

From:Fraser Hunter
Sent:7 Jun 2021 16:28:00 +0100
To:Taylor, Brett
Cc:Annette Glendinning
Subject:21/00706/FUL

CAUTION: External Email

REFERENCE EML-OUT/AT3414/20210607-160735-927

Afternoon Brett

I am writing to you in regards to the Application 21/00706/FUL (Erection of Dwelling house, Land South Of Stable Cottage (Plot 4) Westcote Farm Hawick Scottish Borders)

Following recent objection comments by neighbours, my client Mr Glendinning would like the following replies put forward to each of their points.

They are as follows :-

In reply to objections made by Mr & Mrs Limmer

1.

We believe this point to be Irrelevant, the property is not to be operated as a holiday let and Mr Glendinning is happy to put this in writing, but we cannot guarantee the use of any future owner would not exclusively keep this property as residential. Mr Glendinning has 3 daughters, and this would potentially allow each daughter to relocate back to their family farm at some point in the future. The point about tourism now being the focus of Westcote is in our opinion irrelevant and it is in effect farm diversification. Tourism is actively being encouraged by the Scottish government and is something we believe is in great need in this local area. Hawick is a dying town and requires projects like this to regenerate the local economy.

2.

We believe that the local economy and infrastructure requires the provision of larger properties. With the development of Covid there has been a significant increase in the need for larger rural development. We have already been approached by an interested party asking to potentially purchase the plot and, in our opinion, this proves there is a demand for larger properties in rural locations especially post Covid

where people are more able to work from home.

3.

We acknowledge point 3.

4.

The road department assessed the road and lay-bys and indicated these were adequate. There are 5 passing places thus we believe this is irrelevant.

The road in our opinion is as good as it was when the objectors purchased their property. Despite Mr Glendinning's best efforts, work on the tarring of the road end has been delayed until the autumn due to the yearlong pandemic and contractors work schedules have been delayed by a considerable time period. Materials are increasingly difficult to come by and Mr Glendinning has done my utmost to adhere to all the Scottish Borders council conditions. Unfortunately nobody could predict the unprecedented conditions this Covid pandemic has imposed on all types of infrastructure. I am sure this can be appreciated. The 3 visitor parking spaces at plot 2 encroaching onto the access track is irrelevant there is still more than 3.7 meters to pass on the access road when a vehicle is parked in the visitor parking space. We find it difficult to comprehend how the space left can cause another vehicle difficulties in passing. As the roads department have previously indicated they have no issues we believe this point to be irrelevant.

We believe this objection is based more on their objections to the farm diversification, the Glamping and the holiday let than the proposed property. Which we believe to be irrelevant to this application.

In Reply to objections made by Mr & Mrs Wilson

1.

Mr Glendinning believes he has a building group here with the old farm conversions in the centre and new development on both sides. This would, in our opinion address the balance between new properties on the one side of the conversions with an additional new property on the other. Added to this fact is that the proposed dwelling on plot 4 would be identical in style with the dwelling on plot 3. The proposed house is indeed south of stable cottage and not south of the property the objector lives in. Stable cottage being the nearest property to this proposed dwelling have indicated they have no objection to the erection of this proposed property.

The proposal 3 years ago was not refused it was withdrawn by Mr Glendinning.

2.

The entrance to the farm track is awaiting tarmac and due to Covid issues has been delayed until the autumn (as previously indicated). Mr Glendinning are more than happy to have formalised maintenance of the farm track with each resident contributing as stated in the title deeds, but due to the inability for each residential property to agree to this, Mr Glendinning has not been able to put into action. Mr Glendinning is willing to contact his solicitor to formalise an agreeable arrangement with all residents. The potential of at least 4/5 vehicles is an exaggeration, each property on average has a total of 2 vehicles except for the objector who has a total of 2 cars plus a transit van.

At the end of the farm track there is a public bus route stop and we cannot say as to whether any prospective residents may not in effect decide to use this as their means of transport. If this resident does not believe the current access road is of a safe standard, why have they not raised this before, nor has any other neighbours done so presently.

It is also worth noting that when a 5-vehicle taxi business was operating from Westcote with a substantial increase in road traffic use than is presently occurring, and no concerns were raised.

3.

On purchasing the property in 2014 the occupant was fully aware of plot 2 and 3 application of planning in principle. The property on plot 3 does not overlook any living area or the garden of the old farmhouse (their residence) and is irrelevant to this application. The proposed property on plot 4 is situated 40m away at its closest point and as previously stated not in the direct line of site from the complainant's property.

4.

The proposed dwelling is still adjacent to an existing building group. I believe precedence has already been set in recent years on green field sites that are similar to this proposal (properties granted planning permission on green sites)

Hassendean Farm (4 properties)

Hassendean Burn farm and Mid-shields farm (at least 5 plots granted to the same applicant)

New Houses farm (at least 6 properties)

East Boonraw (at least 2) both of which are significantly visible from the A7.

This is just a quick example of recent plots in the local area. With more research we believe we can provide more evidence of such examples within the Scottish Borders area.

As the soakaway would be in the field adjacent to the footpath, not the footpath itself and pipework running beneath a path would have no effect on the path itself. We believe this point is also irrelevant.

5.

We do not agree that the design is suburban in our opinion Dormer windows on 1 1/2 storey house is in fact a very rural type of design. We are surrounded in this area of similar 1 1/2 story Dormer aspect properties. We are very disappointed the objector find the design on plot 3 and that of the proposed property unsightly but no objections have been previously raised.

6.

The hedgerows are only present on only one side. We are actively trying to encourage wildlife and their native habitats. Mr Glendinning has already tried to start to put wildflowers on our track verges and has tried to apply for grants for hedgerows. Mr Glendinning is looking into various other grants and funding for environmental improvements but due to the small size of the farm currently we have been unable to secure any assistance. Mr Glendinning intends to plant more hedgerows around the field boundary. Again, soakaway will not impede the rural walking route.

7.

The property is not a 2-story structure it is 1 1/2 story and the floor level of the proposed structure which will be sited adjacent to Stable cottage and not the objector's property, will be on a significantly lower level to their property, not as stated as higher in aspect. Again, as previously indicated the view from the objector's property in our opinion will not be obstructed in the way they have indicated. Again, the objector bought the property in 2014 knowing that further farm diversification was imminent.

8.

As previously indicated the objector were aware of the properties were planning in principle and they are actually 4-bedroom dwellings, not and 5 as stated. The fact that the two properties have not been sold we believe to be irrelevant.

We are aware that since the prevalence of Covid there is a high demand for larger rural properties which will bring a much-needed boost to the local economy. Professional individuals are more able to work from home and are desperate to relocate to rural settings.

This property is not to be used at any time as a holiday let.

The objector seems to contradict themselves when on one hand they indicate how the rural walkway is very important to them and used regularly but they object to their lack of privacy, wellbeing, health and well-being when their property and garden are directly adjacent to the rural walkway. It is our opinion that individuals using this walkway would have more of an impact to the privacy of their property than a dwelling house sited 40 meters away and at a lower level.

We hope this addresses the points made by objectors to this date. Please don't hesitate to contact myself if you require any additional information.

Kind Regards

Fraser

Fraser Hunter
Architecural Technician

for and on behalf of
Aitken Turnbull Architects
9 Bridge Place, Galashiels, TD1 1SN
w: <http://www.aitken-turnbull.co.uk>
e: fhunter@aitken-turnbull.co.uk
t: 01896 752760



Confidentiality Note:

The information contained in this electronic mail is legally privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone +44 (0) 1896 752760 and return the original message to us at the above listed address via electronic mail.

Email communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, delayed or incomplete, or contain viruses. Aitken Turnbull do not accept liability or responsibility for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message.