

**SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL**

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO  
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

**PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)**

REF : 17/00472/FUL

APPLICANT : Mr & Mrs Rutherford

AGENT : Stuart Davidson Architecture

DEVELOPMENT : Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

LOCATION: 1 Glenkinnon  
Ashiestiel Bridge  
Clovenfords  
Galashiels  
Scottish Borders  
TD1 3LH

TYPE : FUL Application

REASON FOR DELAY: Negotiation

---

**DRAWING NUMBERS:**

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
P462/LOC	Location Plan	Refused
P462/002	Floor Plans	Refused
P462/003	Elevations	Refused

**NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 1**

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

FLOOD PROTECTION OFFICER: Review of the application shows that the proposed site is located within the 1 in 200 year (0.5% annual probability) flood extent of the River Tweed and may be at medium to high risk of flooding. Notwithstanding the above this is a small scale development that is unlikely to have a significant effect on the storage capacity of the functional flood plain or affect local flooding problems and the FPO would not oppose it on flooding grounds. It is however recommend that the applicant adopts water resilient materials and construction methods as appropriate in the development and the applicant review the Online Planning Advice on Flood Risk. It is also recommend that, to receive flood warnings for 'The Tweed from Peebles to Yair Bridge' from SEPA, the applicant signs up to FLOODLINE at [www.sepa.org.uk](http://www.sepa.org.uk) or by telephone on 0845 988 1188. It would also be advisable for the applicant to develop an evacuation plan for the building during times of flood warning.

**PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS**

This application was publicised by means of the direct postal notification of 4 neighbouring dwellings. Representation was made by one neighbour. The neighbour believed that further consultations with FCS, SEPA, SNH and Scottish Water were required due to the location of the property. This is not the case. It was also noted in the representation that the scale of the proposed extension is 2 storeys, whilst the existing is single storey. The ridge is also higher than the existing.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:**

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016  
PMD2 (Quality Standards)  
HD3 (Protection of Residential Amenity)  
IS8 (Flooding)  
EP13 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows)

**OTHER**

Scottish Borders Council Supplementary Planning Guidance:  
- Householder Development  
- Trees and Development

**Recommendation by** - Andrew Evans (Planning Officer) on 20th July 2017

This householder application seeks full planning permission to extend and alter this traditional detached dwelling at Ashiestiel Bridge by Clovenfords. The property has modest proportions given its traditional nature. The existing house features traditional detailing - slated roof, rendered walls, and a traditional form. It has an existing single storey lean to addition. The house itself is also single storey. The house is of matching scale and form to its immediate neighbour to the east, though both have been altered externally over the years.

There are mature trees located in the garden ground of the house. It would appear that the tree and extension may be capable of co-existing, however no tree survey to BS5837:2017, as required by SBC's adopted guidance on Trees and Development was lodged with the application, to suitably demonstrate this. I note however that a Permitted Development extension to the house would have the same, if not greater, potential impact on tree roots. The loss of the substantial conifer nearest to the extension could be accepted. Impact on trees does not therefore amount to a reason for refusal of the application.

It is proposed to add a rear extension to the house. The proposed rear extension would be to provide additional accommodation. The submitted details for this proposed rear extension would however result in structure with a higher ridge and eaves lines than present in the existing dwelling. The result is uncomfortable, with the extension being of an inappropriate scale and proportion relative to the existing house. This is visible in the proposed elevation drawing accompanying the application.

Policy PMD2 of the 2016 Local Development Plan sets out the quality standards applicable to new developments, including extensions. Criteria (i) requires that development is of a scale, massing, height and density appropriate to its surroundings, and where an extension or alteration, appropriate to the existing building. It is in regard to this criterion that the proposals come into conflict with adopted planning policy. The proposed extension is of greater eaves and ridge heights than the existing house. The extension would have an unacceptable overall height in this context. It is in terms of the scale of the proposed extension that there are concerns. The existing building has an eaves height of c2.3m and a ridge height of c.4.8m. In comparison, the ridge height of the proposed extension, would sit some 1.4m higher than the ridge of the existing house. This transition in level causes issues, in terms of the front elevation of the house. Furthermore, the rear two storey addition would be visible (albeit not prominent) from the opposing side of the valley. The proposed extension would remove the balance that exists between the existing house and its neighbour, in both closer and wider views of the houses.

Fundamentally, the proposals represent an unacceptable two storey addition to an existing bungalow. These current proposals involve the construction of an extension which is contrary to policy PMD2 of the LDP in that it would not be appropriate to the existing building by virtue of this greater scale relative to the existing dwelling.

Although it would be finished in traditional materials to match the existing dwellinghouse, the proposed end extension would be of a different scale to it, notably at odds with the proportions of the existing dwellinghouse. The objections to the proposals are fundamental, principally that the proposed extension has been designed in a manner which would not be subservient to the existing building. The scale is considered to be unacceptable under policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan. There may exist an opportunity for a revised alternative proposal to gain the support of the Planning Authority; however such

revisions were requested of the agent during the processing of the application. The agent has requested that the application be determined on the basis of the original submission.

Policy HD3 of the LDP is concerned with the protection of residential amenity. In this instance, the proposed additional living accommodation would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. The nearest neighbouring dwellings are located on the to the east (no.1 Glenkinnon), and the relationship with neighbouring land and buildings is such that I can conclude that the extension would be in compliance with policy HD3 and the standards set out in the Householder Development SPG.

Finally, I note the comments of the Council Flooding Technician. The site is at a modest risk of flooding. Were the application otherwise acceptable, it would have been possible for flood risk to be addressed via applicant informatives as set out in the Flood Risk consultation response.

**REASON FOR DECISION :**

The proposed extension to the dwelling would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would not be of a scale that would be visually appropriate to the existing building or its surroundings.

**Recommendation:** Refused

- 1 The proposed extension to the dwelling would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would not be of a scale that would be visually appropriate to the existing building or its surroundings.

**“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.**

