

Comments for Planning Application 22/00296/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00296/FUL

Address: Land North And East Of Tweed Lodge Hoebridge East Road Gattonside Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Julie Hayward

Customer Details

Name: Dr Paul Syme

Address: Ashtrees, Hoebridge East Road, Gattonside Melrose, Scottish Borders TD6 9LZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Designated Conservation Area
- Detrimental to environment
- Flood plain risk
- Health Issues
- Inadequate drainage
- Land affected
- Overlooking
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Water Supply

Comment: As immediate neighbours on the notification list we would like to comment and state our reasons for opposing this application.

A property of this size will use a large volume of water. Scottish Water clearly have concerns and cannot at this stage guarantee mains drainage and sewage. Soakaways and a septic tank will be needed. This could be problematic in an area with a high water table close to the river Tweed in an area that floods. In the 28 years we have lived in the property we have experienced frequent flooding close to our property. Any changes which may contribute to raising the water table are of serious concern and extremely worrying for us as neighbours on the flood plain. Reviewing the SEPA flood map of our area, the field to the east of this development is one of the areas at high risk for flooding.

Another consideration is the sheer volume and footprint of this proposed property and its close proximity to other properties; this is nothing like the size or position of the proposed property in the 2020 application mentioned in section 2.1 (Planning Compliance). It also has a much larger

footprint than the original barn on the site.

There have been issues for neighbours with cooking smells emitting from the extractor fan in the adjacent commercial kitchen next door to the proposed development. When the prevailing south westerly is blowing cooking smells tend to be carried away in the direction of the proposed development. With such a large building filling that area we are concerned that this will cause the extracted air to pool and cause further problems for the surrounding properties. This development could therefore have a detrimental effect on air quality for adjoining properties to the commercial kitchen. This needs to be assessed by environmental health.

Another major concern is the failure of this development to remain within the village boundary. Policy PMD4 makes it very clear that this should only be allowed under exceptional circumstances. This development fails to fulfil the exceptions outlined in the Scottish Borders council policy document. Allowing development outside the boundary also changes the use of prime agricultural land policy ED10 and invades the designated countryside around towns EP6 as clearly shown in the councils policy document and illustrated in Fig EP6a. Neither is this development a satisfactory infill development policy PMD5. Any infill development should not conflict with the established land use of the area. It clearly does. Any infill development should not overshadow an adjoining property which it also clearly does. Any infill should have adequate services and it is also clear that Scottish Water cannot provide these services. This very large house will produce large volumes of water which will enter land that already has a high water table.

In summary this development in its current form is not suitable for this area.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00296/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00296/FUL

Address: Land North And East Of Tweed Lodge Hoebridge East Road Gattonside Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Julie Hayward

Customer Details

Name: Mr Patrick White

Address: Tweed Lodge, Hoebridge East Road, Gattonside Melrose, Scottish Borders TD6 9LZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Flood plain risk
- Height of
- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Water Supply

Comment: Tweed Lodge

Hoebridge Road East

Gattonside

TD6 9LZ

20 March 2022

Planning proposal 22/00296/FUL

We wish to object to the above planning proposal primarily on the grounds of loss of amenity for our property, specifically loss of light, loss of privacy and the overbearing impact of the proposed development.

We have no objection to the principle of a house being built on this plot. Indeed, we offered no objection when the indicative planning proposal was made by the previous owner of the land. That indicative proposal showed a single-storey garage immediately in front of our property Tweed

Lodge and a house sited in the far north-east corner of the plot. Our general acceptance of a house being built on the plot was also indicated to the owner of the plot at an informal consultation in 2021. However, we made clear that a two-storey structure immediately in front of our house would have a significant negative impact on the amenity of the property. It is disappointing therefore that the detailed proposal includes precisely such a structure.

As the closest property to the proposed development, Tweed Lodge is mentioned numerous times in the detailed design proposal but inadequate acknowledgement has been made of the impact on our property by this proposed development and inadequate measures taken to mitigate this impact.

Loss of light

If this development is considered as infill development, the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (SBLDP) states on p31 that the property should not "result in any significant loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy to adjoining properties as a result of overshadowing or overlooking". The detailed design proposal shows an illustration of shadow cast by the proposed development at different times of the day. This shows the potential loss of sunlight caused by the proposed structure, and specifically the two-storey annexe, on Tweed Lodge, but the SBLDP places equal weight on the loss of daylight from a development. Even on an overcast day (the norm in this region), light at the front of our house will be limited, and especially given the proposal for the external cladding of the building to be black. The fence behind which the black two-storey annexe would stand is just 2.9 metres from the front of our front door porch. Point 3.4 of the Privacy and Sunlight guidance documentation that supplements the SBLDP states that the height of a new development should fall below a line drawn at a vertical angle of 25 from the centre of a window of an existing building. That would not be the case for this two-storey annexe.

We were told by the owner that the reason why a two-storey annexe structure was proposed in this position is that the upper storey would house a study and it was not possible to accommodate it elsewhere. However, other options could be considered for finding this space in a development of this size, or alternatively a separate single-storey office could be built elsewhere on the plot, as indeed we have done at Tweed Lodge in a way that has minimal impact on the amenity of our neighbours' properties, making it possible for the building directly in front of our house to be a single-storey one.

Loss of privacy

The proposed main building would be very close to our property, significantly closer than was shown on the indicative planning proposal. The rooms facing south would overlook our main kitchen and living room on the ground floor and into our children's bedrooms on the upper floor. Acceptable distances as specified in Section 2 of the SBLDP Privacy and Sunlight Guidance document, depending on the angles between windows, must be observed.

Appropriateness of the proposed design

The SBLDP states, on p25, with regard to Policy PMD2 and specifically Placemaking and Design, that "[the property should be] finished externally in materials, the colours and textures of which complement the highest quality of architecture in the locality", and that it should be "compatible with, and respects the character of the surrounding area, neighbouring uses, and neighbouring built form". If this development is considered as infill development, similar requirements obtain (p31): the property should respect "the scale, form, design, materials and density in context of its surroundings".

Specifically with regard to the colour of proposed developments, the Placemaking and Design guidance that supplements the SBLDP states that "the most important principle is to use colours which blend in with local traditions and surrounding buildings... Coloured finishes should be considered in the context of the building's wider setting - the impact of inappropriate colours can be far-reaching as part of the wider Borders visual character", "... the inappropriate use of colour and materials in new building in the Scottish Borders has eroded the subtle interplay of buildings in their landscape. In order to reflect the local character, the use of colour and materials should... be sensitive to the indigenous materials and hues of the surrounding landscape".

The proposed design for the structure features black cladding. Not only would this exacerbate the light issue mentioned above, it would also make for a very prominent building that will have a visual impact at odds with the existing built forms within the conservation village of Gattonside. It is certainly true, as stated in the proposal, that the village has a variety of styles of property, old and modern. The design proposal chooses to pick out some of the more modern houses and especially flat-roofed ones but none of these flat-roofed buildings are two-storey and in particular none of these are black. The document refers to an old black farm building on the other side of the Tweed and so not in the village and to a neighbour's black-painted gate. These examples cannot be said to constitute a precedent for a large black two-storey property in the conservation village. The choice of black cladding would also emphasize the prominence of the structure, given the relatively exposed location of the plot on the edge of the conservation village. This would be particularly true when entering the village from the east on the B6360 or when looking towards the village from the south. The design proposal states that the site would be "hidden behind an existing line of mature trees" but these sparse deciduous trees provide very little screening indeed when not in leaf.

The scale and massing of the proposed development are considerable. The SBLDP Placemaking and Design guidance states on p57 that "New buildings should be simple in form, relating to traditional building forms in the area" and that "The building size should be relative to its site and surrounding buildings. Larger houses need more space around them and would sit uncomfortably located directly next to a traditional single or storey and a half storey cottage". The proposed development is very large, covers a significant footprint, is two storeys high and would mass in an overbearing manner next to Tweed Lodge.

Waste water and situation in a flood plain

Policy IS9 on p127 of the SBLDP states that "septic tanks are regarded as a last resort and not encouraged" and that there should be direct connection to the sewerage system. This proposal includes a septic tank positioned outside the site (and village) boundary and hence runs counter to this policy. The Scottish Water consultation document that has been submitted also indicates that they cannot guarantee mains drainage and sewerage.

The site is situated in a flood plain with a high water table. There has been regular flooding of the Tweed into the adjoining fields in recent years and, given the effects of climate change, such flooding events will become more frequent and more extensive. It is of concern therefore that a new building could contribute to future flooding and appropriate risk assessment is required.

Patrick White

Sharon Mcteir

RECEIVED

22 MAR 2022

Cedarwood Bank
Hoebridge East Road
Gattonside
TD6 9LZ

20th March 2022

John Hayward
Planning & Development Standards Manager
Scottish Borders Council
Council Headquarters
Newtown St. Boswells
TD6 0SA

Dear Mr. Hayward,

Application Number: 22/00296/FUL
Proposed Development: Erection of a dwellinghouse
Location: Land North and East of Tweed Lodge Hoebridge East Road, Gattonside, Scottish Borders

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object to the development of a dwelling house in this location.

Gattonside is a conservation village where development proposals should be considered carefully and particularly in relation to the character of the village as referenced in the Local Development Plan (Policy PMD5 – Infill Development – Detracts from character and amenity of area).

The proposed siting of the development is in my opinion, ill considered, as it means the loss of prime quality agriculture land and land used by villagers and tourists for recreation (access to Border Abbeys Way, Southern Upland Way and St. Cuthbert's Way) and walking dogs. Building here would diminish this natural asset for the village and the views into and out of the village. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals these would not remedy the siting problem or the inadequacy of Hoebridge East Road to support increases in traffic during construction and afterwards for ongoing access.

The proposal is also contrary to Policy PMD4 of the Local Development Plan (Development Out with Development Boundaries) specifically

- It not a job generating development in the countryside that has an economic justification under Policy ED7 or HD2
- It is not an affordable housing development
- It does it offer community benefits that out weigh the need to protect the Development Boundary.

Yours sincerely

HJ Archibald