

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)

REF : 21/01908/FUL

APPLICANT : Mr Alasdair McKenzie

AGENT : Camerons Strachan Yuill Architects

DEVELOPMENT : Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and formation of access

LOCATION: East Lodge
Netherurd
Blyth Bridge
West Linton
Scottish Borders
EH46 7AQ

TYPE : FUL Application

REASON FOR DELAY:

DRAWING NUMBERS:

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
10133(--)-001	Location Plan	Refused
10133(2-)-001	Existing Site Plan	Refused
10133(2-)-002	Existing Plans	Refused
10133(2-)-004	Existing Sections	Refused
10133(2-)-003	Existing Elevations	Refused
10133(2-)-011	Proposed Site Plan	Refused
10133(2-)-012	Proposed Plans	Refused
10133(2-)-013	Proposed Plans	Refused
10133(2-)-015	Proposed Sections	Refused
10133(2-)-014	Proposed Elevations	Refused

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

No representations received. Consultation responses received from: Heritage and Design Officer - objection; Roads - further information required; Archaeology Officer - no objection; Flood Risk Officer - no objection.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:

In determining the application, the following policies and guidance were taken into consideration:
Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016
PMD2 - Quality standards
HD3 - Protection of residential amenity
EP1 - International nature conservation sites and protected species
EP2 - National nature conservation sites and protected species
EP3 - Local biodiversity
EP8 - Archaeology

EP10 - Gardens and designed landscapes [locally designated Netherurd]
EP13 - Trees, woodlands and hedgerows
IS7 - Parking provision and standards
IS8 - Flooding

Supplementary Planning Guidance
Biodiversity (2005)
Householder Development (incorporating Privacy and Sunlight Guide) (2006)
Local Landscape Designations (2012)
Placemaking and Design (2010)
Waste Management (2015).

The applicant submitted a supporting statement and I have had regard to that.

Recommendation by - Randal Dods (Planning Officer) on 25th January 2022

This application is made for alterations and extensions to East Lodge, Netherurd. The building is a simple, single storey lodge building of traditional proportions and details. It lies within the locally designated Netherurd historic garden and designed landscape. The proposal would see the ridge height of the building increased and a one and a half storey extension constructed to the rear (north west) of the property. The footprint of the building would be increased from 81m square (excluding the ancillary sheds) to 183m square. A section of boundary wall adjacent to the C5 public road would be removed in order to create two in curtilage parking spaces.

In determining the application, the following factors were considered:

Visual impact

The key policy against which this proposal is assessed is PMD2. The most relevant standard for this proposal is i) which requires that extensions or alterations are appropriate to the existing building.

In response to the submitted proposal, the Heritage and Design Officer (HDO) noted:

"Netherurd House is a Category B listed building of special architectural and historic interest as a major example of a small Georgian mansion in wooded policies. Located at the principal entrance to the estate, East Lodge is a small, one storey lodge building relating the Netherurd House. The property is of historic interest both in relation to the historic Netherurd estate and of architectural interest as a high quality picturesque example of a lodge building. The building's form, scale, symmetry and detailing contribute to its special interest. It is acknowledged that few, if any, historic features survive to the interior. Understood to have been in similar ownership by the Girl Guides Association until recently, the building could be considered curtilage listed. Whilst a modest rear extension to the property may be acceptable in principle, the proposed is considered unacceptable due to its scale, the level of intervention to the existing building and the proposed design and detailing. This is set out further below.

"HISTORIC CHARACTER The proposed has not been informed by an understanding of the historic and architectural interest of the existing lodge building. It requires the loss of a number of historic extensions / outbuildings, although it is acknowledged that these are of less heritage interest than the primary lodge building.

"SCALE/FORM It is proposed to raise the ridge height to accommodate an additional floor level, with dormer windows, and add a side extension in alignment with the front building line. This fundamentally alters the character of the lodge building, by eroding its typically-small scale, its historic form (including roof form) and its over-riding symmetry. The proposed extensions would dominate over the surviving historic elements. The proposed two storey rear extension further compounds the dominant scale of the proposed extensions and their impact on the existing lodge building. The proposal would therefore have an adverse impact on the building's historic, architectural and aesthetic interest.

"DESIGN APPROACH The design approach in some instances is largely contemporary to allow the historic and modern phases of development to remain legible, whereas elsewhere the walls are proposed to be built

up to match the existing which erodes to historic record. The elevations and roof form do not have a strong sense of proportion or cohesion.

"DESIGN DETAIL The proposal would result in the loss of historic features such as the decorative gable bargeboard and finial, chimney and exposed rafter feet. The multiple dormer, rooflights and the additional roof form above the entrance are at odds with the simple roofscape of the original. The proportions and detailing of the proposed new window openings do not reflect that of the existing, nor give a contrasting contemporary approach of comparable quality. The location of the bin storage and parking to the front elevation significantly erodes appreciation of the building".

A further comment was made by the HDO regarding the removal of a section of the boundary wall and the adverse effect that would have on the property and the appearance of the area. I do not disagree with the HDO's assessment but, in any event, the entire wall could be removed without the benefit of planning permission, and hardstanding formed.

It is acknowledged that a modest extension to this small lodge house may be acceptable. However, the proposal fails to comply with the relevant placemaking and design criteria of policy PMD2. The resultant scale, massing and height of the proposed design is not appropriate to the existing building and would change fundamentally its character in a negative manner. The proposed materials, differing roof pitches, dormers and fenestration do not respect either the existing property or the context. Although technically possible to locate the extension within the site, with the footprint of the building being increased from 81m square to 183m square, the overall appearance would be one of overdevelopment. Taking all of the above factors into consideration, the proposal does not comply with the terms of policy PMD2.

Daylight, sunlight and outlook
The proposal would not result in overshadowing or loss of light.

Privacy
The proposal would not result in a loss of privacy.

Ecology
The property, due to its location, age and construction, is one which is likely to be suitable for habitation by bats and no ecological information has been submitted with the application. As it is, the council cannot be satisfied that the proposed development will not have a likely significant effect on European Protected Species. Absence of that information leads me to conclude that the application must be found contrary to policy EP1.

Archaeology
There are no archaeological implications resulting from the proposal.

Local landscape designation
Despite the submitted design and its scale leaving much to be desired, the proposal to extend the lodge would not, in principle, be detrimental to the objectives or overall integrity of the locally designated garden and designed landscape.

Trees
The proposed extensions may impinge on the root protection area of one of the trees which forms the avenue to Netherurd House. Where the proposal to be otherwise acceptable, I would have recommended the submission of an arboricultural impact assessment prior to determination to ensure no risk to trees which are of landscape value. However, the application takes no account of those and the proposal has to be found contrary to policy EP13 as a result.

Parking provision
Roads noted that the existing parking arrangement is to the front of the property, served by the existing private driveway. That informal parking area is likely to accommodate one vehicle comfortably and perhaps a maximum of two. The proposal seeks to retain the existing parking and supplement it with two new spaces in the garden which would be accessed directly off the C class road. Roads would have no objections to that, providing visibility splays of 2.4 by 120m in both directions could be achieved. That and other information was not detailed on the submitted plans. Roads noted that to provide the required visibility splay, the height of the boundary wall within the affected area would have to be reduced to a height no more

than 900mm above the carriageway level. A suspensive condition would be necessary to ensure the lowering includes where it affects third party property. I have discussed the lack of turning space within the site with Roads and note that they say the matter was considered by them. Had the road been an A or B class road, they may have required that but, in this instance, they would be content with the proposal as shown. I have no reason to question that assessment. I also discussed the possibility of providing two parking spaces to the south east of the house to enable the retention of the existing boundary wall. As that was not shown on the application drawings, Roads did not assess that but commented that they would be unlikely to object to such a proposal.

Flooding

The FRO noted that SEPA flood maps shows that the indicative 1:200 year flood envelope of the Bryland Burn covers the south-western part of the site but does not reach the existing building or proposed extension. No objection was made to the proposal.

Conclusion

PMD2 requires under criterion i) that an extension or alteration to a building is appropriate to the existing building. The proposed development is unsympathetic to both the existing building and the surrounding context in terms of scale, form and materials. Furthermore, no account has been taken of the trees adjacent to the site meaning the proposal is also contrary to so contrary to EP13. The applicant has not included any ecological information with the proposal and has failed to prove that the development would not have an adverse effect on protected species. It is therefore contrary to policy EP1.

REASON FOR DECISION :

The development would be contrary to policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that criterion i) requires that any extension or alteration is appropriate to the existing building. The proposed development is unsympathetic to both the existing building and the surrounding context in terms of scale, form and materials. Furthermore, no account has been taken of the trees adjacent to the site meaning the proposal is also contrary to Policy EP13. No overriding case for the development as proposed has been substantiated. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations.

The development would be contrary to policy EP1 of the Local Development Plan 2016 and Biodiversity guidance in that the applicant has failed to prove that the development will not have an adverse effect on European Protected Species which may be present on the site. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations.

Recommendation: Refused

- 1 The development would be contrary to policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that criterion i) requires that any extension or alteration is appropriate to the existing building. The proposed development is unsympathetic to both the existing building and the surrounding context in terms of scale, form and materials. Furthermore, no account has been taken of the trees adjacent to the site meaning the proposal is also contrary to Policy EP13. No overriding case for the development as proposed has been substantiated. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations.
- 2 The development would be contrary to policy EP1 of the Local Development Plan 2016 and Biodiversity guidance in that the applicant has failed to prove that the development will not have an adverse effect on European Protected Species which may be present on the site. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations.

“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.