

PLANNING CONSULTATION

To: Archaeology Officer

From: Development Management

Date: 8th December 2021

Contact: Ranald Dods ☎ 01835 825239

Ref: 21/01908/FUL

PLANNING CONSULTATION

Your observations are requested on the under noted planning application. I shall be glad to have your reply not later than 29th December 2021. If further time will be required for a reply please let me know. If no extension of time is requested and no reply is received by 29th December 2021, it will be assumed that you have no observations and a decision may be taken on the application.

Please remember to e-mail the DCConsultees Mailbox when you have inserted your reply into Idox.

Name of Applicant: Mr Alasdair McKenzie

Agent: Camerons Strachan Yuill Architects

Nature of Proposal: Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and formation of access

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

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

Comments provided by	Officer Name and Post: Keith Elliott Archaeology Officer	Contact e-mail/number: Keith.Elliott@scotborders.gov.uk 01835 824 000 ext 8886
Date of reply	27.12.2021	Consultee reference:
Planning Application Reference	21/01908/FUL	Case Officer: Ranald Dods
Applicant	Mr Alasdair McKenzie	
Agent	Camerons Strachan Yuill Architects	
Proposed Development	Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and formation of access	
Site Location	East Lodge Netherurd Blyth Bridge West Linton Scottish Borders EH46 7AQ	
<p><i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></p>		
Background and Site description	<p>This application proposes alterations and extension to the existing East Lodge building with replacement roof and first floor, and extension to the rear alongside the road.</p> <p>This archaeological consultation has been triggered by the appearance of the lodge building itself in the Scottish Borders Historic Environment Record (HER).</p>	
Key Issues (Bullet points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlisted historic lodge building • Recorded in the Historic Environment Record, but not a Listed Building 	
Assessment	<p>This application has been assessed against the Scottish Borders Historic Environment Record (HER) as the on-going record of all known archaeological and historic findspots, sites and landscapes across the area that are known, recorded and mapped. Currently there are over 23410 entries in the records so far, but this number is always increasing and with new information being added, at times to enhance existing entries.</p> <p>The East Lodge building is recorded in the HER as Canmore ID 263100. It is shown by the Ordnance Survey first edition of mid-19th century date. However, it is not a Listed Building of any category and not been surveyed. The building is a gate lodge, likely early 19th century?, at the entrance to the Netherurd House grounds and faces southwards originally across the entrance gateway formed by roughly quadrant low walls with their moulding coping stones as shown by Google Street View photography. The lodge is one of a number of HER entries, some additionally also Listed Buildings, across the Netherurd House estate, which is also recorded as a Scottish Borders Council Designed Landscape area.</p> <p>Both the Ordnance Survey first and second editions (of mid- and later 19th century dates respectively) show the main lodge building, as well as buildings to its rear. It is unclear from that mapping if the outbuildings shown are the same as those now present on the site.</p> <p>This application will have a substantial impact to the location of the historic building with side and (more sizeable) rear extension and the historic building itself in</p>	

	<p>altering it to have an additional storey. Both extensions replace existing outbuildings. At the rear of the lodge a small garden area is shown by the Ordnance Survey first edition, but the full extent of the current garden is only fully shown by the Ordnance Survey second edition. From recent LiDAR surveying of the area, it looks likely that both the house and garden area have been made from cutting away part of a small hillock alongside the house.</p> <p>There are no HER entries recorded in the area until Netherurd Mill (Canmore ID 50125) and it likely that the estate and general Post-Medieval agricultural landscape will have done much to remove reduce or remove archaeological features of the landscape already, save for on the adjacent hilltops. There is a low potential for any undiscovered archaeology in this area.</p> <p>Whilst the building is not a Listed Building, it is nonetheless historic. The extension to the rear of the property will require the removal of the outbuildings and shed, the outbuilding appearing to be generally of the same construction and same style as the main lodge building itself. An extension to the side of the building is also proposed replacing an existing outbuilding. The proposed extensions appear to use, though modify, some of the existing openings of the lodge.</p> <p>It is the alteration in the replacement of the existing roof with an additional storey and bedroom accommodation to be created that there is the greatest impact upon the historic fabric and character of the lodge building. It is, however, unclear whether there would be anything to be gained from the application of a historic building recording condition being attached to any granted planning permission. It is thought unlikely that there any needs for any below-ground archaeological conditions to be applied to this case.</p> <p>Whilst I do not object to the principle of development, there may be design considerations and I see that my colleague the Built Heritage and Design Officer has already commented on the proposal to you on these parts of the proposal.</p>			
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
Recommended Conditions	No archaeological conditions are recommended for this case.			
Recommended Informatives	No archaeological informatives are thought especially necessary either.			

Consultation Reply

ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

To: HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICE

FAO: Ranald Dods

Your Ref: 21/01908/FUL

From: HEAD OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT

Date: 22/12/2021

Contact: Raffaella Diesel

Ext: 6977

Our Ref: B48/3171

Nature of Proposal: Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and formation of access
Site: east Lodge, Netherurd, Blyth Bridge, West Linton

In terms of information that this Council has concerning flood risk to this site, I would state that The Indicative River, Surface Water & Coastal Hazard Map (Scotland) known as the “third generation flood mapping” prepared by SEPA indicates that the site is at risk from a flood event with a return period of 1 in 200 years. That is the 0.5% annual risk of a flood occurring in any one year.

The Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) has primarily been developed to provide a strategic national overview of flood risk in Scotland. Whilst all reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the flood map is accurate for its intended purpose, no warranty is given.

Due to copyright restrictions I cannot copy the map to you however, if the applicant wishes to inspect the maps they can contact me to arrange a suitable time to view them.

Review of the 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.

Therefore, I would have **no objection** to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

As the indicative flood envelope also covers the bridge at the access road, should approval be given, I would recommend that, to receive flood warnings from SEPA, the applicant signs up to FLOODLINE at www.sepa.org.uk or by telephone on 0345 988 1188.

The applicant should be made aware that flooding can occur from other sources including run-off from surrounding land, blocked road drains, and blocked bridges and culverts.

Please note that this information must be taken in the context of material that this Council holds in fulfilling its duties under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009.

Technician – Flood and Coastal Management

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION



Comments provided by	SR Heritage & Design Officer	
Date of reply	5/1/2022	
Planning Application Reference	21/01908/FUL	Case Officer: RD
Proposed Development	Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and formation of access	
Site Location	East Lodge, Netherurd, Blyth Bridge, EH46 7AQ	
<p><i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee and on the basis of the information provided. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></p>		
Background and Site description	<p>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.</p>	
Principal Issues (not exhaustive)	<p>The principal legislative and policy considerations from a heritage perspective in this case are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the key outcomes for the planning system is to help protect and enhance our natural and cultural assets, and facilitating their sustainable use (Outcome 3, SPP). • The siting and design of development should take account of all aspects of the historic environment (paragraph 140, SPP) • Non-designated heritage assets are an important part of Scotland's heritage and irreplaceable resources. These should be protected and preserved where significant as far as possible and in situ wherever feasible (paragraph 151, SPP). • Historic Environment Policy for Scotland sets out a series of principles and policies for the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment. Relevant policies include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HEP1: Decisions affecting any part of the historic environment should be informed by an inclusive understanding of its breadth and cultural significance. ○ HEP4: Changes to specific assets and their context should be managed in a way that protects the historic environment. Opportunities for enhancement should be identified where appropriate. If detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be put in place. 	

	<p>Therefore, the principal considerations from a heritage perspective from this case are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether there is sufficient information to understand the heritage impact of the proposals • Whether the proposals preserves the architectural or historic interest of the building. 			
Assessment	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Recommendation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required

Recommended Conditions	
Recommended Informatives	

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

Comments provided by	Roads Planning Service	Contact e-mail/number:		
Officer Name and Post:	Paul Grigor Roads Planning Officer	pgrigor@scotborders.gov.uk 01835 826663		
Date of reply	21 st January 2022	Consultee reference:		
Planning Application Reference	21/01908/FUL	Case Officer: Ranald Dods		
Applicant	Mr Alasdair McKenzie			
Agent	Camerons Strachan Yuill Architects			
Proposed Development	Alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse and formation of access			
Site Location	East Lodge Netherurd Blyth Bridge West Linton Scottish Borders EH46 7AQ			
<i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i>				
Background and Site description				
Key Issues (Bullet points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visibility 			
Assessment	<p>The existing parking arrangement is to the front of the property, served by the existing private driveway. At present this informal parking area is likely to accommodate one vehicle comfortably and maybe two at a push.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to retain the existing parking and supplement it with two new spaces in the garden which are accessed directly off the C class road. I would have no objections to this providing the appropriate visibility splays can be achieved.</p> <p>In order for me to consider this proposal further, I will require a detailed plan showing how visibility splays of 2.4 by 120 metres can be provided in both directions onto the public road from the new access. This will involve reducing the height of the wall within the affected area to a height no more than 900mm above the carriageway level.</p> <p>The detailed plan should also show the construction makeup and drainage arrangement for the parking area. The strip of land between the existing road edge and the parking area behind the wall will have to be constructed with a bituminous surface.</p> <p>Until I receive this additional information, I am unable to comment fully on this application.</p>			
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further information required

AJS