

**Subject:** FW: Planning Application Representation; P/17/039

**Sent:** 06 August 2017 19:40

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

**Subject:** Planning Application Representation; P/17/039

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your letter informing me of the amended plans submitted with regards to the planning application P/17/039 which was deferred at the last meeting. I have viewed the revised plans and appreciate that the application has been adjusted with, I assume, the various representations in mind which is certainly a step in the right direction and I am grateful for this, especially the removal of the Juliette balcony. However, I do not feel that some of the concerns which are shared by others as well as myself have been adequately addressed.

In the hope that all previous letters will be re-visited when a decision is being made on this application I would refer back to by original letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017 which I feel is still current against the revised plans as follows;

- . The plans do not have adequate enough measurements still and seem ambiguous with regards to size which will certainly make a competent assessment impossible. The plans would make it look like more garden is to be left without development but the statements and plans are lacking enough detail to be sure of this, I actually feel on looking at the plans that this is not the case.
- . The loss of light to the neighbouring property, which is where my main concern would lie for my Grandmother at 11 Porthcressa Road, has not been addressed as much as I feel it should. The new proposal, though two story, now has a pitch roof which will certainly ensure that the sunlight is lost from her garden as efficiently as the last one and will be no less intrusive, though it does leave room for a lovely loft conversion at a later date which should effectively provide a lovely three story extension for the owners.
- . I do not feel that the building works themselves have been considered at all, the extensive development will cause months of upheaval and will undoubtedly require access from the neighbouring properties, I can say with certainty that this will not be granted on my Grandmother's side and I would suggest that the neighbouring property on the other side may also feel less than co-operative.
- . The development will not be in keeping with the surrounding area and will certainly reduce the value of the neighbouring properties, all of which are long standing residents/businesses on the islands, the businesses and their visitors especially will be negatively affected by this development. I would point out that whilst supporters of this development have suggested that the surrounding properties are holiday cottages, owned by second home owners that this is a) not the case and b) should make no difference, why would second home owners not be entitled to the same considerations?

As previously stated my Grandmother's happiness and residency on the islands is my priority when considering this application, her happiness is paramount and the stress and anxiety that these proposals have caused has been great. If these plans are carried out, she will be left with a claustrophobic garden that she used to love growing and nurturing plants in, without light. Her quality of life will be affected in a terribly negative way.

I look forward to finding out the decision made upon this application.

Kind regards,

Carina Luscombe