

Walling, Fiona

From: David Wilson <
Sent: 18 August 2019 18:05
To: localreview
Subject: 19/00020/RREF

James Wilson

I write to you to object to the Planning application to build a dwelling house in the Garden of the Rest Murrayfield, St.Abbs TD14 5PP

Appeal Ref 19/00020/RREF

In April 2018 ,Mark Douglas, the lead officer (Built Heritage and Design) stated that he had concerns about the proposals which neither enhanced or preserved the conservation area nor would they have a neutral impact e.g. it would have a negative impact. Despite this he suggested amendments in an attempt to push this development through. This was a poor decision since the settlement profile of St.Abbs states building material such as sandstone, pantile and slate and architectural details like transom lights, sash and case windows and margins add to the sense of place, any alterations or new developments must therefore aim to contribute to the existing character of the conservation area.

The Assistant Planning Officer disagreed he felt the sitings and design of the development would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area. It was good that he listened to the many public objections and the excellent report by the very knowledgeable Scottish Architectural and Heritage Society.

This was a good example of a democracy in action, it was not a subjective decision by one person, Paul Duncan was supervised by his line manager. This difference of opinion arose because Mark Douglas only considered the conservation area but Paul Duncan agreed with the heritage society of Scotland that the development is in breach of five different clauses of the local development plan and so refused the application. The Heritage Officer's opinion was purely subjective and unsupported.

The Energy efficiency of the house is overstated, all it consists of is passive solar gain. It is hard to see what benefit this will be in the winter when the days are short and there is little heat in the sun.

Recent filming in St. Abbs has led to lots of good publicity, this has helped the local economy. It would be wrong to spoil the character of the village with a contemporary building and chase away the film companies.

Ebba Strand fits in with the Rest and the Beacon. The proposed development is more like the modern development at Coldingham Sands, interesting buildings in the wrong locations, it is important to learn by our mistakes. The SBC supported a complaint by farmers on Coldingham Moors that building a wind farm would spoil the beauty of the moors. To be consistent the SBC must not allow a development that spoils the beautiful view over Coldingham Bay. Similarly, if so called eco houses are allowed why are solar panels not allowed in conservation areas

The Beacon is not residential, it is a business. The house is let out to holiday makers. Building in front of us and spoiling our view will have an adverse effect on our business. If our house loses its link with the sea it will be turned into an oddity with no reason for being there. It was intentionally built back from the sea so Castlerock's prominent setting would not be encroached on. This new building may not spoil the outlook of this landmark building but it will certainly spoil its setting as viewed from the core path.

“Castlerock is a well known, highly recognisably and prominent local landmark. It is very attractive and distinctive, an arts and craft house built in 1895. It is easily viewed from nearby public vantage points including the Berwickshire Coastal Path. Clearly, there is a need to preserve its character and setting as it forms an important component of the local village setting. The building is situated within the St Abbs conservation area”

This paragraph was used by the Scottish Government Officer who refused the planning application for Castlerock's solar panels.

All my previous objections are available to view on the Planning Departments website