

Comments for Planning Application 18/01680/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/01680/FUL

Address: Land West Of 1 Hallrule Farm Cottage Bonchester Bridge Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of three holiday lodges, access and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Stuart Herkes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andy Johnston

Address: Hallrule Mansion House, Hallrule, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 8JF

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Density of site
- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Fire Safety
- Flood plain risk
- Health Issues
- Height of
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Inadequate screening
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Legal issues
- Litter
- Loss of view
- Noise nuisance
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Overlooking
- Poor design
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Road safety
- Smell
- Trees/landscape affected

- Value of property

Comment: Hallrule Mansion House

Bonchester Bridge

HAWICK

TD9 8JF

30 January 2019

Planning and Regulatory Services

Scottish Borders Council Headquarters

Newtown St. Boswells

MELROSE

TD6 0SA

Dear Sirs

Planning Application Reference: 18/01680/FUL

Erection of three holiday lodges, access and associated infrastructure

Land West Of 1 Hallrule Farm Cottage Bonchester Bridge

I, Mr Andy Johnston, residing at Hallrule Mansion House, Bonchester Bridge, Hawick, hereby object to the above-noted planning application for the following reasons:-

1. Development contrary to Policy ED7

Policy ED7 the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016) states that tourism or leisure development in the countryside will only be approved on the condition that the development accords with the Scottish Borders Tourism Strategy and Action Plan 2013 - 2020.

I have not had the opportunity to examine the applicant's business plan. However, as a developer myself with extensive experience of similar projects, I am concerned that the proposals do not appear to be viable or sustainable. I would observe that there are very few amenities or attractions for visitors in the immediate area, and transport links are poor. Whether the development is, in fact, capable of delivering the purported tourism benefits set out in the applicant's planning statement is questionable.

In any event, one of the stated Strategic Aims of the Tourism Strategy and Action Plan is to "Encourage responsible custodianship of the Region's built and natural environments, scenic and wildlife assets by supporting government, local governments, agencies, landowners, and managers to manage and protect the Region's landscape and wildlife assets any manner that maintains and improves the qualities of beauty, remoteness, wildness, peace and tranquillity."

This development would introduce three incongruous newbuild structures to a remote glen acknowledged by the applicants to be scenic, tranquil, and located within a Special Landscape Area. The development cannot therefore be said to respect the amenity and character of the surrounding area.

Policy ED7 also requires consideration of whether alternative existing buildings could be used in lieu of newbuilds. It is understood that the applicants had previously obtained planning consent to develop holiday lets within Hallrule Farm Steading.

For these reasons, and in view of the fact that the proposals would bring no substantive employment or other economic benefits to the area beyond the initial construction phase, I suggest the development is not supported by Policy ED7.

2. Development contrary to Policy HD2

Paragraph 1.3 of the preamble to Policy ED7 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016) provides that:

"Proposals for housing development will not be treated as farm diversification and will be assessed under Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside.

Furthermore, where the proposal is for a guest house or a bed and breakfast, that proposal will also be assessed against Policy HD2."

The proposals cannot be said to fall within any of the categories (A) - (E) of Policy HD2. In paragraph 4.4 of their Planning Statement, the developers instead suggest that the proposals may be supported by category (F), in respect of Economic Requirement.

However, the development is not required for a worker predominantly employed or last employed in an agricultural, horticultural, forestry, or other appropriate enterprise.

For completeness, I would observe that the additional requirements set down in subparagraphs (c), (d), and (e) of Policy HD2 category (F) also fail to be met, but this seems immaterial given that neither of the prerequisite conditions stated in subparagraphs (a) or (b) apply.

Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to Policy HD2 of the Local Development Plan.

3. Development contrary to Policy PMD4

Paragraph 1.1 of the preamble to Policy PMD4 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016) provides that:

"Any development proposals outwith [defined Development Boundaries] would have to comply with the rigorous exceptions criteria contained within this policy. It is considered that development outwith the Development Boundary should not be seen as an alternative to allocated sites where these are available and, therefore, should only be an 'exceptional' occurrence."

Policy PMD4 provides that "exceptional" approvals may be granted provided "strong" reasons can be given that the development "is a job-generating development in the countryside that has an economic justification under Policy ED7 or HD2."

As stated previously, there is no reason to believe that the development is so justified under Policy ED7 or HD2. Not could there be said to be "significant community benefits that outweigh the need to protect the Development Boundary" per paragraph (d) of Policy PMD4.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy PMD4 of the Local Development Plan.

4. Additional Objections

a) I am concerned that if, at a future time, the applicant was to sell the houses to another party, the new owner might not take a sufficiently proactive approach to managing the development. In such circumstances, the holiday lettings business might fail.

For this reason, I would respectfully request that if planning permission is granted, it is on the express condition that the houses are to be used only as holiday lets for all time coming, and not sold off separately as permanent residential dwellings.

b) Our land was affected by significant flooding in 2016. I am not a hydrologist and cannot, therefore, comment on the applicant's flood risk assessment, but there does not appear to be detailed mention in the assessment of potential impacts beyond the application site boundary. I would observe that the application site lies within Potentially Vulnerable Area 13/13 (Bonchester Bridge) of the Tweed Local Flood Risk Management Plan.

c) The proposed access road joins the adopted public road at a bad corner, raising safety issues. Notwithstanding reference in the planning statement to the Borders Railway, the development will also cause an increase in vehicular traffic (both from guests and service vehicles) on narrow local roads.

d) I am concerned about the potential for pollution (from road surface run-off, heating oil, etc.) into the burn, which I use for livestock watering on my own property.

e) The proposed leisure use could entail noise and other disturbance for neighbouring proprietors.

f) At present, the development site, or "Fairy Glen" as it is known locally, provides both an excellent wildlife habitat and corridor through surrounding arable fields. This will inevitably be destroyed.

g) I have received no formal notification of this application. From discussions with another neighbouring proprietor I understand that they, too, were not notified. It is therefore possible that other parties who may have wished to make representations have remained unaware of the proposals.

Thank you in anticipation for considering the points raised in this letter.

Yours faithfully

Andy Johnston

Isabelle Chapman

Robershaw Cottage
Bonchester Bridge
Hawick
TD9 8JF

Dear Sirs

I, TERRELL P. P. MANNING would
like to object to application Ref 18/01680/F

The proposed site Hallroze burn valley is an important natural corridor for bird & mammal between the Roke valley and the wider uplands and is locally known for its growing population of red squirrels. The proposed development presents a grave threat to this status. Commercialization of a site already recognized as a Special Landscape Area will cause irreparable damage. The hazard caused by any spillage of heating oil or soil waste to the burn in this restricted space should be considered

The increase in traffic volume on a single track road is of concern already at times of high farm activity i.e. harvest, silage cutting great caution is necessary

②

The proposed builday present many questions. The large scale and internal layout would suggest more a domestic dwelling than a holiday lodge. Extenualy they make no referance to any local builday tradition. Is the considerable cost of this development rely going to be justified by perhaps erratic rental income or is this infact a housing development by the back door.

Sadly I am aware of other members of the local community who dependancy of Tenore or bussness intrest have made it impossible for them to express there views and oth who have no knolege of the proposal as likie myself they received no formal notification.



T. MANNING

Comments for Planning Application 18/01680/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/01680/FUL

Address: Land West Of 1 Hallrule Farm Cottage Bonchester Bridge Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of three holiday lodges, access and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Stuart Herkes

Customer Details

Name: Ms Charlotte Maberly

Address: Garden Cottage, Hallrule, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 8JF

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Inadequate access
- Increased traffic
- Land affected

Comment: I object to the proposed building of 3 holiday cottages at Hallrule on the following grounds:

- the proposed site is one of very few remaining spaces in this area which is not under intensive agricultural production or horse pasture. In a landscape where habitat for wild animals and plants is becoming increasingly rare, I feel it would not be appropriate or right to construct non-essential buildings in this space.

- if the purpose of this project is to encourage tourism, then development of this specific site - a rare bit of uncultivated land suitable for walkers and other forms of outdoor pursuit that do not require a permanent structure, seems to be self-defeating.

- the increased traffic during both the construction period and when the cottages are being used, will cause significant disruption on local roads that are already narrow and poorly maintained.

- the aesthetic of the buildings is not in keeping with this area, nor the landscape.

- I believe that this project is not sensitively placed, in that there are already developed areas and existing buildings suitable for conversion, that would be more suitable for holiday cottages.

I am also concerned and uncertain about the proposed private water supply to the houses. Other private water supplies in this valley are known to run out in dry periods, and so it seems imprudent to add three further dwellings to an already over-extended resource.

Overall, whilst I am genuinely not against the sensitive development of this area, particularly as a means of supporting local livelihoods, I do not believe that this particular initiative is most sensitively positioned. This is an area of great natural beauty and I know that many walkers and visitors appreciate being able to access and enjoy the landscape. As the agriculture here has intensified and encroached further on local woodland, etc, it would be a shame to restrict that access further. Another great attraction for visitors and residents alike, is the variety of wildlife and plants. This too, is threatened by extensive grazing and intensification of agriculture, as would this proposed encroachment upon a rare corner of non-agricultural land.

Comments for Planning Application 18/01680/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/01680/FUL

Address: Land West Of 1 Hallrule Farm Cottage Bonchester Bridge Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of three holiday lodges, access and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Stuart Herkes

Customer Details

Name: Mr simon blackwood

Address: Wells Old Lodge Wells U75/3 U61/3 At Bedrule Bridge To U62/3 At Billerwell Lodge,
Scottish Borders, Scottish Borders TD9 8TD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: This area is one of specific natural beauty and should remain so.

The building designs are all inappropriate in this setting and the financial benefit to the land owner is far outweighed by the wild flowers and vegetation of the local amenity enjoyed by locals and walkers for all over the Borders and beyond. Farm diversification is no reason to install holiday homes which will increase traffic substantially in an otherwise peaceful rural environment . The roads in the locality are almost entirely single track and already inadequately tended by the Roads Dept. The application should be refused.

RECEIVED
BILLERWELL FARM
MANCHESTER BRIDGE
HAWICK
TD9 8JF

1st February
2019

Dear Sirs,

Planning application ref:- 1801680/FUL.

We hereby object to the above noted application for planning permission for the following reasons :-

1) We are concerned with the probable huge increase in vehicle traffic through the valley, especially on the single track road between Hallrule and Wells.

As you will be aware there are No passing places on this road, and we now have the addition of a deer fence on one side and an unseen deep drainage

ditch on the other side.

2) The proposed access road from the new houses joins the road on a blind summit.

3) The proposed size and design of the houses do not appear to be in keeping with the surrounding houses in the area and seems to be a case of rural urbanisation!

Thank you for considering the points raised in this letter.

Yours faithfully

