
From: Paul Allen
Sent: 29 October 2020 15:27
To: Planning (Isles of Scilly)
Subject: Objection to Planning Reference: P/20/054/FUL

Hanjague
1 Weir Place
Kirton
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP10 0QA

29th October 2020

Planning Reference: P/20/054/FUL

Dear Lisa Walton,

We are writing to express our objection to the amended plans for the above application.

Our previous concerns remain valid, and even though there has been a revision to the application, the reduction in the roof height by 20cm, is trivial in respect of the overall scale of the proposed development, and is an insignificant amendment. This minor adjustment is inconsequential in relation to the overall impact of the property.

The scale and design of the building remains completely inappropriate for this unspoilt and peaceful corner of St. Mary's. It will be overbearing and totally out of place alongside the traditional white-washed Cornish granite cottages, and will do nothing to enhance or preserve the character of this area. This will be compounded by its close proximity to the existing properties, which has been quoted as being over 10 metres, but in reality, the plans indicate that the distance is as little as 6.2 metres at the closest point between buildings, and half this distance from the courtyard wall of the application to the nearest dwelling. Quite simply, there is not room to build something of this nature here.

There will be significant impact on the surrounding properties in terms of loss of natural light due to the height and size of the proposed building; loss of privacy due to the extremely close proximity of windows, and loss of views. I have only been inside my relatives home of 'Domremy', so am unable to refer to the other properties from personal experience in the same way, but the living space and the main garden will be directly overlooking the development, and from an extremely close proximity. The views and privacy will be completely impacted upon.

The disturbance during the building phase will be enormous. Constant access here is essential for all neighbouring properties, and how this will be maintained during construction is questionable. The noise, dust, general inconvenience and disruption during this time, will have a significant detrimental impact on the neighbours, and this whole area. This includes Buzza and Porthcressa, both of which are hugely popular with locals and visitors alike, enjoying the views and tranquillity. So much has been done to improve this area, and if allowed to proceed, this development could undo all of that. It could even affect 'Dibble & Grub' with customers not wishing to sit outside because of the impact of noise and dust. Once complete, access will continue to be

compromised, especially for emergency and refuse collection vehicles. It still appears that 'Domremy' may even lose one point of access, and the boundary appears to be impacted on as well. Having discussed this with Mr. Child, I know he has not given his consent.

Mr. Fletcher is laying claim to part of the garden which is actually the property of Mr. and Mrs Child, and has been since they purchased 'Domremy' around 50 years ago. Unfortunately, neither of them are able to object independently. How can it be acceptable that an application can be considered or even approved, where someone is laying claim to property without proof, and therefore the discrepancy is unresolved? I have discussed this with Mr. Child, and he is gravely concerned about it, along with all of the other concerns we are raising.

Another issue in relation to this is in respect of referring to the garden as a 'brownfield site'. The land in question is a garden attached to a property and therefore cannot be classified as brownfield land. By doing this, inaccurately lessens its value and importance.

This corner already catches the wind, and the proposed building will compound and exasperate the wind tunnel effect. Structural damage has occurred to the existing properties here in the past, and inevitably such events will increase in frequency and enormity, with the construction of such a significant building in such close proximity to the existing properties.

This area already suffers from flooding during times of heavy rain, but this issue does not appear to have been addressed.

This peaceful and unspoilt corner is a haven for a variety of birds, with thrushes and blackbirds nesting, and other wildlife as well. I understand that even hedgehogs have been seen here and known to breed. As a Biodiversity Action Plan species, efforts should be made to protect them, not destroy their habitat.

There is also the heritage importance of this site. Boat building is an inherent part of the history of Porthcressa, and these two boatsheds are evidence of that heritage. Surely, efforts should be made to protect such historical features, rather than allowing their loss and degradation.

Finally, but no less importantly, we fail to understand why this site is being allowed for a new build, when sites to fulfil the Local Housing Need on St. Mary's have already been identified elsewhere in the Local Plan. This location does not fall within any of those locations.

We urge you to take into account all of the objections raised when considering this application.

Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Allen