

Lisa Walton
Chief Planning Officer
Planning Department
Council of the Isles of Scilly

4th October 2025

Dear Lisa

Re: Applicant responses to the objections raised against Planning Application P/25/075/HH 7 Buzza Street, St. Mary's, Isles of Scilly TR21 0HX

I write in my capacity as the applicant in relation to the above Planning application. Now that the consultation period has ended, please see below my responses which will hopefully manage any concerns you have from a planning perspective.

The points below specifically respond to each point raised in the initial objection letter from Tracey Setter. The 2 further objections from Gulls Way property management and Scilly Self Catering (who provide a property management service and holiday lettings service 8a & 8b Buzza street) are a duplication of the same points raised by Tracey Setter. Therefore, my responses below are in relation to all objections as they are essentially the same.

Points of objection and responses:

1. Severe Loss of Privacy, Outlook and View

The proposed dormer with bi-folding doors opening onto a roof terrace will be positioned beside our bedroom window and opposite our bathroom, at the same level and within very close proximity. Although screening is indicated, this would not remove the impact. Instead, it would dominate our outlook, significantly diminish our existing view, reduce light, and leave the rooms feeling dark, enclosed, and hemmed in.

Response to objection

The extension and terrace are carefully designed to have acceptable and minimal effect on outlook and light for the adjacent property. Our proposals provide the appropriate safeguards which manage these objections.

2. Impact on Ground Floor and Courtyard

Our small courtyard garden is the only outdoor space at the property. This would inevitably be overlooked and overshadowed by the proposed terrace, removing all sense of privacy and quiet enjoyment. Any screening used to address overlooking would also cut daylight to our ground floor, which already opens onto a confined courtyard area and this would diminish the amenity of the whole property.

Response to objection

By deliberately not using the whole of the roof, the design of the roof terrace ensures that there is no overlooking and overshadowing. The area proposed for the roof terrace is less than 50% of the available roof area. The screening is set back 1.225 metres from the boundary, as can be seen clearly on the proposed Northwest elevation drawing. The use of opaque glass, together with the distance from the boundary, ensures that privacy and light quality are maintained. Furthermore, these proposals will not create any detriment to the existing courtyard which is currently small and shadowed.

3. Noise and Disturbance

The terrace is clearly designed to be used as an external living/entertaining space. Its immediate proximity to our bedroom windows and courtyard will inevitably result in intrusive levels of noise making it impossible to enjoy our property peacefully or to keep windows open.

Response to objection

By the nature of terraced properties, all functions are in immediate proximity to their neighbours. The noise levels from the enclosed courtyard of No. 8 will probably reverberate more loudly (ie the echoing effect) than from the more open (and smaller) terrace of No.7. Our proposed screening ensures that the courtyard will be protected for any potential noise and or disturbance. The terrace is not designed as an 'entertaining' area, it is designed as a quiet and peaceful space to enjoy a view. The nature of terraced living requires neighbours to be respectful of each other's needs.

4. Overbearing and Enclosing Impact

The positioning of the terrace immediately adjacent to our windows and courtyard would create an oppressive and intrusive presence. The sense of enclosure and overbearing impact will be particularly harmful given the modest size of our home, and the effect would extend across the property as a whole, not just to the first floor.

Response to objection

By not including the whole roof in the terrace, and maintaining a distance from the boundary, there will be an acceptable minimum impact on the neighbours especially given that number 8 has been through various enlargements in previous years to create multi dwellings, with this in mind the proposal is not inconsistent with the direct surroundings.

5. Loss of Light

Any screening to prevent overlooking would, by its nature, block daylight to our windows and courtyard. This would darken both the bedroom and the ground floor rooms, substantially reducing the quality of our living environment.

Response to objection

The use of opaque glass, together with the distance from the boundary (the glass will be set back by 1.225 metres,) ensures that the current levels of privacy and light quality are maintained.

6. Effect on Holiday Lettings

Our property is also operated as a small self-catering holiday let. Guests choose it because of its light, privacy, and peaceful character. These qualities would be lost if the terrace is constructed, leaving the property far less attractive to visitors. In an already challenging tourist market, this would not only damage our ability to sustain lettings but would also reduce the contribution on our property makes to the local visitor economy.

Response to objection

The current tourism market on the Isles of Scilly is not a challenging market, it is infact the opposite. There are high levels of demand to visit the islands and the updating of No 7 will add to the local visitor economy as it will be used as a holiday let aswell, and hence contributing to the local economy. These proposals do not negatively affect light, privacy and peaceful character as described above as reasons for choosing to stay at No 8. At present No 8 is adjacent to a dilapidated, unsightly and derelict property, and these proposals address this.

7. Inappropriate Design and Use of Roof

The conversion of a flat roof into a terrace is out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and introduces an intrusive and unneighbourly form of development. I believe Planning policy and established case law are clear that such proposals are often unacceptable where they lead to loss of amenity.

Response to objection

The character of the rear areas of this terraced row is defined by a series of random and ad hoc extensions. Our proposals are carefully and considerably designed to meet the clients' requirements with minimum impact on the neighbours. There is no loss of amenity and there are other terraces in Hugh town.

8. Cumulative Impact

Given the scale of our small one-bedroom property, the impact of this development would be disproportionately harmful. Unlike larger homes with multiple outdoor spaces or more separation between properties, the effect here is intensified and leaves us with no private or peaceful space at all.

Response to objection

Our proposals will bring back to life a neglected property and is wholly appropriate and proportionate given the direct locality and for the area and type of accommodation. Buzza street and its direct surroundings are built up, this proposal is consistent with the direct locality and will not be out of place.

I hope the above responses provide enough clarity and detail for you, however if you need any further information / discussion, then please do not hesitate to contact me. Similarly, if you have any feedback prior to any decision being made, again please do not hesitate to contact me if appropriate.

In closing, I hope that you can see that our proposal has been created in considerate and sympathetic manner, whilst being respectful to our neighbours and their properties.

Many thanks

Tony Fleming – applicant

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]