

2nd September 2020

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

Application: P/20/054 Garage, Buzza Road, Hugh Town

I should like to object to this application on behalf of my father, Ken Peay and myself, on the following grounds.

1. The applicant put in a planning application on the site in 2016 for a one bedroom property. This was rejected by the Council (P/16/129) on the 25th January 2017 on two bases

(a) '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'

(b) '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'.

The application was renewed (P/19/020) for a larger three bedroomed property. In its then pre-application advice the Council noted the need for 'resolution of scale, mass and amenity impacts'. This application was withdrawn.

The applicants have now put in plans for a property with two bedrooms and a study office, to accommodate 'potential growth of the family, consideration for working from home, a room for potential visitors and the flexibility to adjust to changes to lifestyle as the Applicants age'. The plans now extend in a dog leg in the direction of Domremy, occupying almost all of the claimed site.

We are accordingly at a complete loss to understand why the applicants have now submitted such plans, completely dominating the area, occupying the great bulk of the claimed site, and creating a building whose mass is unacceptable, whatever might be its architectural merits in another context. Tellingly, the applicants' intentions reflect a curious lack of sensitivity to the quality of the lives of those amongst whom they wish to live. But, most critically, it is clear that all of the Council's previous reasons for rejecting the development remain overwhelming; indeed, even more so now.

2. In our previous objections we had been under the impression that the applicants had acquired land from Denver Child at Domremy. It is now evident that this was not the case. There is a history of dispute about the land the applicants now claim as theirs, purchased from the estate of Charlie Trezise. We understand that this land was purchased by Mr Child from Charlie and agreed with a handshake, but never registered with the Land Registry. However, Mr Child's use of the land in the time of our occupation of Beggars Roost (my parents bought this property in 1989) is consistent with

Mr Child's ownership of it. Steps descend from his house into the garden and the passageway from the house onto Buzza Road is now seemingly located on land the applicants claim to be theirs (see their site location plan edged in red). We all remember well Audrey Child standing at the gate at the bottom of this passageway in the throes of her dementia. Knowing Charlie over many years, it is inconceivable that he would have permitted Denver Child to develop the land in this way, if he did not believe that ownership had been transferred from him. In any event, the murky history of the use of this land should lead all involved to be cautious about their plans.

3. I also note problems with the sewage connections. About 8 years ago we did have a problem with the manhole immediate behind the applicants' proposed site (the manhole in Buzza Road slightly elevated from Charlie's House). Charlie drew our attention to the fact that sewage was coming out of the manhole (presumably draining from the four houses on Buzza Road; and he was worried about it coming into his house (now owned by the Harms). We resolved this matter privately. The applicants answered the question about connection to an existing drainage system as 'unknown'. This is potentially worrying; and more so if they plan to put additional stress on an existing sewer that has already created health hazard.

4. Finally, our objections in our previous letter of 29th December 2016 remain valid, and we reiterate them. In essence these related to the significant erosion of the character of the area and everything that has been done to enhance its sense of openness and light, including much work by the Council; the impact on the enjoyment of day-trippers of the ambience of the area and of our own visitors; and anxieties about access, including access up Buzza Road.

With kind regards

Dr Jill Peay and Mr Ken Peay