

From: Lucy McRobert <PROVIDED>
To: Planning (Isles of Scilly) <planning@scilly.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application Men a Vaur P/20/048 - on behalf of Rosevean House Ltd

For the attention of the Planning Department, Council of the Isles of Scilly

On behalf of Rosevean House Ltd

Dear Madam/Sir,

R.E. Planning Application Men a Vaur P/20/048

We would like to state our objections to the proposed dwelling for Men a Vaur, Church Road, on behalf of the management company that owns Rosevean House Ltd. The four properties that comprise Rosevean House, Church Road, would all be impacted upon by the construction of the dwelling; we are made up of a mixture of residential and holiday lets, three of which directly overlook the proposed development site. The Location and Block Plan and Proposed Site Plan appear to be incorrect. They do not show the correct details of Rosevean House, Gorregan House, 8 Branksea Close and the extension to rear of Men a Vaur: all four buildings have a larger floor area than are shown on plan.

Our objections are as follows:

1. Access to the site throughout the build
We have concerns that access to the proposed site for materials and building equipment will be severely restricted to the narrow entrance via Branksea Close, limiting and endangering pedestrian access to Branksea Close (an area where children regularly play) and potentially damaging pavements, etc. Parking is already difficult at most times on Church Road and will be further inhibited by works traffic.
2. Disturbance throughout the build, and post-construction
Representing both holiday lets and residential flats (some of which will be occupied throughout the whole winter period), we are concerned about the noise levels throughout the construction from the site; our flats are regularly occupied by families with young children and babies and elderly visitors, who rely on the peacefulness of the area. Flat 4 Rosevean has a garden that directly abuts the site and flats 2 and 3 both have overlooking windows, which will be impacted on by dust and debris, both from the removal of the vegetation and trees and from the build. We are also concerned about addition of big groups of people to

this quiet neighbourhood, with the potential for noise disturbance and parties that would impact upon the three surrounding streets. The garden is very much overlooked and not suitable for large social gatherings. Men a Vaur has already been converted into a holiday let for big groups, and has already generated noise complaints from neighbours.

3. Impact of local infrastructure, e.g. drains, sewage, water

The Church Road, Branksea Close and Rams Valley area are already stretched to capacity with regards to sewage, which has been known to back up and overflow on occasion. An additional eight-bed dwelling will severely add to the problem. Water provision on St Mary's is already stretched in the summer; a four-bathroom property would seriously add to local pressures. The pavements are already in need of repair in places and uneven. There doesn't seem to be any provision for the removal of rain water; the proposed water butts aren't much use for holiday guests, who won't be watering plants! Will excess rain water be flowing straight into the sewers? The sewage pipes, including the main run from Church Road to Hugh Town, which are close to the proposed build (perhaps 4-5 metres), do not seem to be on the plans.

4. Impact on local ecology

The removal of the garden would cause a serious loss of habitat on this important local greenspace and wildlife corridor, which links Hugh Town with the gardens heading up Church Road and out towards Porthmellon, too. Overlooking the site as we do, we can see it's importance for several red listed bird species, bats and invertebrates which use the area as a foraging ground; whilst the proposed provision of bat boxes and bird boxes is a nice addition, this will not make up for lost feeding areas. The trees, vegetation and scrub are a hive of activity throughout the year, for both locally breeding species (like house sparrows, starlings, linnets, goldfinches, etc) and migratory species of warblers and thrushes.

5. Unsuitability of the site for proposed disabled access

Whilst we are all in admiration of the proposed disabled-friendly ethos and trust that the site itself may be suitable, the surrounding area is on an incline, is accessed by uneven pavements and many shops and facilities in Hugh Town are not suitable for disabled guests. Even were the development to go ahead, what guarantee would there be that the property would prioritise disabled guests and not larger parties of able-bodied guests? Is there a necessity for more high-end, expensive holiday letting, prioritised over accommodation for locals and workers?

We hope that the application is refused, and that the repeated attempts to develop this special area can be put to bed once and for all.

Regards,

Lucy McRobert, Secretary
On behalf of Rosevean House Ltd