

Re: Amendments to planning application P/22/026/FUL at Pengarris, 2 Bay View, St Mary's

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to register our continued objection to the proposals (including amendments) at Pengarris, 2 Bay View (ref: P/22/026/FUL). In addition to our previous comments (P-22-026 REP LTR Jones), our key reasons for objecting are as below:

- Increased noise disturbance that would be created by use of proposed raised deck in the seaside garden**
- Damage to the existing boundary hedge that would be made by proposed works to seaside boundary wall with 5 Little Porth**
- Significant loss of daylight/sunlight that would be caused by the proposed new fence on the road side**
- Impactful disturbance and noise nuisance that would be caused by the front door in the proposed position, the proposed external door to bedroom, and by people inhabiting the proposed courtyard space**

Please find a more detailed explanation of each of our objections below:

Increased noise disturbance that would be created by use of proposed raised deck in the seaside garden

The proposed raised deck in the seaside garden would encourage increased use of this rear space close to the houses for parties and other social activities - particularly late at night when any noise disturbance has most impact, and especially since the recent (welcome) moves to ensure people do not create late-night noise disturbance on Little Porth and Porthcressa beaches. Regardless of how the applicant intends to use this space if it were to be granted planning approval, the property is currently used for the extended family's holidays. People on holiday inherently (even if unwittingly) inhabit spaces in a different way, with greater emphasis on enjoyment and with less concern for being a respectful part of a local community or being a good neighbour. In due course, the property could be let out to strangers, where this effect would be exacerbated further. If the deck were to be approved, it would encourage this use and disturbance in a way in which the existing condition does not.

As noted above, we fundamentally oppose the proposed deck. If, however, the council see fit to approve the proposed deck, then we request that the applicant's amendments to the height of the boundary wall be made - in order to ensure that there is no loss of privacy to 5 Little Porth in comparison to the existing condition. I.e the boundary height should be increased by the height of the deck above garden level along the full length of the deck. The height of this boundary must then be maintained - i.e. should this be done in fencing and said fencing is damaged or removed (e.g. by the storms that can and do go over the properties on Little Porth), then any height lost must be reinstated without delay to ensure that privacy is maintained.

[It is noted, too, that the figures in the applicant's/agent's information vary for this boundary wall. The existing drawings suggest that the top of the existing wall is only 1190mm high from garden level, which is wildly incorrect. Proposed drawings give inconsistent, if close, figures of 1670mm and 1690mm. Regardless, the existing privacy condition must be maintained.]

Damage to the existing boundary hedge that would be caused by proposed works to seaside boundary wall with 5 Little Porth

As noted in our original comments, any works in proximity to the existing hedge seriously risk damaging the root system and compromising the whole hedge. The applicant's form states incorrectly that there are no hedges on the development site. The boundary hedge has enormous roots at the base of the wall, and it is from these roots that the majority of the boundary hedge down the whole garden is growing. Any disturbance will damage, if not kill, the hedge. The hedge is essential for biodiversity, visual appeal and to maintain the established character of this part of St Mary's: houses set back from the sea wall, with a clean buffer between beach and town of uninterrupted gardens separated by soft, hedge boundaries.

Significant loss of daylight/sunlight that would be caused by the proposed new fence on the road side

As highlighted in our previous comments, this area is north-facing and so the rooms here already receive very little in the way of daylight and no direct sunlight. This is especially key, as the only window to the kitchen/dining room of 5 Little Porth is on this north-facing elevation (please refer to the diagrams submitted as part of our original comments). What little daylight we already receive is precious. Reducing the daylight that this kitchen/dining room receives will render it unusable without powered lighting. This is a key living space in the property, particularly in winter, when being in a large storm-battered seaside living room is uncomfortable and heating it is unsustainable.

The agent states that "the bathroom I would assume has obscure glazing". This is incorrect. When we recently had to replace a window, we purposefully chose to have clear glass specifically due to the lack of light within the space - and all the accompanying issues that this fosters, such as black mould.

We have rights to light, which while not typically part of the planning process are nonetheless protected by law. We believe that the proposed fence would violate these rights.

It is entirely irrelevant what the external space on the 5 Little Porth side of the boundary is used for, as the issue is the proposed reduction of daylight into the rooms within the property, and does not relate to the external space.

Impactful disturbance and noise nuisance that would be caused by the front door in the proposed position and by people inhabiting the proposed courtyard space

The agent states that "the use of this space for additional activities is very unlikely, and no more likely than disturbance in the backyard as existing" and "whether the bedroom is a window or a sliding doorset does not have any particular relevance in my opinion". We contest the validity of both of these statements.

The proposed introduction of the front door where the current bedroom window is would instantly increase the use of this space from infrequent and momentary (accessing elements in the storage boxes only as and when required) to a regular occurrence, as people enter and leave the property. Not to mention people waiting by the door, to enter or to deliver items, to put shoes on, to smoke, etc. It is most likely that people would be coming and going many times a day and at night, into and through a space that is currently fully occupied only by static storage.

The proposed doors from the bedroom directly to the outside would also encourage people to use this space as a dwelling space to spend time, rather than just as a through-route. As noted with regard to the proposed seaside deck, people use spaces in different ways when they are

on holiday, and the proposed configuration would create a sheltered courtyard. By having a window from the bedroom, rather than doors (which the agent anyway says they do not really see a difference between), this proposed courtyard area would be more of a simple through-route than an external 'room' onto which multiple internal rooms and doors open.

In summary, the proposed amendments and agent's responses do little in the way of improving or further justifying the proposals. We continue to object.

Yours faithfully,

Sian Jones
5 Little Porth