

Subject: FW: Form submission from: Planning application: P/17/039

Sent: 04 August 2017 18:35

To: Planning <planning@scilly.gov.uk>

Subject: Form submission from: Planning application: P/17/039

Submitted on Friday, 4 August, 2017 - 18:35

Full Name: Stephen Cooper and Sue Smout

Your Address:

An Treath

11 Porthcressa Road

Hugh Town

St Marys

TR21 0JL

Representation:

Dear Ms Walton,

Planning Application P/17/039

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

Once again, we find ourselves in the position of having to write regarding the above application to build a substantial extension to the rear of 9 Porthcressa Road, a property adjoining our own house. We believe that this is the fourth time in the last year that Mr and Mrs May have submitted plans: the first application was withdrawn due to the strength of opposition from local residents; subsequent plans have – on the recommendation of the professional officers – been refused (or in the case of the last submission, deferred) by the Planning Committee.

We are beginning to feel worn down by these repeated attempts to secure permission for development. Officers have previously described the May's proposals as being "an overdevelopment of the site" which is "inappropriate", "overbearing and dominant" and which will result in "increased overlooking detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties". Previous reports have also pointed out that the proposed plans are "contrary to the Isles of Scilly Adopted Local Plan (2005)" and "to the guidance set out in the Isles of Scilly adopted Design Guide Supplementary Planning Policy Framework". Furthermore, it has been stated that "The bulk and design of the

proposed extension would also detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to the statutory designation of the Isles of Scilly Local Plan 2005 Policy 1". It is our contention that all of these comments still apply to the resubmitted plans, despite the minor amendmen

ts that

have been made to them.

Over the course of the last year we have watched with interest the deliberations of the Planning Committee as they have appeared on the Council's "You Tube" channel. It is very striking that the only argument that has ever been advanced in support of the proposals is the wish to "support a young local family". To our recollection, no Councillor has ever tried to argue that the planned development would enhance the area or improve the amenities of the neighbouring properties. As we wrote in our response to the first submission, we are not unsympathetic to the needs of a growing family but Councillors are respectfully reminded of their duty to consider all applications on their planning merits, without allowing personal feelings to cloud their judgement.

It should go without saying that all applications should be judged in exactly the same way, irrespective of whether they are being made by prominent local islanders or by "incomers".

We bought An Treath from a local couple five years ago and although it is currently let out to visitors for around 30 weeks each year, who is to say that - in years to come - An Treath will not revert to local ownership? Equally, what guarantee is there that Roanoke will remain forever in local ownership? Stating the obvious, if the proposed development is allowed to proceed, the impact will be permanent and owners of the adjoining properties will have to live with the detrimental consequences long after Mr and Mrs May have moved on.

At the last meeting comments were made that suggested that, as year-round residents, the Mays should enjoy more favourable consideration than their neighbours, some of whom spend time away from the Islands. Yet Mrs Roma Griggs, the owner of Pieces of Four and an immediate neighbour of Roanoake, is a year-round resident. She would be most directly and adversely affected by the proposed development as it would completely overshadow her ground floor apartment and condemn her to living in perpetual twilight. In any case, favouring one group (local residents) over another seems to us to be in direct contravention of the Council's own Equality Policy and, furthermore, distinctly undemocratic. Indeed, should a decision be made based on these considerations - rather than on legitimate planning grounds - we understand that we would have strong grounds for complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman.

The introductory page to the Planning section on the Council's website includes a statement that, "The (Planning) department reports to the Planning Committee of the Council and is responsible for upholding the Isles of Scilly Local Plan, determining planning applications and making decisions that conserve and preserve the AONB and preserve or enhance the conservation area and the important natural and historic environments". The Planning Officer has already expressed the view that the scale and nature of the previously submitted plans was "contrary to the Isles of Scilly Adopted Local Plan (2005)" and the revised plans are not materially different. Furthermore, no one – not even the applicants or their architect – has tried to argue that the proposed extension would enhance the conservation area in any way. We are sure that we are not alone in finding this whole process extremely prolonged and very stressful and therefore urge Councillors to show consistency by

rejecting this application and discouraging any further proposals of this nature.

Please note that all of the objections that we have previously raised (inappropriate for the area, overdevelopment of the site, overshadowing and overbearing, loss of privacy etc) continue to apply to these revised proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Cooper and Sue Smout