

23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020

To:  
Planning and Development Department  
Town Hall, The Parade  
St. Mary's, Isles of Scilly  
TR21 0LW

Dear Sir,

Objection to Planning Application ref: P/20/054/FUL  
Proposed Dwelling, Land at Buzza Road, Porthcressa, St. Mary's

Further to the submission of 'an 'amended' planning application we wish to communicate our strong objection to the proposed building application in its revised form. It would be deplorable if the Council permits the interest of one transient essential worker to override the interests of two established key workers and their young family, and in fact **all future RNLI employees** who occupy Penventon.

This history behind this current application is longstanding, and with numerous refusals to date is no doubt contributing to the frustration of relevant stakeholders. That however, does not negate the need for those with whom the decision rests, to critically consider the many valid reasons for earlier rejections of smaller builds, which remain highly relevant at this time.

(P/16/129) on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017

*'R1 The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site and by virtue of its scale and massing, would appear unacceptably overbearing and dominant when viewed from Penventon, Monaveen and Domremy, contrary to the Isles of Scilly Adopted Local Plan (2005), and to the guidance set out in the Isles of Scilly adopted Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2006) and contrary to Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

*R2 The proposed development, by reason of its cramped appearance in the streetscene and proximity to the site boundaries would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and, if permitted, would be likely to set a pattern for similar undesirable proposals in the vicinity, resulting in a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is presently developed, thereby contrary the Isles of Scilly Adopted Local Plan (2005) and the guidance set out in the Isles of Scilly adopted Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2006).'*

We believe that the Council should refuse this application in its revised form on the same basis and in view of the key points below

1. The amended proposed structure would still represent an **over-development of the site** given its footprint would fill virtually all of land available. The 'tokenistic' reduction of roof height by 20 cms since the meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> October would result in a construction with a height in excess of 2.0 m above the existing garage building. The design of the proposed property is not in keeping with the area and it defies us to understand why a building which is purported to be a 'starter' home requires 3 toilets (2 bathrooms).
2. Essentially this build would, as we communicated previously **materially impact the visual appearance** of the current area, which is characterised by a number of older traditional granite cottages. The architect's 3D rendering clearly illustrates how the planned build is more **barn-like** than house; 3 aspects largely devoid of windows and as such not in keeping with the character of the area and surrounding buildings. It actually detracts the character of the area.
3. Listening in to the Council meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> October, it was evident that some facts being presented to those present were **erroneous and potentially misleading** ahead of the vote. It was asserted no property was within 10 metres of this build, when in fact **5 properties are less than 10 m** away; critically the gap between Penventon and access to this build is more like 3 metres.

4. Our understanding is that the **right to light** is very well established in English Law, and we believe that this development would breach that in respect to principally Charlies Cottage, Penventon and Monaveen; light into our kitchen at Monaveen where we dine would be significantly affected by this build. This issue is something we see as being non-negotiable and at no point has the applicant made any approach to discuss this or engage with us.
5. The Environmental Impact Statement which was uploaded in the last couple of days, makes explicit reference to this application having an effect on '**a particularly environmentally sensitive/vulnerable location**', so why is it then concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required?
6. We also remain concerned about the **land ownership**; some of land in fact belonging to Mr Denver Child at Domremy rather than the applicant. Based on our families ownership of Monaveen for 55 years we support the views put forward by Janet Vosper regarding Denver Child's claim to this land.

Finally, it is curious that councillors who may stand to benefit from contracts awarded to develop this proposal have not declared potential conflicts of interest.

We would like to be kept in touch with developments on this application, as it is, as the Planning Officer reports particularly sensitive.

Yours sincerely

Richard Smith & Nicola Heneghan