

Comments for Planning Application 20/01327/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01327/FUL

Address: Land Adjacent Carnlea Main Street Heiton Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gillian Harrop

Address: Hillcrest, Main Street, Heiton, Scottish Borders TD5 8JR

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Density of site
- Height of
- Inadequate access
- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Road safety

Comment: With regard to the proposed construction of a 3 bedroom bungalow on land adjacent to Learn Ref. No: 20/01327/FUL

Having given all the documents considered thought we object to this application.

From the plans it can be seen that the design has a considerably larger footprint than the original structure / home, that stood here. One wouldn't necessarily expect a new development to be of the same size but this is much larger and is an attempt at over-development. We question if the existing services can accommodate a property of this size with particular regards to the additional waste water and sewerage.

This building would have a significant impact on the adjoining properties at Carnlea and ourselves at Hillcrest. The position of the building would lead to the west elevation blocking out significant amounts of sunlight from our property, especially during the winter months, when light is at a premium. If this is a bungalow, then the increased roof height running from the east to the west is totally unnecessary and again would impact the adjacent properties. If this has been done to incorporate what can only be described as an upper level window in the east gable elevation, then it is not necessary and further impacts on the residents of Carnlea, making them overlooked. It is clear why the design incorporates an elevated double window and a vaulted roof design - to incorporate more light into the property. However the elevated roof design will cause us to experience the very issue which is attempting to be alleviated in the new build. In essence sunlight

and daylight into our home will be considerable diminished in an attempt to gain light into the new build. We feel that as a result of this we will suffer an unacceptable loss of light to habitable rooms. Additionally the increase in roof height creates the impression of a 'house' and one worries that if granted and built, this sets a precedent. Also what would stop an additional application to create 'upstairs' rooms. All the remaining properties within this 'cul-de-sac' are single storey 'true' bungalow designed structures.

The access to the main A698 is a considerable issue.

It has always been understood by ourselves and neighbours that there is a 'turning circle' located at the top of the shared driveway. This is at the northern elevation of the proposed build. This is to enable any vehicles visiting any of the properties, i.e. delivery vehicles, emergency vehicles, trades people etc, to turn and egress safely onto the A698 facing forwards. The plans do not appear to have allowed for this. Indeed on the plans this area is shown as grassed. Obviously, grass can be driven over, however what if a wall or hedge is installed?

Under no circumstance should the egress onto the A698 be attempted in reverse. It is **EXTREMELY DANGEROUS**.

Again, if planning is granted, the access to the shared, communal driveway must be kept available at all times during construction. It should also be reinstated to a usable, clean and level existence concurrent to the build and at the eventual conclusion of the build.

If there are plans to install mains gas at the property then this will necessitate the digging of a trench from the A698 up to it. This will cause a great amount of disruption to all existing properties. Consideration should be given to keeping all residents informed of all proposed works as the residents at Tandarra and Hillcrest will effectively be 'marooned' at the west end of the driveway. The proposed removal of the large, coppiced sycamore 'trees' These are not on our land but immediately adjacent to our boundary wall. If planning is granted then it should be stipulated that the removal is carried out by suitably qualified and insured arborists. These are very tall, large mature trees and if not removed correctly, by professionals, then significant damage could be caused to our existing boundary wall and, more importantly to the property at Hillcrest itself, our home.

From plans we can see the approximate siting of windows. The Master bedroom west elevation window looks into our dining room, so we object to the position of this corner window.

It is also clear that windows in bedroom 3 overlook our kitchen.

We would respectfully request that the master bedroom doesn't have a corner window overlooking us. Also, if planning is passed, that a condition be stipulated that the positions of bedroom 3 and the family bathroom with opaque glass, be exchanged. Whilst still facing towards our property the position of conifers in our garden would then afford privacy to both parties.

For the sake of accuracy it should be noted that an uncovered drain appears to have been missed off the plan drawings. To give an approximate location, looking at the document Full Site Plan Section Through - 3406517 it is sited within the area of the proposed marked turning space and driveway.

In conclusion, we object to the proposed plans for the fact that:

- The proposed property design is too large for the plot.
- It is an attempt at over-development.

- The build overshadows neighbours, causing significant loss of sunlight and daylight.
- The added roof height is unnecessary, again causing significant loss of light and the potential to set a precedent.
- The apparent removal of the turning circle and the resultant danger of vehicles having to egress, in reverse, onto the A698 impacts considerably on highway safety.
- The build and position of windows overlooks other homes, causing loss of privacy

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01327/FUL

Address: Land Adjacent Carnlea Main Street Heiton Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwelling house

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Mr James Wilson

Tandarra

Main St

Heiton

KELSO

Scottish Borders

TD58JR

Email Address:- [REDACTED]

15th November 2020

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Height of Roof
- Road Safety
- Inadequate Access

Comment: With regards to the proposed construction of a three bedroom bungalow on land adjacent to Learn Ref. No: 20/1327/FUL

Objections

I am in **agreement** with the concerns **Mrs Gillian Harrop** has with the submitted plans.

I am also objecting to the plans.

(1)

The cottage that allocated the site previously had the same footprint of Craimar before Craimar was extended.

I am objecting to the house being built on the site with the plans that have been submitted the plans show single storey with extended roof that makes it a possible two storey that does not fit in with all the other properties which are all single storey bungalow structures.

(2)

On the plans they do not allow for a turning circle at the top of the shared driveway.

My house Tandarra has allowed a turning space but if the new house builds a boundary wall or fence adjacent there is not sufficient space for a car, or larger vehicles to turn and go back down onto the road A698.

The driveway was not designed for two cars to pass only a single driveway.

Often people mistake the drive as a road and then discover they have taken the wrong turning, on the plans submitted there is no turning circle so they would be forced to reverse onto a busy main road which would be **extremely dangerous** as there is often cars parked on the opposite side of the road.

(3)

If planning is permitted the access to the drive will require to be accessible to all properties also notification given.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01327/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01327/FUL

Address: Land Adjacent Carnlea Main Street Heiton Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Hunter

Address: Ladyrig Farmhouse Heiton, Kelso, Scottish Borders TD5 8JP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Density of site
- Inadequate access
- Increased traffic

Comment: It is clear that, to add a dwelling of this size, with three double bedrooms, ie 6 people potentially, will add very considerably to the usage of the access road. Further, it will severely limit the ability of present residents at the top and their visitors/services vehicles to turn safely when departing. The exit onto Heiton main street has restricted view already and no vehicle should ever be forced to reverse out onto the main road.

From: Calvert, Euan
Sent: Mon, 8 Feb 2021 11:26:46 +0000
To: Planning & Regulatory Services
Subject: FW: 20/01327/FUL | Erection of dwellinghouse | Land Adjacent to Carnlea, Main Street. Heiton.

Pleas redact and upload as objection to 20/01327/FUL

Euan Calvert

Assistant Planning Officer (Development Management)

Planning, Housing & Related Services

Scottish Borders Council, Council Headquarters, Newtown St Boswells, MELROSE, TD6 0SA

Tel: 01835 826513 | ecalvert@scotborders.gov.uk

From: Gill Harrop [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2021 11:04
To: Calvert, Euan <ECalvert@scotborders.gov.uk>
Subject: 20/01327/FUL | Erection of dwellinghouse | Land Adjacent to Carnlea, Main Street. Heiton.

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Euan,

Again we write to reiterate our ongoing concerns with the submitted plans for this development.

We appreciate that the turning circle aspect of our and others objections appears to have been addressed, which is very welcome news. However there still remains the issue of the proposed increased height of the structure.

Referencing the Privacy and Sunlight Guide, Guidance on Development and Building control found on the SBC website via Planning and building and with particular reference to Section 3 and 4 of that advice:

We repeat our original objection:

This building would have a significant impact on the adjoining properties at Carnlea and ourselves

at Hillcrest. The position of the building would lead to the west elevation blocking out significant amounts of sunlight from our property, Hillcrest, especially during the winter months, when light is at a premium. If this is a bungalow, then the increased roof height running from the east to the west is

totally unnecessary and again would impact the adjacent properties. If this has been done to incorporate what can only be described as an upper level window in the east gable elevation, then

it is not necessary. It is clear why the design incorporates an elevated double window and a vaulted roof design - to incorporate more light into the property. However the elevated roof design will cause us to experience the very issue which is attempting to be alleviated in the new build. In essence sunlight and daylight into our home will be considerable diminished in an attempt to gain light into the new

build. We feel that as a result of this we will suffer an unacceptable loss of light to habitable rooms.

Additionally the increase in roof height creates the impression of a 'house' and one worries that if granted and built, this sets a precedent. Also what would stop an additional application to create 'upstairs' rooms. All the remaining properties within this 'cul-de-sac' are single storey 'true' bungalow designed structures.

Thank you.

Gill and Mark Harrop

Hillcrest.

Main Street.

Heiton.

TD5 8JR

Sent from Samsung Mobile on O2
Get [Outlook for Android](#)