Roanoke, and do not succumb to Mr Coupe's over-presumptuousness in telling the Planning Officer and the Planning Committee that -there should be no reason in relation to the Local Plan or planning policy that would give cause to not recommend approval"

-Yours sincerely

Sheila and Chris Thomas