

King, Andrew

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

From: website@scilly.gov.uk [mailto:website@scilly.gov.uk]
Sent: 23 May 2017 00:00
To: Planning <planning@scilly.gov.uk>
Subject: Form submission from: Planning application: P/17/039

Submitted on Tuesday, 23 May, 2017 - 00:00

Full Name: Sheila & Chris Thomas

E-Mail Address: *PROVIDED*

Your Address: Auriga, 7, Porthcressa Rd, St Mary's, Isles of Scilly,

Representation:

22/05/2017

Planning Application P/17/039

Proposed rear 3-storey extension & changes to front elevation to Roanoke, 9 Porthcressa Rd, St Mary's, Isles of Scilly. (Affecting setting of a listed building)

Dear Ms Walton

We are finding it somewhat tiresome to be faced with yet another planning application from Mr & Mrs May, for building a 3-storey extension to the rear of Roanoke, which is adjacent to our home, Auriga.

Again these plans are not very well drawn, with the minimum of dimensions given, however, as far as I can see, this new application differs very little from the previous 2 applications, (the 1st withdrawn by the applicants and the 2nd application refused by the Planning Committee on March 21st 2017). This time the difference being a Velux window instead of a dormer window in the roofline.

Our reasons for objecting to this planning application remain the same as previous, which are:

- 1) Loss of Light. This proposed 3-storey extension will cause us to lose significant levels of sunlight and daylight in our back garden sanctuary, virtually all the morning sun and into the early afternoon, 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.
- 2) The replacement of a dormer window with a Velux window will make no difference to the impact this large, imposing, 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 - as these plans submitted have no measurements, I doubt that there is 7 meters to the shared rear wall with Treveffa. This unacceptably high density of building caused by over-development of the site is known as "Garden Grabbing".
- 3) The size of this 3-storey extension would cause us a great sense of enclosure and a feeling of being hemmed in, because of its proximity to our property and because of its height.

4) The windows in this proposed extension would result in us feeling much more overlooked and causing us loss of privacy.

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 over-development 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, (previous applications for Juliet Balconies on other houses have been refused). I am also concerned that a balcony could afford overlooking into our front guest bedrooms.

7) By their own admission, as shown on the existing ground floor plan, the garage no longer exists! It has already been incorporated into the house as a store, office, shower room and toilet. As there is a sewer manhole inside the garage, which serves both the houses on Porthcressa Road and The Parade, there would be no direct access to it should the garage doors be replaced by a brick wall & in the event of blockage problems etc as were had by previous owners of Trevesa, Wingletang and Roanoke.

8) The Right of Way between Auriga and Roanoke is on our land. A dispute was legally settled by ourselves and the previous owners of Roanoke "Giving owners for the time being of the 2nd property (Roanoke) at all reasonable times to pass and repass on foot only over and along that part of the footpath". We will not give permission for builders to access Roanoke through the narrow passageway. Any building works would be very disruptive and very noisy to both ourselves, (our bedroom on the ground floor of Auriga, shares 1 wall of the passageway) and to our guests (2 of the bedrooms are directly above the passageway). This again would have a great detrimental impact on our business and cause loss of income which we would reclaim from the applicants should these plans be passed.

9) I would suggest that any bedroom on the ground floor which has a window onto OUR passageway is subject to less privacy than any bedroom existing in Roanoke at present. People use the right of way from both Trevesa and Shearwater as well as ourselves, we know, we have blocked our passage window up!

By virtue of the description of Roanoke on the For Sale particulars, Roanoke is described as "having 3 bedrooms" - the family are therefore already afforded a bedroom each so the young "Scillonian family" are more than adequately housed. I am objecting to the application on the above, set out reasons, so that an "older Scillonian family, of more Scillonian generations than Mrs May's" can enjoy their home and garden, where we have lived for nearly 20 years.

For these reasons we hope that you direct the planning committee to refuse permission for this overbearing extension to Roanoke yet again.