

**SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL**

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

**PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)**

**REF :** 22/01612/FUL

**APPLICANT :** Mrs Jane Prady

**AGENT :** WT Architecture

**DEVELOPMENT :** Alteration and extension to dwellinghouse

**LOCATION:** Ratchill Farmhouse  
Broughton  
Scottish Borders  
ML12 6HH

**TYPE :** FUL Application

**REASON FOR DELAY:**

---

**DRAWING NUMBERS:**

<b>Plan Ref</b>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Plan Status</b>
1 of 11	Location Plan	Refused
PL_E101	Existing Site Plan	Refused
PL_E01	Existing Plans	Refused
EL_E01	Existing Elevations	Refused
PL_DEM	Proposed Plans	Refused
PL_101	Proposed Site Plan	Refused
PL_01	Proposed Plans	Refused
PL_02	Proposed Plans	Refused
PL_03	Proposed Roof Plan	Refused
EL_01	Proposed Elevations	Refused
EL_02	Proposed Elevations	Refused

**NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:** 0

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

No representations received,

Consultation responses received from: Roads - no objection; Contaminated Land 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

EP4 - National scenic areas [Upper Tweeddale]  
EP13 - Trees, woodlands and hedgerows  
IS7 - Parking provision and standards

Supplementary Planning Guidance  
Householder Development (incorporating Privacy and Sunlight Guide) (2006)  
Placemaking and Design (2010)  
Trees and Development (2008)  
Waste Management (2015)

**Recommendation by** - Ranald Dods (Planning Officer) on 13th December 2022

Ratchill Farmhouse is a traditionally proportioned and detailed single storey house, constructed of stone with a slate roof with white windows and later extensions. It is located some 390m outside Broughton on the C9 Dreva Road. This application is made for an extension to the house. That would comprise a one and a half storey building to the north west of the house, linked to it by a flat roofed, glazed linking element. An existing extension to the rear of the house would be removed, as would the existing uPVC conservatory on the north western gable. A number of trees to the north of the house have been removed. Those were not covered by a tree preservation order. The applicant submitted a supporting statement and I have had due regard to that.

In determining the application, the following factors were considered:

**Policy**

The key policy against which this proposal is assessed is PMD2, quality standards. As set out below, the proposal does not comply fully with the terms of that key policy.

**Visual impact**

Policy PMD2 has 4 standards which are applied to all development. Those are: sustainability; placemaking and design; accessibility and; green space, open space and biodiversity. The most relevant standard for this proposal is placemaking and design with 7 further criteria being specified under that heading. Those relevant to this application are that the proposal: h) creates developments with a sense of place, based on a clear understanding of the context; i) is of a scale, massing, height and density appropriate to the existing building; j) is finished externally in materials, the colours and textures of which complement the existing building and; k) is compatible with and respects the character of the surrounding area, neighbouring uses and neighbouring built form.

Criterion h) relates to the design being appropriate to the location. Ratchill Farmhouse is traditionally proportioned and detailed and sits in close proximity to other similarly designed and detailed former farm buildings. The proposed extension, although of some design merit, varies from the existing house in terms of proportions, materials, fenestration pattern, orientation, detailing and style. In particular, the colour chosen for the cladding material is not one which is common to the area, being a colour more often found within the Highlands rather than found widely within the Borders. These variations from the character of the existing building are exacerbated considerably by the substantial scale of the proposal. It is acknowledged that the applicant has drawn an influence from the layout of the buildings to the south east but the relationship is entirely different due to the distance between the house and those buildings and the degree of projection to the front of the property.

Criterion i) sets out that where an extension to a building is proposed, it must be of a scale, massing and height which appropriate to the existing building. The height of the existing house is roughly 5.4m with the proposed extension being approximately 7.7m. The footprint of the house is approximately 140 square metres (after the removal of the rear extension) and the proposed extension would be 154 square metres. That, combined with the significant difference in height means that the massing of the extension would be at odds with the existing house. The house would, in effect, be subservient to the extension. The issue is particularly acute when viewed from the south east, when travelling along Dreva Road towards Broughton, especially given the materials chosen for the proposal. Whilst a suitably designed modest extension to the house may be acceptable, more than doubling the footprint of the property cannot be described reasonably as appropriate. The proposal incorporates a low link, which mitigates the difference in scale, but not sufficiently so to render the proposal sympathetic to the existing building.

Criterion j) considers the external finish of proposals. Ratchill Farmhouse is constructed of stone and has a Scottish slate roof. The proposed extension would be finished with vertical timber boarding at ground floor level with red coloured profile steel sheeting at first floor level and across the roof. As noted above, the colour of the proposed sheeting is not one which predominates in the Borders. The windows would be dark coloured of varying proportions and opening methods, albeit most have a strong vertical emphasis. These departures in specifications (albeit they could be addressed by planning conditions in themselves) would also exacerbate concerns above regarding the scale of the proposal.

Although the house is remote from the properties within Broughton, the nearest buildings are traditionally proportioned former farm steading buildings. While the relationship of the proposal to adjacent buildings is acknowledged, the proposal's considerable scale and variation from the character of the host dwellinghouse to which it would be attached would not complement its most immediate neighbouring built form. I consider that the relationship with the host dwellinghouse is the most visually critical aspect, and, therefore, I do not consider that the proposal would conform with criterion k.

Taking all of the above factors into consideration, the proposal does not comply with the terms of policy PMD2. The scale and massing of the extension, together with the proposed materials and fenestration pattern, do not respect the property to be extended, nor is the relationship with other buildings sufficient to justify its significant departures. I acknowledge the relatively discrete siting of the development from public view, but consider that this does not provide sufficient mitigation for this development because of the significance of effect on the character of the existing dwellinghouse. I also acknowledge the applicant's design approach, in recognising the visual relationship with adjacent buildings, but also do not consider this justifies such a significant extension to the existing dwellinghouse.

Daylight, sunlight and outlook

The proposal would not result in overshadowing or loss of light.

Privacy

I am content that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy.

Trees

The site previously had a number of semi-mature trees within it which were removed prior to the application being submitted. Their loss is regrettable but those were not protected by a tree preservation order.

Ecology

The applicant intends to remove a rear extension on the existing building but, its removal would not be required to enable the extension to be built and, in fact, it could be retained. Were there to be a direct impact, it would be appropriate to require the submission of an ecological appraisal prior to determination. As it is, it has to be borne in mind that the removal of the existing extension could be done without the benefit of planning permission. For that reason, an Informative note would, if consent were to be granted, refer the applicant to their obligations under habitat regulations.

Roads issues

There is ample parking and space for turning of vehicles within the curtilage of the property.

Conclusion

The design of the proposed extension would be a dominant and unsympathetic extension to the building which it would extend in terms of form, scale, height, massing and materials and does not complement that building. It is therefore contrary to policy PMD2.

## **REASON FOR DECISION :**

The development would be contrary to policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that the following criteria require that developments: h) create a sense of place based on a clear understanding of the context and are designed in sympathy with Scottish Borders architectural style; i) are of a scale, massing and height appropriate to the existing building; j) are finished externally in materials which complement the existing building; k) respect the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring built form. The proposed development is unsympathetic to the building which it would extend in terms of form, scale, height,

massing and materials and would not complement that building. No overriding case for the development as proposed has been substantiated. 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 the following criteria require that developments: h) create a sense of place based on a clear understanding of the context and are designed in sympathy with Scottish Borders architectural style; i) are of a scale, massing and height appropriate to the existing building; j) are finished externally in materials which complement the existing building; k) respect the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring built form. The proposed development is unsympathetic to the building which it would extend in terms of form, scale, height, massing and materials and would not complement that building. No overriding case for the development as proposed has been substantiated. 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”.**