

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

EILDON AREA COMMITTEE

21 SEPTEMBER 1998

APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

ITEM: **REFERENCE NUMBERS:** a) 98/00844/OUT,
b) 98/00845/OUT
c) 98/00846/OUT

OFFICER: Mr C Johnston
LOCAL MEMBER: Councillor C Riddell-Carre
PROPOSAL: Erection of dwellinghouse
SITES: a) Site Adjacent Allesudden Charlesfield St. Boswells
b) Plot 1, Site Adjacent Grieve's Bungalow, Charlesfield St. Boswells
c) Plot 2, Site Adjacent Grieve's Bungalow, Charlesfield St. Boswells

APPLICANT: Charlesfield Farms Ltd
AGENT: Edwin Thompson & Co

SITE AND APPLICATION DESCRIPTION :

These three applications are for single houses on plots of land at Charlesfield near the Industrial Estate. There are six existing houses on the public road to the north of Charlesfield Industrial Estate. Two of the houses are proposed to the east of these houses and the other is proposed on the west. The applications can be summarised as follows;

98/00844/OUT - This house will be located on the western end of the row of existing houses and is bounded by the Charlesfield access road on the north and west boundaries. Access to the plot is via an existing access to the semi-detached block immediately to the east, the road being continued to the rear of these semis to serve the plot. The proposal will require the relocation of an overhead line.

98/00845/OUT - This house will be located immediately to the east of the existing houses and will be served by an access onto the main road to the north.

98/00846/OUT - This house will be to the east of proposal 98/00845/OUT and will also be served by the same mutual access onto the main road to the north. It is proposed to plant a strip of amenity woodland on the eastern boundary to protect the residential amenity from the industrial use.

All the sites are currently fields used for grazing and are allocated for industrial use in the local plan. The applicant feels industrial development on this land would be impractical and undesirable as it would conflict with existing residential use, access for industrial purposes is not practical and, as the land has a significant gradient, it would pose problems to provide a level surface for industrial purposes.

PLANNING HISTORY :

Residential development in this area of land used to comprise of only the semi-detached block to the west and a single house 130 metres to the east. In 1987 a planning application was submitted for three houses between these aforementioned houses. The application was eventually approved on the grounds that this was an infill development and an acceptable addition to the existing building group. These houses have since been built.

LOCAL PLAN POLICIES :

Ettrick & Lauderdale Local Plan Policies 7, 8 & 23 apply which state :

Policy 7

Outwith the settlements identified in policies 2, 3 and 6, new housing development will be encouraged within or adjacent to the preferred building groups listed below. In addition, limited development may also be permitted within or adjacent to other building groups. All development should meet the following criteria:

1. No adverse effect on the viability of a farming unit or conflict with the operations of a working farm;
2. Satisfactory access and other road requirements;
3. Satisfactory public or private water supply and drainage facilities;
4. No adverse effect on countryside amenity, landscape or nature conservation;
5. No adverse impact on ancient monuments, archaeological sites or on gardens or designed landscapes in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland;
6. Appropriate siting, design and materials in accordance with Policies 62 and 63.
7. The safeguarding of known mineral resources from sterilisation unless this is acceptable following an assessment of the environmental implications.

Preferred Building Groups

Bemersyde, Clintmains, Dryburgh, Ettrick, Legerwood, Yarrow Feus.

Policy 8

Within the areas specified on the Proposals Map, there will be a presumption in favour of sensitively designed and well sited isolated housing in the countryside. Elsewhere, there will continue to be a presumption against single houses in the countryside which are not within or adjacent to existing building groups. Development will be permitted if an economic need can be clearly substantiated. Any development should meet the following criteria:

1. No adverse effect on the viability of a farming unit or conflict with the operations of a working farm;
2. Satisfactory access and other road requirements;
3. Satisfactory public or private water supply and drainage facilities;
4. No adverse effect on countryside amenity, landscape or nature conservation;
5. No adverse impact on ancient monuments, archaeological sites or on gardens or designed landscapes in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland;
6. Appropriate siting, design and materials in accordance with Policies 62 and 63;
7. The safeguarding of known mineral resources from sterilisation unless this is acceptable following an assessment of the environmental implications.

Policy 23

In existing industrial areas there will be a presumption in favour of industrial development and the retention of existing uses. The Regional Council will encourage firms to develop and expand in these areas.

OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS :

New Housing in the Borders Countryside Policy and Guidance Note

CONSULTATION RESPONSES :

Councillor C Riddell-Carre : No objections to all applications

Director of Technical Services : Objections to the two houses proposed to the east on the grounds that this is ribbon development in what is primarily an industrial area. Could support the proposal for the house to the west as the proposed access is via an existing access onto the main road. However, if the existing western access to Charlesfield is upgraded it is likely part of the site must be taken over by the Council for road widening purposes.

St Boswells Community Council : No objections to the applications.

East of Scotland Water : Water/sewers available.

OTHER RESPONSES :

A letter of objection has been submitted and at the objectors request it is copied in full for members attention.

PLANNING ISSUES :

The main planning issue is whether the proposals comply with the housing in the countryside policies.

ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION :

Three houses originally existed on this stretch of land and three others were allowed on the understanding that it was infill development of an acceptable scale to the building group. The house to the west is bounded by the access road to Charlesfield and therefore is an infill site which in practice may be difficult to be served and used for industrial development. For these reasons this site is acceptable for residential development.

However, the other two sites to the east would extend the existing group along the public road, served by separate access, and would thus constitute ribbon development. Given that that the original building group comprised of three houses including a semi-detached block, it cannot be argued that this proposal which would result in an aggregate of six new houses is an acceptable addition in scale with the group.

RECOMMENDATION BY DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT :

I recommend

a) that application 98/00844/OUT is approved subject to the following conditions.

1. The subsequent approval by the Planning Authority of the means of access, the layout of the site, the design and siting of any buildings and the landscape treatment of the site.

Reason: Approval is in outline only.

2. The means of water supply and of both surface water and foul drainage to be submitted for the approval of the Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the site is adequately serviced.
3. The proposed access to be upgraded to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of road safety.
4. An area of land within the site to be earmarked to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority for a road widening scheme.
Reason: In order that the proposal does not prejudice future road widening schemes for the upgrading of the Charlesfield access.

b) that applications reference 98/00845/OUT and 98/00846/OUT are refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would be contrary to policies 7 and 8 of the Ettrick & Lauderdale Local Plan in that it would constitute ribbon development outwith the existing building group at Charlesfield and an inappropriate form and scale of addition to the original building group.