



4th September 2020

Planning and Development Departments Town Hall
St Marys
Isles of Scilly

Dear Sir

Objection to planning application P/20/054, Mr Tristain Fletcher

We wish to strongly object to the planning application P/20/054/FUL

Despite the applicant buying new land, producing a new design, this new application does not answer the original comments which caused the previous scheme to be withdrawn (P/19/020/FUL).

- The new proposals still result in the scale and massing, appearing unacceptably overbearing and dominant.
- The proposed development still maintains a siting which represents a cramped appearance in the street-scene and proximity to the site boundaries to Buzza Road, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and AONB.

The original comments made by officers on P/19/020, as quoted by the architects in their Design and Access Statement say.

”Whilst officers recognise the need to support development of brownfield sites, this cannot be at the expense of high quality design, the protection of landscape character or the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. On this basis, the proposal is considered unacceptable by virtue of its scale and massing.”

We would maintain that by scrutiny of the proposed plans, this comment still applies, and on those grounds the application should be refused because they do not meet the criteria mentioned in the Local Planning Policies

May I point out that not ONCE has the applicant approached us about his plans to over develop the area, bearing in mind we are one of the closest properties it will impact. The homes nearby have not been considered at all in these plans, plunging some into darkness.

As a close neighbour of the site we will be hugely affected by the loss of natural light in our main living areas of the house and the bedrooms. We will be over shadowed and over looked. This is not a 'like for like' footprint replacement and it will be over development of the site. It is going to impact hugely on our privacy and this is a big worry for us.

As stated in my previous objection, another huge concern of ours, with the over development, is the wind tunnel this is going to create on the path leading right up to our house. With forces of 108 knots being recorded on that path in a strong Southerly, frequent in the winter, the proposed build is only going to funnel those winds and therefore increasing them. This puts my children at risk and our house, being at the end of the path, will get full brunt of the wind and debris. It was only 2 years ago that glass flew off Monaveen and wedged into our gate.

The reasons for refusal of the previous scheme have been written in Appendix A of the design and Access Statement.

I have had a look back on the previous application in 2017 which was smaller in size. The Council refused it on the following grounds..

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). Signed Senior

With the new proposed dwelling being considerable larger, more overbearing, it will have a detrimental affect on our home. I hope the Council will consider all our concerns and refuse the application as it did in 2017.

We would suggest that R1 and R2 with little or no amendment, should be the basis for refusing this new application.

With the new proposed dwelling being considerable larger, more overbearing, it will have a detrimental affect on our home. I hope the Council will consider all our concerns and refuse the application as it did previously

Yours sincerely

Georgia and Adam May

