

## Walling, Fiona

---

**From:** localreview  
**Subject:** FW: Planning application 18/01777/FUL - appeal ref 19/00029/RREF

---

**From:** Clarke, Carlos  
**Sent:** 12 February 2020 14:03  
**To:** localreview <localreview@scotborders.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Miller, Craig <CMiller@scotborders.gov.uk>; Scott, Alan (Technical Services, HQ) <ascott@scotborders.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Planning application 18/01777/FUL - appeal ref 19/00029/RREF

Fiona

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to these revised drawings.

I have commented under each reason for refusal in the attached response, and I would be grateful if this could be considered by the Local Review Body as part of their determination of this Review.

Regards,

Carlos Clarke  
Team Leader  
Development Management  
Regulatory Services  
Scottish Borders Council  
Tel: 01835 826735  
Email: [cgclarke@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:cgclarke@scotborders.gov.uk)

**APPEAL REF 19/00029/RREF**

**PLANNING APPLICATION REF 18/01777/FUL - Erection of two dwellinghouses, Garden Ground Of 7 Heriot House, Heriot**

1. *The proposed development does not comply with Policies PMD2, HD2 and EP13 of the Local Development Plan 2016, or Supplementary Planning Guidance on New Housing in the Borders Countryside 2008, Trees and Development 2008 or Placemaking and Design 2010 in that the siting and design of the proposed development would have an adverse and unsympathetic impact on the landscape character of the site; sense of place of the existing group and its built form; and existing tree planting. Other material considerations do not outweigh these policy conflicts*
  - a) The siting of the development is unchanged thus this aspect cannot be considered to have been addressed. It is our view that the gap between the proposed houses and the existing group is unacceptable. A sympathetic proposal would have been to site the houses closer to the existing, instead of allowing for the houses to leapfrog a strip of ground dedicated to a stable block
  - b) The revised drawings do, however, address concerns regarding level changes, providing clear and fairly comprehensive information which demonstrates a sympathetic tie in with existing levels. Stone/rendered walls, as opposed to gabions, would, however, be preferred. It is assumed the level changes will not need adjusted to suit any health and safety issues associated with the adjacent drain outlet. It is for the applicant to ensure this is the case, as any subsequent adjustments to the levels may have adverse visual consequences
  - c) The proposals do not address concerns regarding impacts on trees. The information is no more precise than before, nor does it address the impact of the trees when fully grown on the amenity of the nearest house
  - d) The design and detail of the houses has not materially changed. There remains a poor flow to the roofs; external chimney; dormers to the rear; fascias to eaves; and heavy fascia treatments/eave overhangs to the dormers. These elements combine to produce a development that will depart from the character of the existing buildings, which are fundamentally traditional in their design and detailing
2. *The proposed development does not comply with Policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 or New Housing in the Borders Countryside Supplementary Planning Guidance 2008 in that it has not been demonstrated that the development can be provided with a safe means of vehicular access and would not adversely impact on the integrity of the public road and verge, therefore potentially leading to an adverse impact on road safety. Other material considerations do not outweigh these policy conflicts*
  - a) I would respectfully refer the Local Review Body to the views of our statutory consultee, the Roads Planning Service, on whether the revised submission addresses concerns as regards this reason for refusal
  - b) I would note that access to the stable block, as shown on the revised plans, requires separate Planning Permission as it would not benefit from Permitted Development Rights.