

**RECEIVED**

By Olivia.Rickman at 2:39 pm, Nov 22, 2021

Ray Jackman

Westward Ledge, Church Road

St Mary's, Isles of Scilly

TR21 0NA

Lisa Walton, Senior Planning Officer

Council of the Isles of Scilly

Town Hall, St Mary's

TR21 0JD

21<sup>st</sup> November 2021

Dear Ms Walton

RE PLANNING REFERENCE P/21/054/HH WESTWARD LEDGE

Thank you for your letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> November inst. I am not prepared to alter the amended plans any further, and wish to withdraw the amended proposed elevations, and have the application determined on the original proposed elevations, showing the construction aligning with the front wall of the house, and to the height of the existing roof ridge.

In your email of 5<sup>th</sup> September 2021 you refer to the application adding considerable bulk to the roof. This criticism appears to be totally out of line with your recent approvals, namely "Chy Carn" (opposite), "2 Matthews Field" (next door), "4 Porth Cressa Road" and "Salt Whistle" at McFarland's Down – where the bulk of those roof developments exceed what is asked for at Westward Ledge. I enclose photos of "2 Matthews Field", the closest property, showing the increase in the bulk of the roof. Further, in your letter of 19<sup>th</sup> May 2021, your colleague, Andrew King, Planning and Development Manager, in his fourth paragraph, states:-

*...whilst the dwelling is located prominently, the introduction of rooflights and dormer windows of the style proposed could be considered to reflect the features on the neighbouring properties at Chy an Mor and at 2 Matthews Field and the proposed elevation does not look particularly out of keeping. I would emphasise the need to ensure materials are both sustainable and in keeping with the surrounding area and do not result in a poor quality appearance, subject to this the proposal could be considered acceptable.*

The application was posted up on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2021, showing the proposed roof alterations. It appears to date there have been no objections. The drawings for the proposed dormers have been shown to numerous people, including neighbours, who all agree the proposal vastly improves the appearance of the property.

You appear to be obsessed that the alterations are for residential use, of which it is not. Indeed in your latest letter you say that:-

*..... information has been sent through to the Planning Department that suggests this property has been sub-divided in some way and that there is an independent and self-contained unit of accommodation.*

You have been wrongly advised, and I suggest you make an arrangement to carry out a site visit to establish the correct position.

This is not the first time you have been wrongly advised, or made wrongful assumptions yourself. You will recall in 2019 you alleged that a fourth unit of residential accommodation had been created in Maritime House. Your subsequent site visit proved the allegation incorrect,

Yours Sincerely,

  
R T JACKMAN





