

NOTICE OF OBJECTION

22/00297/FUL | Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking | Land West Of Burnmouth
Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Sirs,

I am the homeowner overlooking the subject site and consider the site to be unsuitable for ANY form of development.

The write to **object** to the above planning application for the following reasons:-

1. My home lies above the subject site and has in the last couple of years been the subject of subsidence following movement of land within the glen; movement which has resulted from the glen becoming significantly more marshy to the extent that areas have become a quagmire. This recent physical change in the glen would appear to be from greater than usual run off water flowing through it. The applicant's site is similarly affected and if developed, the land would be impermeable, placing further strain on the currently overwhelmed natural drainage lines.
2. **Line of sight.** There is no adequate line of sight from the proposed driveway within the site at the point of joining the public highway. The angle of the junction provides less than circa 45-degree vision due to the proximity of a bend. This will no doubt be confirmed as being unacceptable by the Highways Department.
3. On Saturday 12th March, the drains blocked again at Harbour View/Bay View/Coastguard Cottage. The road was temporarily blocked whilst the drains were cleared by an industrial drain cleaner, but the issue is that this is a regular occurrence and it is believed that the drains run through the applicant's site, a point omitted within the application.

In light of the above I request that the application is REFUSED.

Alan Cook

Nullahghar
Burnmouth
TD14 5SY

Not For Publication: 

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Alison Jepson

Address: 2 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Density of site
- Detrimental to environment
- Flood plain risk
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Litter
- No sufficient parking space
- Road safety
- Subsidence
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: I object to the proposed plans.

This is a unique site and I hope any decision is taken after an actual visit to the site, as I do not think photos indicate the problems clearly.

Burnmouth is on the Berwickshire Coast which is a Special Landscape Area in the Scottish Borders, and the Berwickshire coastal path runs close to the site. The proposed building will alter the landscape, affecting wildlife, and affect the harbour and residents of Lower Burnmouth, Cowdrait and Ross and services to Partonhall.

What must be appreciated is that the road running down the brae is the ONLY public road serving the harbour and the houses down below. As well as the residents and the fishermen, it is for the

grit lorries, bin lorries and emergency vehicles, including the coastguard. Many residents are elderly and using their cars is vital to get up the brae, as there are no buses.

The proposed site access is just before a ninety-degree bend on a single track road where traffic at the top is expected to give way.

Any added pressure on traffic on the brae will cause problems for local workers and residents. Building these pods will mean we have more visitors who do not know the area attempting to negotiate a difficult traffic situation.

It is correct that people have parked there for the church, but church services were not weekly and that was local people who understood the difficulties of the site, and parked for a few hours on a Sunday.

The plans do not explain what the intended visitors are supposed to do to access the site. I do not think they can easily turn left when going onto the site. If they drive down the brae, turn and approach the site by a right-hand turn, then there will be more vehicles turning in front of the harbour or Lower Burnmouth.

For anyone driving up, the corner by the church is always difficult, as it is a very steep blind bend. The proposed plans will mean vehicles coming up will just get round the bend and then run the risk of vehicles coming out from site on the right.

There is only one parking space for each pod, and any other vehicle will have to park at the top of the brae causing more pressure on the village.

Cottages did use to be on the site, but I think the proposed pods are not on the original footprint, and the cottages have not been there for 70 years.

I would therefore think this should be regarded as a change of use for the site.

Building on that area will increase surface water and the flooding risk for the private road to Partonhall and increase the risk of erosion to the area below the site, which is still recovering after the electricity company re-sited their pole. I have concerns that this will cause subsidence to the land and the road, particularly at the corner.

The wooded area is a haven for migrating birds and the brae has a colony of the Northern Argus Butterfly, a priority species in the UK biodiversity plan. It feeds and lays eggs on the Common Rock-rose and over developing this area might well affect this plant and the butterfly.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Dudley-Smith

Address: 15 Lower Burnmouth, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate screening
- Increased traffic
- No sufficient parking space
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Poor design
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: This proposal is totally out of keeping with this gem of local heritage. The access road is already dangerous for the existing traffic flow and will only become more dangerous with additional traffic to the pods.

The pod design is totally out of keeping with proposed location and has no recognition of the local area and its proud history. There are already a great number of holiday lets available throughout the existing built community which are successful as the village has not been overdeveloped with unsympathetic architecture. These pods would simply defeat the very purpose for which they are suggested.

The development of this area is totally out of keeping with everything that surrounds it. There is no proposed benefit for the existing community nor is there any foreseeable benefit as there would be nothing brought to the community other than rentals which would bring nothing to Burnmouth itself.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr Bill Jepson

Address: 2 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Flood plain risk
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Poor design
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected
- Water Supply

Comment: Traffic

The angle of the property entrance is so acute that vehicles coming down attempting to turn in will not be able to do so without making a multiple point turn across the road and blocking it as they do so. The same is true for vehicles leaving the property trying to turn right up the hill. This is clearly dangerous as the single track road past the site is narrow, winding and steep with a curving left hand bend just before the property and a blind sharp right hand bend just below. This is the only access for the communities of Lower Burnmouth, Cowdrait, Ross and the fishermen accessing the harbour. Increased traffic volumes on this narrow road are also an issue.

Ecology

The Design & Access Statement acknowledges that the original cottages (which did not extend as far as the new proposed development) were demolished over 70 years ago. During those 70 years the woodland has spread over the whole area, not just to the east of the site, as suggested in the Statement, and wildlife has taken over and established itself. Some rarer birds and butterflies are to be found in this area. Recently the ecology of this site has already been damaged, firstly by the

replacement of the powerline poles, and then by storm Arwen. An independent, professional survey and assessment of the impact of removing this woodland on the local flora and fauna should be carried out.

Style

The proposed construction and style of the development is not in keeping with the current look and character of the village.

Flooding

During heavy rain, quite a torrent of water already flows down the valley, resulting in flooding lower down. This could be made worse by the paved patio areas if less water is able to soak away into the ground.

Waste storage and collection

The application indicates waste to be collected from the main road. Bins would have to be off the main road to avoid obstructing traffic on the narrow single track road.

Sewage

The intention is to connect to the current drainage network. I understand that this already struggles to cope in the summer months. Scottish Water should be consulted about this.

Coastal Path

The official coastal path that runs next to/through the site is not shown on the plans.

Ghost company

I cannot find any evidence on the companies register that the company on the application, ASE Holiday & Property Rentals Ltd. or Stonefalls Development Partnership exists.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr Bill Jepson

Address: 2 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Road safety

Comment: Rely to Stonefalls Consultation Response - 6 May 2022

Repeated references to the three original cottages to justify the current project are irrelevant as they were removed over 70 years ago. As is reference to informal church car park use, as this was very infrequent.

Vehicular Access

The traffic survey is invalid. It was carried out in March when occupancy of the cottages and visitors to the bottom of the Brae was very low. The survey would need to be carried out during July/August to be representative of the traffic during the holiday period.

The site access is not shown to be suitable and safe.

The swept path graphic (drawing MTS 9055 SK01) showing a vehicle entering the site demonstrates that the descending vehicle travels on the wrong side of the road, for over 25m, impeding any vehicle coming up the Brae. At this point vehicles have just come round the blind bend and are trying to accelerate up the steep hill. It also demonstrates that (even if widened) two cars cannot pass at the entrance to the track, as the entering vehicle is again on the wrong side of the track and will be blocked by the exiting vehicle. This will inevitably result in obstruction of the Brae as the two cars respond to the situation and sort out which vehicle is going to reverse.

The claim that 'The access to Coastguard cottage requires the same manoeuvre as does the access to Partenhall at the bottom of Burnmouth Brae. Therefore, this is a common manoeuvre in the area' is not correct. It is not a common manoeuvre. Partenhall traffic does not carry out this manoeuvre. Vehicles travelling to Partenhall drive down the back road. On leaving Partenhall they do come along the bottom road but then proceed straight to the wider area at the harbour or beyond where a three point turn can safely be carried out in order to return safely up the Brae.

Drainage

The concerns raised were not about the capacity of the pumping station at Eyemouth. It is the pumping system on the Brae that already struggles to cope in the summer with the extra visitors, an extra six people could make this even worse.

Nature Scotland

Were not only concerned about the construction method.

There is more to environmental considerations than protected species.

The following Nature Scotland concern has not been addressed.

'We are also concerned that development of this site would result in the permanent loss of an area of coastal habitat, which, although not part of the adjacent Burnmouth Coast SSSI, is of a similar species composition to SSSI habitat immediately north and south of the development site, and forms an important natural habitat link between these sections.'

Local Economy

This justification is very tenuous. There is not the infrastructure or space for water sport business development at the harbour.

Visual impact images

Three viewpoints carefully chosen do not make the pods invisible. They do not alter the fact that the pods are not in keeping with the other cottages and will be seen by residents, visitors and walkers.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Miss Dorothy Aitchison

Address: Whinfaulds, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Inadequate screening
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Poor design
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected
- Value of property

Comment: The pods are non residential in a community which has far too many holiday lets and not enough affordable housing for families.

The site of the proposed pods is a damp, woodland habitat. A wild area hosting a range of birdlife including long tail tits, warblers, gold finches, chiffchaffs etc. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the whole ambiance of the Glen, spoiling the environment for residents and visitors alike.

The pressure on the brae of more traffic is also an important consideration.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr James Cameron

Address: Whinfaulds, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Legal issues

Comment: The agent names the applicant as ASE Holiday & Property Rentals Ltd and claimed they own the land.. They are not registered with Companies House, and the address given 'The Hill Stonefalls, TD145ST' does not exist.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr james lillie

Address: 4 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Density of site
- Health Issues
- Increased traffic
- No sufficient parking space
- Road safety

Comment: Proposed Burnmouth pods.

1. On this corner of the Brae comprise of holiday homes, Coast Guards, the Burnmouth Church, development into Air B and B plus proposed 3 holiday homes/pods, totalling at least 5 Motor Vehicles in this congested area.
2. It is noted these pods will be built on the site of previously demolished Fisher persons cottages. No motor vehicles associated with these in 1950s.
3. Generally the holiday makers (H.M.) arrive on a Saturday. If the designated parking spaces are occupied with cleaners, gardeners or maintenance workers where do the H. M. park. Anywhere convenient. Possibly on the Brae.
4. Burnmouth has a vibrant working Harbour. With workers in motor vehicles going up and down a 20% 5/1 incline. The fishermen need to be on time for work and get home quickly after their shift. Plenty of complaints from the village when the tree surgeons were called to remove a fallen tree after storm Arwen, at the corner below Cliff Cottage. Some residents thought this would cause congestion going up and down.
5. This I feel is an accident waiting to happen with H. M. paying for the right to enjoy their expensive holiday. They may park indiscriminately where ever they want. Who will police & enforce this at the time. Even if they have a designated parking space. Will they park at the busy harbour and walk up the 20% incline of the Brae? Will they park their motor vehicle at the road junction near the School house at the top & walk down the 20% decline? I think not.

6. If the H. M. have more than one car per pod, where will that car be parked?

7. Health and Safety is to be considered & paramount for this application. The Brae has limited road width and single way traffic areas. This is one of them. The Brea also has visual restricted view on certain areas. This is also one of these points.

17 Cowdrait
Burnmouth
TD14 5SW

25th March 2022

22/00297/FUL

OBJECTION

Ecology Impact - Planning for 3 Pods in Burnmouth

Dear Sirs,

I write to appeal to you to allow the area known locally as "The Glen" at Burnmouth, to be allowed to return to its natural state, as a haven for birds, bats, insects, butterflies, flowers and trees; and as an attractive entry to our little village.

I have lived here for 28 years, but my first introduction to the Glen was with the Scottish Wildlife Trust, even before that. We were netting and ringing migrant birds and it was a pristine, wild, beautiful area. It has suffered recently by the installation of the pylons, together with storm damage, but it would recover if allowed and become once again the beautiful approach to our little community that it was. It does not need pods on concrete blocks, extra traffic all that goes with it.

Sincerely Yours

Jean Armstrong

22/00297/FUL | Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking | Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Notice of Objection

The **road to the harbour** was built for horses and carts to take the boats' catch up the hill and it has only been slightly altered twice when the original cottages at the site were demolished, the road was widened there. As a result, those same cottages would no longer fit on to the site.

Land was also taken beside Cliff Cottage and the road altered.

Parking At times there can be three cars at Coastguard Cottage – it only has space for one, so two park informally behind the church. The same applies to Bayview, which can have two cars, but only parking for one. Furthermore to access Harbour View, the parking at Bayview (which blocks access to Harbour View), becomes unusable.

The road has a big problem with motorhomes, which seem to get bigger.

Cliff The cliff behind the site is unstable and a section has been covered in wire mesh for safety.

There are pod developments everywhere, but I would suggest that this development is inappropriate in this location, due to inadequate access and on-site parking provision.

History A previous planning application for development at the harbour was refused on grounds of inadequate access, the planning stating that the road was not suitable for additional traffic. There is more traffic now than ever – tis is exacerbated by the number of supermarket, home deliveries and other delivery vehicles.

John Aitchison
Harbour Master
Burnmouth

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr John K McGregor

Address: Bay View, Stonefalls, Burnmouth Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5ST

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Land affected
- Loss of view
- Noise nuisance
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Overlooking
- Poor design
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected
- Value of property
- Water Supply

Comment: I live next to the proposed site. I'm fairly annoyed by the whole thing.

A. The proposed buildings do not fit in design wise with all the other buildings near by and I personally don't want to look out of my window at them instead of the trees and bushes already there.

B. There is so much wildlife in that space that will probably be lost, the swampy area is used by all sorts of birds especially in the winter including woodcock and the whole area is a haven for migratory finches/warblers etc nesting in the spring/summer. It will ruin the tranquility of the area, well known for bird watchers. Already the new church owners have decimated the trees within their grounds with their plan for AirBnB accommodation. It would destroy a wildlife refuge.

C. The mess, the noise, the inconvenience and the extra traffic on a single track road used by the local fishing community, these are some of problems that will occur.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Park

Address: 18 Lower Burnmouth, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Density of site
- Detrimental to environment
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- No sufficient parking space
- Poor design
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment:1. The access to this development is totally inadequate. It is on a dangerous bend where, because of limited view there are regular traffic jams. These often involve large vehicles.
2. There would appear to be three small parking spaces for the three pods. It would be more than probable that the occupants of the pods would have visitors and no parking spaces would be available with the possibility that they would park on the road. This would be dangerous.
3. Drainage from the site could put a strain on the existing system
4. The proposed development would offer no advantage to the existing community.
5. There would be an increase of traffic in an already difficult area. Because of the single track road down to the harbour any further increase in traffic could only add to the danger on this section of road.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Kathryn Hansell

Address: 3, West Winds, Upper Burnmouth, Eyemouth TD14 5SL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Inadequate access
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: Proposals totally out of keeping with Upper and Lower Burnmouth, Partanhall, Cowdrait and Ross...a historic fishing harbour.

The aesthetics are quite inappropriate for the environment

There is already a plentiful sufficiency of holiday accommodation.

The most hazardous section of the roadway down the bank to the harbour is the proposed access and exit point. Visibility is very poor on account of the bends in the brae and the narrowness of the roadway.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr Kenneth Wilson

Address: 1 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Density of site
- Designated Conservation Area
- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Flood plain risk
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Inadequate screening
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- No sufficient parking space
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: I object to this development on several grounds, most notably as laid out below.

1, Site access, access to the site is from a particularly tight turn on an already narrow, steep and mainly blind section of a single track road at the site location. Traffic turning into the site would need to use the full width of the road and most likely would need to use both forward and reverse gears to complete the maneuver, thus increasing collision risks and congestion at an already tight part of the brae.

2, Over Provision of this type of amenity, Lower Burnmouth already has a large percentage of holiday accommodation which provides little or no economical benefit to the village, but rather leaves the village a somewhat desolate place in the off season months with many properties standing empty.

3, Ecology, The site has a very diverse ecology and is bordered on both sides by sites of special scientific interest, I am at a loss as to why the site has not also been designated so, with noted sightings of bats, kingfisher, otter, deer, northern brown argus butterflies as well as many other visiting migrating birds and wildlife species.

4, Sight lines, The pods whilst smart in their own appearance are not visually in keeping with other properties in the area, Burnmouth is a traditional Scottish coastal fishing village and has done well to retain this character but these pods, sitting high on an open sight easily viewed from around the harbour area will stand out as a carbuncle in an otherwise tranquil location.

My final concern is over the ownership of the site, the footprint is much larger than the original footprint of the fishermen's cottages and there appears to have been a slightly underhand land grab over the rest of the site by what also appears to be a shell or ghost company with no records held by companies house of the said applicants companies. This leaves me concerned that should this application be accepted then it sets a precedent for other entities to follow a similar course of action with the authorities being left with a poor precedent of over development having already been set.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Kirsten Wilson

Address: 1 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- No sufficient parking space
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment:1. The area is a haven for wildlife including bats, migrating birds, rare butterflies, and with evidence of kingfishers and otters.

2. The proposed location appears larger than the site of the previous cottages. Granting permission sets a dangerous precedence for further areas in the village and on the braes.

3. The brae is a steep, narrow, single point of access and already suffers due to the volume of visiting cars, be it for holiday homes or day trippers. The access to the pods, right on a steep blind bend is an accident waiting to happen.

4. The village already suffers from too many holiday homes, this development brings nothing to the resident communities.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Margaret Cowie

Address: The Blue House, 24 Cowdrait, Burnmouth Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Increased traffic
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: The proposed pods will be a blight on a natural landscape., a natural beauty spot.

The brae at Burnmouth cannot support additional traffic

The proposed parking and entrance will be a danger due the sharp bend in the road where oncoming traffic is not visible.

There will be additional strain on the sewage system which already struggles due to increased use by holiday cottages

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mr PAUL OSWALD

Address: 19 - 20 Lower Burnmouth, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Designated Conservation Area
- Detrimental to environment
- Flood plain risk
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Legal issues
- Noise nuisance
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected
- Water Supply

Comment: We object for the following reasons:-

- 1 Increase traffic density- heavy delivery trucks, tankers of bunker fuel, rubbish collection trucks, gritters and builders merchants lorries frequently cause pinch points at this location.
2. Dangerous and difficult access- blind corners, steep gradient. Many collisions here over the years.
3. Environmental degradation-habitat destruction of a wild area.
4. Sewage is already inadequate for the neighbouring houses. Further works are required to make satisfactory arrangements not outlined, causing further degradation to the environment.
5. Doesn't bring any benefits to Burnmouth-income, local assets or infrastructure. Already over 50% of all properties at sea level are either 2nd homes, holiday lets or empty, making an absent community.

6. This is an unregistered company making an application posing potential threats for future development of the brae and further degrading the unique village character.

Penelope and Christopher Fleming

Harbour View
Stonefalls
Burnmouth
TD14 5ST

04 March 2022

Planning and Regulatory Services
Council Headquarters
Newtown St. Boswells
Melrose
TD6 0SA

Planning Application: 22/00297/FUL

Proposal: Erection of 3 holiday pods and associated parking

Location: Land West of Burnmouth Church, Stonefalls, Burnmouth TD14 5ST

Dear Sir

As residents, for over twenty years, of one of the 3 cottages formed from the former Coast Guard Station opposite the intended development site, we wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds:

1. **Traffic and Access** – the location lies on a steep and winding road which descends towards the harbour and where a sharp and dangerous narrow bend is a frequent cause of traffic risk. The intended access and increased traffic movements would be likely to increase the risk to both local residents using the road on foot or on wheels and to walkers using the coastal path and public right of way crossing this area. On the assumption that the proposed holiday cabins would attract families with small children, the road in itself would present them with a significant risk.
2. **Drainage and infrastructure** – The drainage and sewerage system serving the 3 cottages and church has been a long term cause of problems to the residents and to Scottish Water apparently due to the age of the pipework and the instability of the hillside surrounding the burn. On many occasions during our time blockages have occurred and sewage has been known to escape down the road. This development would be likely to put pressure on an aged and inadequate drainage and sewerage system leading to further problems and expense. In addition, the edge of the proposed development appears likely to exacerbate a problem with the burn that runs down the brae which often floods in that area in very heavy rain making passage along the public footpath that crosses the burn difficult if not impossible on occasion.
3. **Appearance, siting and materials** – The 3 cottages formed from the former Coast Guard Station located opposite the development site have white painted harling-coated rough stone walls and slate roofs in the local vernacular and form an attractive vista from the Category B listed harbour. The site plan indicates clearly that because of the acknowledged slope of the brae the proposed holiday cabins would be both visible from the harbour and in sharp contrast to the existing cottages. No other building in the area would blend in with the cabins as proposed.

Yours faithfully



Penelope Fleming



Christopher Fleming

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Rhianon Mcgeoch

Address: Cliff Cottage, Burnmouth Brae, Burnmouth Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SN

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Flood plain risk
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Land affected
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected
- Water Supply

Comment:I object to:

1. Environmental disturbance and DESTRUCTION to...

resident Bats

migrant Birds' first landing from Continent, ie chiffchaffs, redwings

varied habitat for starlings, finches, tree sparrows, long tail tits etc.

rare Butterflies and Moths

marsh land insects.

2. DANGEROUS excess Traffic -exit and entry out onto Brae by hair pin corner.

3.Sewage and Drainage-extra sewage from holiday home visitors ALREADY causing blockages.

Burnmouth already has many holiday homes.

Are there any Covenants on this piece of land?

HAS AN ECOLOGICAL SURVEY BEEN CONDUCTED?

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Sheila Lillie

Address: 4 Ross, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Flood plain risk
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate drainage
- Increased traffic
- Noise nuisance
- Poor design
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: Dangerous access to and from traffic coming up and down brae. Blind spot at corner.

Land is a haven for wildlife, migrating birds, bats that seek refuge there.

Sewage and drain problems, already causes problems in holiday season.

Burnmouth is a lovely village. It is such a shame for people to come in and design unsightly holiday homes which will not enhance the area at all.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Su Potter

Address: 21 Lower Burnmouth, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Density of site
- Inadequate access
- Road safety

Comment: The proposed provision of three holiday pods bears no relation to the original three fishermen's cottages that the applicant is using to justify the density of their scheme and is erroneous. The footprint of the original building (a terrace of three houses) bears no relation to the siting of the pods. Granting consent would set a precedent that would be hard for the planning department defend if other developers submitted further applications nearby.

The access to the site is completely inadequate and this alone should result in the application being refused. A site visit by Committee members will confirm this.

The brae, the only two way access to the harbour and 50 or so homes, is in part a dangerous road, steep in places with a series of blind spots and sharp curves. A minor road, the council recognises its importance with regular gritting during poor weather. The proposed development will introduce additional hazards to this locally important highway.

Consent for the scheme proposed should be REFUSED.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00297/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00297/FUL

Address: Land West Of Burnmouth Church Stonefalls Burnmouth Eyemouth Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of 3 no holiday pods and associated parking

Case Officer: Paul Duncan

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Susan Dudley-Smith

Address: 15 Lower Burnmouth, Burnmouth, Eyemouth, Scottish Borders TD14 5SP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Detrimental to Residential Amenity
- Inadequate access
- Increased traffic
- Over Provision of facility in area
- Poor design
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Road safety
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: Lower Burnmouth is already well supplied with holiday accommodation. The access to the village is restricted and is only single track with blind corners. Passing places are already inadequate and two vehicles cannot pass without considerable inconvenience.

Holidaymakers do visit throughout the year but on an occasional and ad hoc manner. This application would lead to greater, regular use to the inconvenience of existing residents and home owners without adding any benefit to the village by way of social support or neighbourliness. Many of the visitors that already come to the village are users of the Coastal Path. Their only access is via a single roadway without footpaths. This application would increase the risk to these visitors who might also choose the roadway to leave the village to find the only bus stops at the top of the brae.

The access to this site from the single carriageway can be seen and is obviously unsafe and will require either a two or three point turn or an unnecessary trip to the bottom of the brae for a visiting vehicle to turn around. Departure from the site would require a reverse of that, again adding to public risk and inconvenience..

I can see no reason for this application to be approved. The buildings would be unsightly and are not required; the access to Lower Burnmouth would be compromised and made more unsafe; the existing road users both pedestrian and motorised would suffer inconvenience and added hazard.