

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

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

PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)

REF : 17/00011/FUL

APPLICANT : Ms Evelyn Brown and Mr John Kirk

AGENT : Keith Renton, Architect

DEVELOPMENT : Erection of detached garage with first floor studio, alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

LOCATION: Danderhall Cottage
St Boswells
Melrose
Scottish Borders
TD6 0EB

TYPE : FUL Application

REASON FOR DELAY: Negotiation

DRAWING NUMBERS:

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
815P-01	Location Plan	Refused
815P-03	Existing Elevations	Refused
815P-02	Floor Plans	Refused
815P-07	Other	Refused
815P-08	Elevations	Refused
815P-05	Floor Plans	Refused
815P-06	Elevations	Refused
815P-04	Floor Plans	Refused

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: No objections to this proposal.

PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

This application did not require any publicity or notification.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016)
PMD2, HD3

OTHER

Scottish Borders Council Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- Householder Development
- Placemaking and Design

Recommendation by - Andrew Evans (Planning Officer) on 11th May 2017

Danderhall Cottage is located on sloping land to the east of St Boswells. The property was extended last year, with additions granted planning permission to the western gable elevation. This was constructed.

It is now proposed in this current application to extend the dwelling to the opposite eastern gable elevation. It is also proposed to erect a detached garage with first floor studio accommodation. Via permitted development rights, an outbuilding would have been possible, but would have been limited to 4m in height.

In terms of placemaking and design there are no issues with the extension to the house. In terms of neighbouring amenity, again, there are no issues arising, and the proposals comply with the guidance and standards in the SPG on Householder Development. In terms of road safety, the Roads Planning Service was consulted and advises that there are no objections to this proposal.

There were however concerns over the visual impact, and size and scale of the proposed new outbuilding. In an attempt to address this, 3d images which show both the garage and the house together in context were produced by the agent. The contention of the architect is that whilst higher, the relationship of the buildings mean that neither the massing nor scale of the garage dominate that of the house. These 3d views have been taken from positions that equate to the site boundary with the public road and from within the site. A degree of screening by trees which are between the road and the house is present. However it is possible to see both the house and the site of the outbuilding from the public road.

Whilst the planning authority notes these points, and notes the proposed planting that could be carried out in front of the proposed building, this would not be a subservient structure. The depth of the proposed garage building would be greater than the existing house. The agent highlights that the eaves would be lower than the house eaves, and the garage would be set back from the house. This is true, however the land on which the new outbuilding would sit is higher than the level that the existing house sits at. The ridge and eaves would sit at a higher level relative to the existing house (the site being on higher land). The ridge of the existing house is at 6.5m. This compares to a ridge height for the proposed building of 6.795m. Visually from the roadside, the proposed outbuilding would sit at a higher level than the existing house. The building would have a greater visual mass than the existing house. From the road it would visually be confused as another house.

I do note the setback location, tree screening, good quality design, shorter length etc. However, the submitted visuals emphasise this is too large a structure, accounting for the size and scale of the existing house. The building ideally needs to appear incidental in comparison to the house. Policy PMD2 of the LDP requires that scale, massing and height be appropriate to the existing building. This garage requires reduction in order to appear visually sympathetic to the existing house. On balance, this conflict with policy is considered unacceptable.

REASON FOR DECISION :

The proposed outbuilding would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would not be of a scale, massing and height that would be appropriate to the existing dwelling or its surroundings and would be visually unsympathetic as a result.

Recommendation: Refused

- 1 The proposed outbuilding would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would not be of a scale, massing and height that would be appropriate to the existing dwelling or its surroundings and would be visually unsympathetic as a result.

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