



2 June 2021

Planning Application 21/00734/FUL

Land North East of Eckford Gamekeepers Cottage, Eckford TD5 8LG

THE BLACK BARN

Dear Sir

What a disappointment!

The Black Barn has been a redundant eyesore in Eckford since we moved to the village more than thirty-five years ago.

It has been a topic of discussion in the village throughout this time and there have been numerous promises from the Estate to 'do something about it', all to no avail.

We were therefore delighted to hear that the Estate had, at last, come forward with a planning application but was so disappointed to see what was proposed.

The Black Shed is to be replaced with a Black House!

This is utterly out of character with the rest of the village and, rather than being a statement building, will be a continuing eyesore. It doesn't even seem to conform to Planning Regulations.

This is a wonderful site for housing. It would be such a pity to waste it.

I know that there are planning constraints which may limit what can be done with the site, but surely common sense will prevail and the site will be made available for a number of smaller houses, affordable to younger people with families.



This would meet a clear need in the village and would be a very positive addition. Something that cannot be said for the current proposal.

Finally, I note that it is proposed to use the waste water facility in the centre of the village for this planning application. It is the stated policy of the Community Council that it will oppose any application which seeks to use this facility until it can be shown to work as it is supposed to. In the present warm weather, the smells emanating from it are even more noxious than usual.

I wish to object to this application on the grounds stated above and hope that it will be withdrawn so that something more in keeping with the village can be agreed.

Yours sincerely

Charlie Robertson



3 June 2021

John Hayward
Planning and Development Standards Manager
Scottish Borders Council
Newtown St Boswells

Dear Mr Hayward

**Planning Application by Buccleuch Estates Ltd.
Change of use of agricultural building and alterations to form dwellinghouse.
Land North East of Eckford Gamekeepers Cottage, Eckford, Kelso.**

I write to lodge my objection to the above planning application.

I have lived in the Eckford area for 36 years and have always regarded the Black Barn as an eyesore. It is a large and deteriorating agricultural building totally out of keeping with the adjacent houses in the village. It is no longer used and I consider that the opportunity should now be taken to have it demolished and for the cleared site to be developed for housing units in keeping with the village environment.

I understand that Buccleuch Estates are of the view that planning requirements limit their options for the site and that the only permitted development would be to alter the Black Barn to form a house. The plans lodged depict a large and bulky house totally out of keeping with the village. It seems ironic that an eyesore should be continued in a slightly altered state for the next hundred years or so when what is required is a cleared site for new housing to be built which will enhance the village.

I would urge the rejection of this planning application and encourage a dialogue to be opened up between SBC and Buccleuch Estates to have the site cleared for new houses to be built.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Jeary

Comments for Planning Application 21/00734/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00734/FUL

Address: Land North East Of Gamekeepers Cottage Eckford Kelso Scottish Borders

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural building and alterations to form dwellinghouse and garage

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ray Jones

Address: Eckford Howe, Eckford, Kelso, Scottish Borders TD5 8LG

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
- Land affected
- Poor design
- Value of property
- Water Supply

Comment: We are in favour of housing on the Black Barn/Shed site but we wish to object to the current proposal. The outer shell of the Black Shed dates back to the 1950s and is not and never has been in keeping with its village setting. Since the development of the new bungalows in the last 20 years the village has "come closer" to the Black Shed and it is more of a monstrosity now than it has ever been. It is our understanding that it has always been considered to be an eyesore within the community as it is basically an agricultural shed.

The planning application to keep the shell and develop it into a property of a broadly similar size and look is therefore, in our view, not acceptable. The site would be better developed if the properties on it were more in keeping with the village setting.

More importantly, however, this whole site is a once in a generation opportunity to utilise a rarely available site of this size to bring several new houses into the village to attract young families which would bring a vitality to the village and sustain the excellent community spirit and activities we already enjoy. The current demographic of the village can probably be, in the main, classed as 'senior citizens'. The current proposal is unlikely to be in a price range which is available to a young family.

We respectfully suggest that those who are in the position to make such decisions locally should look at the bigger picture and consider strategically how to improve the village for future generations. We cannot think of any other sites available in or near Eckford which offers the potential which this site does. If the current planning application is approved, it will presumably be followed by another similar application for the fenced off part of the Black Shed site and consequently we will end up with two large plots occupied by houses out of a young family's price range. If the majority of the current housing stock in the village came onto the market it is probably unlikely that these would be affordable to young families.

The opportunity is there for several houses on the site if the Black Shed was demolished and the site developed with one and half or two storey houses in line with several houses currently in the village.

We believe that the current Planning Application, from Buccleuch Estates, should be rejected on the grounds that it makes a mockery of the existing planning policies. We believe that Buccleuch Estates should withdraw this application and work with local Community Councillors and the village residents particularly those who are immediate neighbours of the Black Shed site, to achieve a positive and satisfactory outcome for everyone.

In the event of this Planning Application not being withdrawn our specific comments and objections to it are:-

1. It does not appear that key policies support the proposals. The building sits outside the settlement boundary of Eckford and it is therefore classified as development in open countryside.

2. A residential dwelling of this size does not relate well to the scale or pattern of development of the village. Policy PMD2 states:

- Be compatible with, and respect, the character of the surrounding area, neighbouring uses and neighbouring built form;
- Be of a scale, massing and height appropriate to the surroundings;

The Gross Internal Area (GIA) of the building is approximately 589m² and it could not be argued fits with the scale, form and massing of surrounding residential properties.

3. Policy HD2 states:

Development that is a change of use of a building to a house may be acceptable provided that:

- a) The Council is satisfied that the building has architectural or historic merit, is capable of conversion and is physically suited for residential use.

Clearly this building is a 1950's agricultural shed of a scale that does not allow for a successful conversion. It does not have architectural or historic merit and therefore warrant saving by this conversion. A building of this scale with such a simple form does not convert successfully to a dwelling.

4. The application repeatedly refers to General Permitted Development and Use classes that permits the conversion of agricultural buildings to residential use without exceeding 150m². However, this application far exceeds the criteria set out in this policy. The determination that it is only a little bigger and therefore the principle is acceptable is disingenuous. The application building has a GIA of approximately 589m². It is nearly 4 times the maximum of that set out within the policy, and therefore should not be considered.
5. The details of the landscaping of the site are very basic. No details of the materials and finishes have been provided. Further details of the boundary treatments, natural screening and hedge planting should be provided including a criteria for their maintenance. Without further detail of the development and control measures from the local authority the landscaping could create a negative visual impact to the site and landscape and therefore the amenity of its neighbours.
6. No details beyond showing a few pv panels have shown that policy PMD1 has been considered. It does not demonstrate in detail anywhere in the application how a sustainable approach has been adopted.
7. The proposed application also extends into Grade 1 or 2 land which is not good practice in this food producing Teviot Valley.
8. Any development on this land should have its own waste water facility. The current Eckford waste water plant is totally inefficient.
9. The Black Shed was built in the early 1950's as a general purpose shed, it was never suitable for dairying, cattle housing, grain storage and certainly not suitable as a domestic dwelling.

We hope these comments are helpful to the decision makers.

Yours faithfully

Ray and Frances Jones

Comments for Planning Application 21/00734/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00734/FUL

Address: Land North East Of Gamekeepers Cottage Eckford Kelso Scottish Borders

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural building and alterations to form dwellinghouse and garage

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ray Jones

Address: Eckford Howe, Eckford, Kelso, Scottish Borders TD5 8LG

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

Dear Mr Calvert

Ref 21/00734/FUL

We write in response to a letter sent to you by Fergusson Planning who seem to be reacting to information from you where, quite rightly you deem the planning application is not compliant with Policy HD2 c) part a) and PMD4.

This contravention of policies has been highlighted from our first objection.

We are concerned that Fergusson's letter is not strictly accurate.

The Community Council last met Bucccleuch representatives before the current plans were proposed. The Community Council believe a better form of housing for perhaps 4 families would sit better in the same area.

The barn as described by Fergusson's is really a disused Agricultural Shed. It was an eyesore when first built in the 1950's and the proposed plans do not change that view in what is a village setting.

Any reference to a 'Dutch Barn type' in Norfolk is erroneous.

The Black Shed is currently in a state of disrepair with a sunken roof due to rafters failing. The

shed has not been used for any agriculture use for over 20 years and in that time has been a home for feral pigeons and rats.

We find that reference to Scottish Amendment Orders which came into force in April 2021 not relevant to the planning application in question and implying you are not aware of legislation.

The applicant also fails to mention that for their application to work they have to take virgin Grade 1, food producing ground, out of production in this post Brexit era. The Teviot Valley is one of Scotland's best producing food areas (barley, wheat, potatoes, oil seed, blueberries).

If you meet with Fergusson Planning, then we believe you should offer us the same courtesy and meet on site to see yourself.

The village wishes to work with Buccleuch Estates to ensure more sympathetic housing can be considered as part of the development of Eckford Village.

Yours sincerely
Ray & Candy Jones
(06/08/2021)

Comments for Planning Application 21/00734/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00734/FUL

Address: Land North East Of Gamekeepers Cottage Eckford Kelso Scottish Borders

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural building and alterations to form dwellinghouse and garage

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Name: Mr Robert Cape

Address: Eckford Estate Cottage, Eckford, Kelso, Scottish Borders TD5 8LG

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
- Height of
- Inadequate screening
- Land affected
- Poor design
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Trees/landscape affected
- Water Supply

Comment: We are in favour of housing on the Black Barn/Shed site but we wish to object to the current proposal. The outer shell of the Black Shed dates back to the 1950s and is not and never has been in keeping with its village setting. Since the development of the new bungalows in the last 20 years the village has "come closer" to the Black Shed and it is more of a monstrosity now than it has ever been. It is our understanding that it has always been considered to be an eyesore within the community as it is basically an agricultural shed.

The planning application to keep the shell and develop it into a property of a broadly similar size and look is therefore, in our view, not acceptable. The site would be better developed if the properties on it were more in keeping with the village setting.

More importantly, however, this whole site is a once in a generation opportunity to utilise a rarely available site of this size to bring several new houses into the village to attract young families which would bring a vitality to the village and sustain the excellent community spirit and activities

we already enjoy. The current demographic of the village can probably be, in the main, classed as 'senior citizens'. The current proposal is unlikely to be in a price range which is available to a young family.

We respectfully suggest that those who are in the position to make such decisions locally should look at the bigger picture and consider strategically how to improve the village for future generations. We cannot think of any other sites available in or near Eckford which offers the potential which this site does. If the current planning application is approved, it will presumably be followed by another similar application for the fenced off part of the Black Shed site and consequently we will end up with two large plots occupied by houses out of a young family's price range. If the majority of the current housing stock in the village came onto the market it is probably unlikely that these would be affordable to young families.

The opportunity is there for several houses on the site if the Black Shed was demolished and the site developed with one and half or two storey houses in line with several houses currently in the village.

We believe that the current Planning Application, from Buccleuch Estates, should be rejected on the grounds that it makes a mockery of the existing planning policies. We believe that Buccleuch Estates should withdraw this application and work with local Community Councillors and the village residents particularly those who are immediate neighbours of the Black Shed site, to achieve a positive and satisfactory outcome for everyone.

In the event of this Planning Application not being withdrawn our specific comments and objections to it are:-

1. It does not appear that key policies support the proposals. The building sits outside the settlement boundary of Eckford and it is therefore classified as development in open countryside.

2. A residential dwelling of this size does not relate well to the scale or pattern of development of the village. Policy PMD2 states:

- Be compatible with, and respect, the character of the surrounding area, neighbouring uses and neighbouring built form;
- Be of a scale, massing and height appropriate to the surroundings;

The Gross Internal Area (GIA) of the building is approximately 589m² and it could not be argued fits with the scale, form and massing of surrounding residential properties.

3. Policy HD2 states:

Development that is a change of use of a building to a house may be acceptable provided that:

a) The Council is satisfied that the building has architectural or historic merit, is capable of conversion and is physically suited for residential use.

Clearly this building is a 1950's agricultural shed of a scale that does not allow for a successful

conversion. It does not have architectural or historic merit and therefore warrant saving by this conversion. A building of this scale with such a simple form does not convert successfully to a dwelling.

4. The application repeatedly refers to General Permitted Development and Use classes that permits the conversion of agricultural buildings to residential use without exceeding 150m². However, this application far exceeds the criteria set out in this policy. The determination that it is only a little bigger and therefore the principle is acceptable is disingenuous. The application building has a GIA of approximately 589m². It is nearly 4 times the maximum of that set out within the policy, and therefore should not be considered.

5. The details of the landscaping of the site are very basic. No details of the materials and finishes have been provided. Further details of the boundary treatments, natural screening and hedge planting should be provided including a criteria for their maintenance. Without further detail of the development and control measures from the local authority the landscaping could create a negative visual impact to the site and landscape and therefore the amenity of its neighbours.

6. No details beyond showing a few pv panels have shown that policy PMD1 has been considered. It does not demonstrate in detail anywhere in the application how a sustainable approach has been adopted.

7. The proposed application also extends into Grade 1 or 2 land which is not good practice in this food producing Teviot Valley.

8. Any development on this land should have its own waste water facility. The current Eckford waste water plant is totally inefficient.

9. The Black Shed was built in the early 1950's as a general purpose shed, it was never suitable for dairying, cattle housing, grain storage and certainly not suitable as a domestic dwelling.

We hope these comments are helpful to the decision makers.

Yours faithfully

Robert Cape

Comments for Planning Application 21/00734/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00734/FUL

Address: Land North East Of Gamekeepers Cottage Eckford Kelso Scottish Borders

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural building and alterations to form dwellinghouse and garage

Case Officer: Euan Calvert

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sheila Campbell

Address: Teviot Folds, Eckford, Kelso, Scottish Borders TD5 8LG

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
- Height of
- Land affected
- Poor design
- Value of property

Comment: Planning Ref 21/00734/FUL

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural building

We are in favour of housing on the Black Barn/Shed site but we wish to object to the current proposal. The outer shell of the Black Shed dates back to the 1950s and is not and never has been in keeping with the village setting. Since the development of the new bungalows in the last 20 years the village has "come closer" to the Black Shed and it is more of a monstrosity now than it has ever been. It is our understanding that it has always been considered to be an eyesore within the community as it is basically an agricultural shed.

The planning application to keep the shell and develop it into a property of a broadly similar size and look is therefore, in our view, not acceptable. The site would be better developed if the properties on it were more in keeping with the village setting.

More importantly, however, this whole site is a once in a generation opportunity to utilise a rarely available site of this size to bring several new houses into the village to attract young families which would bring a vitality to the village and sustain the excellent community spirit and activities we already enjoy. The current demographic of the village can probably be, in the main, classed as 'senior citizens'. The current proposal is unlikely to be in a price range which is available to a young family.

We respectfully suggest that those who are in the position to make such decisions locally should look at the bigger picture and consider strategically how to improve the village for future generations. We cannot think of any other sites available in or near Eckford which offers the potential which this site does. If the current planning application is approved, it will presumably be followed by another similar application for the fenced off part of the Black Shed site and consequently we will end up with two large plots occupied by houses out of a young family's price range. If the majority of the current housing stock in the village came onto the market it is probably unlikely that these would be affordable to young families.

The opportunity is there for several houses on the site if the Black Shed was demolished and the site developed with one and half or two storey houses in line with several houses currently in the village.

We believe that the current Planning Application, from Buccleuch Estates, should be rejected on the grounds that it makes a mockery of the existing planning policies. We believe that Buccleuch Estates should withdraw this application and work with local Community Councillors and the village residents, particularly those who are immediate neighbours of the Black Shed site, to achieve a positive and satisfactory outcome for everyone.

In the event of this Planning Application not being withdrawn our specific comments and objections to it are:-

1. It does not appear that key policies support the proposals. The building sits outside the settlement boundary of Eckford and it is therefore classified as development in open countryside.
2. A residential dwelling of this size does not relate well to the scale or pattern of development of the village. Policy PMD2 states:

- Be compatible with, and respect, the character of the surrounding area, neighbouring uses and neighbouring built form;
- Be of a scale, massing and height appropriate to the surroundings;

The Gross Internal Area (GIA) of the building is approximately 589m² and it could not be argued fits with the scale, form and massing of surrounding residential properties.

3. Policy HD2 states:

Development that is a change of use of a building to a house may be acceptable provided that:

- a) The Council is satisfied that the building has architectural or historic merit, is capable of conversion and is physically suited for residential use,

Clearly this building is a 1950's agricultural shed of a scale that does not allow for a successful conversion. It does not have architectural or historic merit and therefore warrant saving by this conversion. A building of this scale with such a simple form does not convert successfully to a dwelling.

4. The application repeatedly refers to General Permitted Development and Use classes that permits the conversion of agricultural buildings to residential use without exceeding 150m². However, this application far exceeds the criteria set out in this policy. The determination that it is only a little bigger and therefore the principle is acceptable is disingenuous. The application building has a GIA of approximately 589m². It is nearly 4 times the maximum of that set out within the policy, and therefore should not be considered.

5. The details of the landscaping of the site are very basic. No details of the materials and finishes

have been provided. Further details of the boundary treatments, natural screening and hedge planting should be provided including a criteria for their maintenance. Without further detail of the development and control measures from the local authority the landscaping could create a negative visual impact to the site and landscape and therefore the amenity of its neighbours.

6. No details beyond showing a few pv panels have shown that policy PMD1 has been considered. It does not demonstrate in detail anywhere in the application how a sustainable approach has been adopted.

7. The proposed application also extends into Grade 1 or 2 land which is not good practice in this food producing Teviot Valley.

8. Any development on this land should have its own waste water facility. The current Eckford waste water plant, as stated several times previously by the Community Council, must not be used by any other additional properties as it cannot cope with any additional waste.

9. The Black Shed was built in the early 1950s as a general purpose shed it was never suitable for dairying, cattle housing or grain storage and is certainly not suitable for conversion to a domestic dwelling.

10. Local knowledge, in the village, indicates that this site is contaminated which requires to be checked by an expert.

11. The Black Shed site is out-with the current Eckford Local Development Plan.

We hope these comments are helpful to the decision makers.

Sheila and John Campbell