

Subject: FW: Form submission from: Planning application: P/17/039

Sent: 29 May 2017 13:43

To: Planning <planning@scilly.gov.uk>

Subject: Form submission from: Planning application: P/17/039

Submitted on Monday, 29 May, 2017 - 13:42

Full Name: Mr and Mrs Beck

Your Address:

Trevessa
The Parade
St Mary's
Isles of Scilly
TR21 0LP

Representation:

Dear Mrs Walton

We are writing to confirm our objection to the proposed rear extension at Roanoake.

The proposed development remains the same at ground and first floor as the previous application P16/121/FUL, which was refused. It does nothing to address our objections set out previously.

We are the owners of Trevessa which is located immediately behind Roanoake and think that the proposed three storey extension will have an overbearing impact on our property and other properties within the vicinity.

The applicant has not submitted a Listed Building and Conservation Area Appraisal and therefore has made no assessment of the impact of the proposed extension on the listed buildings in the area.

The application is contrary to Council Policy as set out within the Scilly Design Guide 2006 as the proposals do not meet the following requirements:

1. The layout of a new building, or extensions to an existing building, on a plot must take account of the need to respect the privacy of adjacent households.
2. EXTENSIONS should be SUBSERVIENT to the original building.
3. To ensure that all relevant future development proposals respect and protect the recognised quality of the islands natural, archaeological, historic and built environment, they will be permitted only where, as applicable, they:
 - a. preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and preserve the architectural or historic interest of all listed buildings including their features and settings;

The space between the properties on the Parade and Porthcressa Road is already very narrow. The block plan submitted with the application is incorrect as a single storey extension has been built to the rear of Trevessa which is used as a kitchen. There is currently 15.3m between our kitchen

window and the existing rear wall of Roanoake. There is already overlooking of our back garden from the existing kitchen window of Roanoake which is only 5.1m from our rear boundary. If the extension is constructed there will be only 12.8m between our kitchen window and the proposed kitchen window and approximately 2.6m from the new kitchen window to our rear boundary. There is currently 18m between Roanoake's kitchen window and our bedroom window at first floor level. This will reduce to 15.5m under the proposals.

The Isles of Scilly Design Guide published in 2006 states:

The layout of a new building, or extensions to an existing building, on a plot must take account of the need to respect the privacy of adjacent households.

It goes on to state:

Privacy can be achieved by;

(a) distance (usually the imposition of a standard spacing of 21 metres between opposite living room windows) and

(b) by design (the layout of one building in relation to another, the careful definition of the public and private side of a house and the size and disposition of windows on an elevation).

Due to the "tight" character of many of the settlements, proposed layouts based on a strict adherence to the distance principle are unlikely to be appropriate as the principle tends to produce a suburban layout, which is rarely achievable or desirable. Thus privacy should be achieved through the careful siting, design (interior and exterior) and placement of windows.

The proposals do not meet part (a) at present and will reduce the gap between the kitchen windows of the two properties to 12.8m, only 60% of the recommended 21m.

The proposals also do not meet part (b) as the design has not sited the kitchen window to prevent overlooking of our property and does not utilise the ground floor for living accommodation.

We therefore believe that the proposals result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and are contrary to The Isles of Scilly Design Guide.

The proposed extension will still leave Roanoake with very little private outdoor space.

The Isles of Scilly Design Guide states that;

4. EXTENSIONS should be SUBSERVIENT to the original building.

When viewed from the side the proposed extension is still large compared to the existing house and we do not consider the extension to be subservient to the original building from the side elevation. This will have an overbearing impact on properties either side of Roanoake.

Trevesa is a Grade 2 listed building as are the other properties along The Parade. The application does not consider the impact of the proposals on these listed buildings. The Isles of Scilly Design Guide states that:

It should be noted that the guide does not provide specific advice in relation to listed buildings as the design considerations contained in this document apply to all types of buildings - although the guidance will apply more strictly to listed buildings.

The Isles of Scilly Local Plan Policy 1 (Environmental protection) states that:

To ensure that all relevant future development proposals respect and protect the recognised quality of the islands natural, archaeological, historic and built environment, they will be permitted only where, as applicable, they:

- preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and preserve the architectural or historic interest of all listed buildings including their features and settings;

How do these proposals preserve or enhance the settings of the listed buildings along The Parade?

There seems little point in having an adopted policy if it is not applied fairly for all applications and granting the proposed extension could reasonably be expected to lead to similar applications from other properties along Porthcressa Road with an expectation that they would be granted. Taken together these could have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the listed buildings along The Parade.

The proposed development would reduce our privacy by directly overlooking our garden from the kitchen window and reducing the distance between living rooms of the two properties to an unacceptable degree. For this and the other reasons listed above we object to this application.

Thank you for considering our representations concerning this application.

Mr and Mrs Beck