

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO LRB REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION



Comments provided by	SR Heritage & Design Officer	
Date of reply	01/03/23	
Appeal Reference	22/00045/RREF	
Planning Application Reference	22/00371/FUL	Case Officer: PD
Proposed Development	Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse	
Site Location	17 George Street, Eyemouth, TD14 5HH	
<p><i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee and on the basis of the information provided.</i></p>		
Comments	<p>A request has been received for comments on the impact of National Planning Framework 4 on the above planning application and subsequent review, and on the Heritage Statement submitted as part of this appeal.</p> <p>Heritage Statement</p> <p>Conservation Area Character Statement</p> <p>The area of the conservation area affected includes views from the seafront which is a key public space within the conservation area. It also includes the warren of streets which comprise the historic core of the settlement and contribute to its character. The site therefore is prominent and contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Extension to South</p> <p>The extension is a large addition to the front elevation of the property. Its relative subservience to the host building is affected by its positioning to the front elevation.</p> <p>The principle of an extension in this location has been accepted. It may be the case that an appropriately-scaled and well-detailed extension could better define the intersection of roads (as suggested by the appellant's heritage statement). The opposite is however true of a poorly-scaled and poorly-detailed extension, which instead is unduly prominent at this intersection of roads and detracts from the character of the area.</p> <p>It is still considered that the proportions and detailing of the extension do not accurately reflect that which characterises the conservation area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The depth of the extension, and resultant enlarged massing for a secondary extension to a front elevation. - The large area of blank wall between the ground floor openings and eaves level to the west elevation, which impacts on the proportions of the elevation. - The proportions of the openings to the west elevation. 	

Tod's Court Elevation.

The submitted heritage statement sets out that buildings were historically situated between Tod's Court and the seafront, such that Tod's Court was enclosed and the rear elevation of 17 George Street was not historically visible from the seafront. This accounts for its secondary / ancillary appearance as originally identified in the Heritage & Design Officer's comments to the planning application.

Amendments to this elevation were accepted on balance during determination of the application. The design of the proposed amendments remain unsupported, as they do not remain secondary to Tod's Court.

Conclusion

The submitted Heritage Statement has been reviewed. No new information has been provided which would alter the conclusion made in the original assessment of the application; that the design of the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

NPF4 – Policy 7 (Conservation Area)

Assessment made during the determination of the planning application, and as further assessed above, found that the architectural and historic character of the area is impacted by the proposals and fails to preserve or enhance its character and appearance. The assessment at the time of determination was made against Scottish Planning Policy 2014 (now replaced by NPF4), as well as all other relevant heritage legislation, policy and guidance which remain extant.

Policy 7 of the NPF4 seeks to protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and will only support proposals in conservation areas where 'the character or appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced' (Policy 7, part d). In assessing the application against Policy 7, the original conclusion that the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area remains unaffected.