

17 GEORGE STREET, EYEMOUTH 22/00371/FUL AND 22/00045/RREF

RESPONSE TO LOCAL REVIEW BODY REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION – COMMENTS ON HERITAGE STATEMENT AND THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 4 ON THE PLANNING APPLICATION AND SUBSEQUENT REVIEW

Heritage Statement

The Heritage Statement and accompanying appendices submitted with the appeal have been reviewed by the Case Officer and by the Council's Heritage and Design Officer.

The Heritage and Design Officer has provided detailed comments in response to the Heritage Statement. These conclude that the information submitted would not alter their assessment that the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Noting the detailed comments within the response, and having fully considered the contents of the Heritage Statement, the Case Officer draws the same conclusion. A point worthy of emphasis is that the proposed extension is to the frontage and principal elevation of 17 George Street, issues of scale, massing and detailing are therefore of particular significance for the host building and conservation area.

National Planning Framework 4

The relevant policies from NPF4 are noted below, with officer commentary on their relevance, and a conclusion below.

Relevant NPF policy	Commentary
Policy 1: Tackling the climate and nature crises	This policy requires significant weight to be given to the global climate and nature crises when considering all development proposals. Whilst relevant, the effect of the policy is considered to be neutral in this instance.
Policy 7: Historic assets and places	Part d) is a key policy consideration for this appeal. This states that proposals in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. This wording is similar to the wording of Local Development Plan 2016 policy EP9 (Conservation Areas). The report of handling concluded that the development would harm the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to LDP policy EP9. This would also be contrary to part d) of Policy 7.
Policy 14: Design, quality and place	Parts a), b) and c) are all relevant. They require developments to be designed to improve the quality of an area and consistent with the six qualities of successful places. The six qualities of successful places include 'distinctive' which is defined as 'supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity'. Annex D sets out further detailed considerations including scale, massing, detailing and legibility.

	<p>The development proposal is not considered to be supported by this policy for the reasons set out in the report of handling, including the form/ massing (including gable depth), detailing and proportions of the proposed front extension, which do not reflect the detail of local architectural styles.</p>
<p>Policy 16: Quality Homes</p>	<p>Parts g) and h) relate to householder development proposals and are therefore relevant. Part g) i. and ii) are of particular significance here.</p> <p>Part g) i. states that householder developments will be supported where they do not have a detrimental impact on the character or environmental quality of the home and the surrounding area in terms of size, design and materials.</p> <p>The development proposal is not supported by this policy. The proposed front extension would have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling due to its scale and design. The extension would be wider and deeper than the dwelling's historic narrow gables. The scale and massing of the proposed extension would harm the principal elevation of the existing dwelling, with a detrimental impact upon its character.</p> <p>Part g) ii. states that householder developments will be supported where they do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.</p> <p>The development proposal is not supported by this policy due to the issues of overshadowing detailed in the original report of handling.</p>

NPF4 - Conclusion

Where conservation areas are concerned, Policy 7 (Historic assets and places) does not depart significantly from the equivalent policy of the Local Development Plan 2016 (Policy EP9). For the reasons set out in the report of handling, the development proposal is considered to be contrary to NPF4 policy 7 (Historic assets and places).

NPF4 policies 14 (Design, quality and place) and 16 (Quality homes) vary from existing LDP policies in certain respects. For the reasons noted above, the proposed development is not considered to be supported by these policies.

In conclusion, therefore, for this appeal the effect of NPF4 is to reinforce the policy basis for the reasons for refusal stated in the original decision notice and the Report of Handling.