

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

Phone:

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

RECEIVED BY THE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

22 MAY 2017

22 May 2017

Dear Mrs Walton

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)

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. As with the original refused application, I continue to object strongly to the development of the proposed revised extension to this house.

I note from the design and access statement that 'Much effort has gone into listening to the comments made about impact to other neighbours'. I feel this is not the case, as the plans still do not have adequate measurements, there are boundary issues that have not been addressed and the proposed extension is still a three storey extension.

At the risk of repeating myself, 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 three storey extension at the rear of the property is to extend to within 2.5 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 (a time-lapse video is sent under separate cover to show the effect), even in midsummer when the sun sets further to the north;
- The loss of sunlight at the end of the day to my mother's lounge although minimal, due to the Juliet balcony at the front of the building which appears to be larger than one would expect;
- 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;

Although I realise that problems arising from the construction of the building is not part of the building decision, thought should 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.

The Design and Access Statement also states that 'there is no dormer window, and the roof is hipped to ensure the wall adjoining 11 Porthcressa Road is reduced in height to two floors and not three.' This, which is essential still a three story extension, has little or no effect in improving the loss of sunlight that my mother will suffer if this extension is approved or the overbearing site of a blank wall only yards from her rear windows.

I believe Roanoake remains on the market so, if and when sold, may be inhabited by people who are not a 'local family'. 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 who, for the last eight months and at the age of 87, has 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. This has also caused stress to other neighbours (who are also local families) and I am aggrieved that this application should be reapplying for virtually the same extension that has been refused previously.

Yours sincerely



Rhona Holland