

# Comments for Planning Application 18/00728/PPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 18/00728/PPP

Address: Land East Of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street Innerleithen Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Lucy Hoad

## Customer Details

Name: Dr Nicholas Hesford

Address: Holly Hill, Maxwell Street, Innerleithen, Scottish Borders EH44 6HS

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Detrimental to environment
- Inadequate drainage
- Inadequate screening
- Litter
- Noise nuisance
- Overlooking
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Water Supply

Comment: The site is not identified on the LDP as a potential development site and indeed development of this space would detract from the character of the Innerleithen Conservation Area.

The current Right of Way - whilst not maintained by the owner at all, generating increased foot traffic and dog-fouling on the monoblock driveway - is not the correct Right of Way as stated in the Local Plan. The Right of Way actually runs diagonally through the site in this application.

Development of the site for a dwellinghouse would present issues for suitable and sufficient drainage and foul waste sewerage.

Erection of a dwellinghouse directly in front of our house would block natural light, impede our view of the natural surroundings, and increase traffic on the private driveway.

For the reasons above, I formally OBJECT to this planning application.

# Comments for Planning Application 18/00728/PPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 18/00728/PPP

Address: Land East Of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street Innerleithen Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Lucy Hoad

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Kayleigh Hesford

Address: Holly Hill, Maxwell Street, Innerleithen, Scottish Borders EH44 6HS

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Loss of light
- Loss of view
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Road safety

Comment: I formally OBJECT to this planning application for the following reasons:

Inadequate drainage

Increased traffic (foot and car) on monoblock driveway

Loss of light

Loss of view

Neighbour privacy

Road safety (monoblock driveway and adjacent Maxwell Street)

Colin  
Riddell

---

From: Colin Riddell  
Sent: 8 Jul 2018 20:24:50 +0100  
To: Planning & Regulatory Services; Hoad, Lucy  
Subject: Planning Application No 18/00728/PPP - Land ease of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street, Innerleithen EH44 6HS

Planning Application No 18/00728/PPP - Land ease of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street, Innerleithen EH44 6HS

Objector: Mr C J Riddell of Old Damside Cottage, Damside, Innerleithen, EH44 6HR

I objected to the above Planning Application via a signed petition, not realizing that it is considered as 1 representation.

I therefore formally object to the above Planning Application via this email for the following reasons outlined below:

- I would draw your attention to the fact that planning and subsequent appeal for a similar property failed, together with enforcement on the plot, ref circa 2001 etc.

Reference in these documents is made to development on amenity space which was subsequently used as a reason for rejection of the application. In particular the reporter, item 14, PPA/140/74 concurs that development of this space by a dwelling would detract from the character of the Innerleithen Conservation Area and is at variance with the policy.

This site is currently not identified in the LDP as potential for development.

The area in question is within the Innerleithen Conservation Area zone and no reference is made within the application to this fact.

- It transpires through our research that there is dubiety on the position of the right of way. The current position to the east of the site is not considered in the application and there is evidence to show the right of way could actually bisect the site diagonally. I believe SBC confirmed in a letter of 4/12/2002 that the right of way has to be maintained. This is not clarified. At present the applicant does not maintain the alleged current route which suggests an inference to influence the situation (omit the maintenance of the right of way and its very existence).
- The site has previously been used as a "tip" for building materials. The extent and type is unknown. With potential contamination we have concerns on developing this site from currently being grass land due to Health and Safety issues.

I believe SBC in their letter of 4/12/2002 agreed to the principle of open grassed area with "Any such scheme must be in keeping with the surrounding conservation area and maintained accordingly"

The consent reference 0202049FUL defines the site as open grass land.

- Drainage aspects on the application (ie Water Supply and Drainage Arrangements) note no changes are envisaged - this is incorrect.

I note Scottish Water have not commented on the application as consultee.

Referring to the application it clearly states SUDS will not apply. The area and relevant properties are served by a combined sewer within the road on Damside. Scottish Water are clear on this issue, new surface water discharge cannot connect to the system and has to be treated via SUDS and soakaway as there are no watercourses available.

Soakaways cannot be implemented and hence the site cannot drain for the undernoted reasons:

- The geology of the site precludes infiltration
- Soakaway location has to be 5m from properties and boundaries - there is no space to locate such a feature.

**From:** lorna riddell  
**Sent:** 8 Jul 2018 20:13:17 +0100  
**To:** Planning & Regulatory Services; Hoad, Lucy  
**Subject:** OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION NO 18/00728/PPP - July 7th 2018

Planning Application No 18/00728/PPP - Land ease of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street, Innerleithen EH44 6HS

Objector: Mrs Lorna E Riddell of Old Damside Cottage, Damside, Innerleithen, EH44 6HR

I objected to the above Planning Application via a signed petition, not realizing that it is considered as 1 representation.

I therefore formally object to the above Planning Application via this email for the following reasons outlined below:

- I would draw your attention to the fact that planning and subsequent appeal for a similar property failed, together with enforcement on the plot, ref circa 2001 etc.

Reference in these documents is made to development on amenity space which was subsequently used as a reason for rejection of the application. In particular the reporter, item 14, PPA/140/74 concurs that development of this space by a dwelling would detract from the character of the Innerleithen Conservation Area and is at variance with the policy. This site is currently not identified in the LDP as potential for development.

The area in question is within the Innerleithen Conservation Area zone and no reference is made within the application to this fact.

- It transpires through our research that there is dubiety on the position of the right of way. The current position to the east of the site is not considered in the application and there is evidence to show the right of way could actually bisect the site diagonally. I believe SBC confirmed in a letter of 4/12/2002 that the right of way has to be maintained. This is not clarified. At present the applicant does not maintain the alleged current route which suggests an inference to influence the situation (omit the maintenance of the right of way and its very existence).
- The site has previously been used as a "tip" for building materials. The extent and type is unknown. With potential contamination we have concerns on developing this site from currently being grass land due to Health and Safety issues. I believe SBC in their letter of 4/12/2002 agreed to the principle of open grassed area with "Any such scheme must be in keeping with the

surrounding conservation area and maintained accordingly"

The consent reference 0202049FUL

defines the site as open grass land.

- Drainage aspects on the application (ie Water Supply and Drainage Arrangements) note no changes are envisaged - this is incorrect.

I note Scottish Water have not commented on the application as consultee.

Referring to the application it clearly states SUDS will not apply. The area and relevant properties are served by a combined sewer within the road on Damside. Scottish Water are clear on this issue, new surface water discharge cannot connect to the system and has to be treated via SUDS and soakaway as there are no watercourses available.

Soakaways cannot be implemented and hence the site cannot drain for the undernoted reasons:

- The geology of the site precludes infiltration
- Soakaway location has to be 5m from properties and boundaries - there is no space to locate such a feature.

# Comments for Planning Application 18/00728/PPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 18/00728/PPP

Address: Land East Of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street Innerleithen Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Lucy Hoad

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Ross McGinn

Address: Leithen Foot Princes Street, Innerleithen, Scottish Borders EH44 6JX

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Designated Conservation Area
- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Inadequate access
- Increased traffic

Comment: The development site is an important area of green space in the heart of this community and within the conservation area. There was strong community and community council objection to development on this site some years ago. An appeal was unsuccessful and the Reporters comments then are still relevant. The community view remains unchanged. The Right of Way was diverted and is now partly obstructed by lack of regular maintenance although still used.

Fencing now partly obstructs the amenity use of the green space and is not necessary.

Communities today feel strongly about the loss of green spaces and this area should be developed.

I object.





# Comments for Planning Application 18/00728/PPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 18/00728/PPP

Address: Land East Of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street Innerleithen Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Lucy Hoad

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Russell Blackhall

Address: Damside Cottage, Damside, Innerleithen, Scottish Borders EH44 6HR

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Flood plain risk
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Loss of view
- No sufficient parking space
- Poor design
- Value of property

Comment: I refer to the comments from Environmental health and rights of way,

Specifically, they will only accept connection to the public system which as noted in my previous comments is not technically possible.

The right of way issue has not been cleared, there are historic drawings showing the path diagonally through the site.

In terms of general design, I would also note no design details have been provided and therefore the application is lacking in detail and cannot be properly assessed in terms of massing, height footprint. It is considered that with a typical footprint the normal proportion of garden ground needed cannot be met.

# Comments for Planning Application 18/00728/PPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 18/00728/PPP

Address: Land East Of Rose Cottage Maxwell Street Innerleithen Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Lucy Hoad

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Russell Blackhall

Address: Damside Cottage, Damside, Innerleithen, Scottish Borders EH44 6HR

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Health Issues
- Smell

Comment: I refer to the environmental health officers reply. I am disappointed no reference is made to contaminated land and its appraisal. SBC have specified guidelines where such sites should be investigated if such suspicion is valid.

This site has a record of "dumping" and I refer to past enforcement notices where action was implemented to "Clean" up the site. Who knows what lies below the surface which would be released during any construction works.

However as an experienced ground investigation professional this site needs a concise and compliant investigation and should be referred to the CLO for consideration. As a minimum a suitable condition should be applied to any consent in respect of ground assessment and health and safety issues.