

RECEIVED BY THE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
04 AUG 2017

Rhona Holland
Uppness, The Maisonette
Back Lane
St Mary's
Isles of Scilly
TR21 0LA

The Planning Officer
Planning Department
Council of the Isles of Scilly
Town Hall
The Parade
St. Mary's
Isles of Scilly, TR21 0LW

4 August 2017

Dear Sirs

Planning Application P/17/039

Proposed rear extension to Roanoake, and changes to the front elevation (resubmission of previously refused application P/16/121/FUL) (Affecting setting of a listed building) AMENDED PLANS (27/07/2017)

With reference to the above planning application, I continue to object strongly to the amended plans to the proposed extension.

I am not sure how the applicants have come to the conclusion that this is a better option as the amended roof has been pitched to the end of the proposed extension instead of a hipped roof and seems to be as high as the previously submitted plans. The plans are very misleading and still do not have adequate measurements. This gives the impression that the extension leaves the bigger part of the garden free from building works. This is not the case when reading the statements, as the extension is actually proposed to take up 2.5 metres of the garden and only 2 metres will remain as garden. There are also boundary issues that still have not been addressed and the proposed extension, although now purporting to be two storey, is in effect still a three storey extension when taking into consideration the height of the pitched roof.

I can only reiterate, the proposed development is ill-considered: building development in this conservation area with listed buildings very nearby would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance on the area. In particular, the proposed two/three storey extension at the rear of the property is to extend to within 2 metres of the boundary of the property to the rear, alongside the property to the west, and also to the boundary of the property to the east, my mother's property, 11 Porthcressa Road.

The effect of this extension would be:

- A severe loss of sunlight to my mother's rear garden, kitchen, hall and bedroom, even in midsummer when the sun sets further to the north;
- the loss of residential amenity due to overshadowing to the rear;

- the loss of outlook to my mother, given the large blank wall that is proposed to extend more than halfway along the extent of her boundary;
- the adverse effect on the residential amenity to varying degrees of other neighbours;
- the overbearing, out of scale size and overdevelopment of the site with substantial loss of garden land;

These amended plans, which is essentially still a three story extension, has effect of worsening the effect of the loss of sunlight that my mother will suffer if this extension is approved. A time-lapse video taken at the end of May from 10.00 until 23.00 can be viewed at <https://youtu.be/Xmb8gUhKNi8> to show the effect from her kitchen, tape showing the end of the proposed extension; anything to the left of the tape will, therefore, be a loss of light. The overbearing sight of a blank wall only yards from her rear windows has not improved, but arguably worsened. ~~The amended plans now have windows closer the properties to the rear,~~ increasing the effect of overshadowing.

Although I realise that problems arising from the construction of the building is not part of the building decision, thought should still be given to the effect the construction would have on the residents given the relatively small amount of access to allow demolition and the removal of materials. Road closure would probably be needed in Porthcressa Road and construction would undoubtedly mean that access to other properties would be needed to allow any build whatsoever.

Any property privately owned property could be sold at any time and, if or when sold, may be inhabited by people who are not a 'local family'. Contrary to the belief of some representations the immediate neighbours to Roanoake are mainly longstanding residents and who are also local families. The last meeting gave consideration to the fact that the family in Roanoake are business people. So are the neighbours. I believe an objective decision should not take into consideration the family applying but be judged on the merits of the application itself and the effects on the surrounding area which is, without interpretation, part of the conservation area of the Isles of Scilly.

I can only reiterate my deep concern for the worry and stress this has caused my mother and the immediate neighbours. My mother has, for nearly one year now, been living with the prospect of a huge loss of light and being hemmed in by an ugly and overbearing wall for her remaining years. I am aggrieved that this resubmission should be reapplying for virtually the same extension that has been refused previously and deferred at the last meeting and which will have a worse effect on the surrounding properties.

Yours faithfully

Rhona Holland