

BERWICKSHIRE CIVIC SOCIETY RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR OBSERVATIONS ON PLANNING

Application Ref: 21/01690/FUL

Site: 17 George Street, Eyemouth. TD14 5HH.

Observations: The Berwickshire Civic Society notes that this application relates to alterations and an extension to a residential building within the Eyemouth Conservation area. BCS observes that the extension will materially alter the sightlines in the immediate area as the extension will be substantially larger than the existing one storey garage/store that will be replaced.

This part of the conservation area has been impacted already by modern buildings which have greatly reduced the original character of the built environment. In light of that, and since the proposed works fall under the householder development exemptions, BCS is neutral in respect of this application.

Declaration of Interest: The professional involved in the submission of this application on behalf of clients is currently instructed by this writer in another matter. No conversation has been had at all with respect to this application.

BWP

Signed for and on behalf of the Berwickshire Civic Society.

Brian Payne

PLANNING CONSULTATION

To: Archaeology Officer

From: Development Management Date: 28th October 2021

Contact: Paul Duncan 2 01835 825558 Ref: 21/01690/FUL

PLANNING CONSULTATION

Your observations are requested on the under noted planning application. I shall be glad to have your reply not later than 18th November 2021. If further time will be required for a reply please let me know. If no extension of time is requested and no reply is received by 18th November 2021, it will be assumed that you have no observations and a decision may be taken on the application.

Please remember to e-mail the DCConsultees Mailbox when you have inserted your reply into Idox.

Name of Applicant: Mr and Mrs Craig Fletcher

Agent: IRD Design Ltd

Nature of Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Site: 17 George Street Eyemouth Scottish Borders TD14 5HH



CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION

Comments provided	Officer Name and Post:	Contact e-mail/number:	
by	Keith Elliott	Keith.Elliott@scotborders.gov.uk	
	Archaeology Officer	01835 824 000 ext 8886	
	10.11.0001		
Date of reply	16.11.2021	Consultee reference:	
Planning Application	21/01690/FUL	Case Officer:	
Reference		Paul Duncan	
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Craig Fletcher		
Agent	IRD Design Ltd		
Proposed	Alterations and extension to dwelling	house	
Development			
Site Location	17 George Street Eyemouth Scottish	Borders TD14 5HH	
as they relate to the a	rea of expertise of that consultee. A tion of all relevant information, cons	e consultee on the submitted application decision on the application can only be ultations and material considerations.	
Background and Site description	This application is composed of two component parts relating to the existing house and garage of Number 17 George Street, Eyemouth. The house is located within the core of Eyemouth town, in the rabbit warren of streets and buildings between High Street and the coastline, and the town itself literally on the very northeastern edge of the Scottish Borders area. This archaeological consultation has been triggered by the application being located in the surrounding of entries recorded by the Scottish Borders Historic Environment Record (HER). These include the historic buildings of the area.		
Key Issues (Bullet points)	 Impact upon the known historic building Impact upon the potential archaeological features and deposits in the garage alterations Location of the development proposal Significance of the archaeological and historical features 		
Assessment	This application has been assessed against the Scottish Borders Historic Environment Record (HER) as the on-going record of all known archaeological and historic findspots, sites and landscapes across the area that are known, recorded and mapped. Currently there are over 23400 entries in the records so far, but this number is always increasing and with new information being added, at times to better, existing entries.		
	19th century date, when much the sar also shown. However the history of E Medieval period alone, but the exact the town (British Museum Cotton Mss reproduced (such as A Plan of Aymo 1557, in which year it was fortified by (bl.uk) and in Excavations in the fishing rows of houses laid roughly north to see the same alone when the same alone when the exact the period of the same alone when the same alone wh	on by the Ordnance Survey first edition of mid- me rabbit warren of irregular blocks and streets syemouth is much earlier than the Post- details remain unclear. The 1557 mapping of a Augustus I i 60) which has been widely auth, or Eyemouth, [Berwickshire] taken in Henri Clutin, Sieur d'Oysell et de Ville Parisis and town of Eyemouth 1982-1984) shows two south for the town west of the sand dune. This definitively in this area of the town, though it is	

more schematic for the town as the main concentration of the map maker towards the artillery fortifications on the headland, the strategically important harbour and bay.

This artistic licence can also be demonstrated by the 1982 to 1984 excavations as false that located to the immediate east of where the Eyemouth Museum is now within the old church to the southeast of George Street. This revealed that patchy waterlogged pools within the original sand dunes of the area had been infilled, with resulting well-preserved archaeological finds of note. Further, the documentary record for the town goes as far back as between 1151 and 1188, though there may be archaeological remains earlier than this again given the prominence of the local Coldingham Priory and number of earlier settlements again.

The origins of towns and backland use of plots are targets of the Scottish Archaeological Research Framework (ScARF) as both little known, and the results from Eyemouth unclear. However, even the smallest area of work may usefully add to the sum total of knowledge and the range of finds rich in the waterlogged hollows.

Assessment

This application has the potential to reveal something of the history of the Medieval town through the groundworks associated with the replacement extension to where the utility and store outbuilding located. It would be recommended that an archaeological watching brief be maintained during the groundworks for the foundation trenches to observe and record the presence of any archaeological remains in the area. This is the lowest level of archaeological conditions that may can be conditioned and rather than the archaeologists choosing the work, it is the recording within the scope of the groundworks should the application be consented.

Whilst it is neither recorded in the HER or as a Listed Building, it is possible that this house may be earlier than the mid-19th century. The house appears squeezed in to the surrounding area as the main street frontage does not align with neighbouring properties and the shape of the building irregular. This has the appearance of being a pair of neighbouring properties converted into one.

The interior of the building is comprehensively altered in what is proposed in this this application should it be consented. It would be recommended that a historic building condition be carried out for the recording of the building, though the level of this is unclear.

Conclusions

Therefore two archaeological conditions are recommended in line with the determination of this application with possible effects upon the potential archaeological remains of the area, as well as more definitely upon the historic building. An archaeological watching brief condition is required for the groundworks associated with the extension, whilst a historic building recording condition is required for the works in in the interior of the house.

These are recommended in line with Scottish Planning Policy and the identification of a local or regional importance likely of the archaeological remains and historic building in line with the Scottish Borders Council Local Development Plan.

It would be recommended that the applicants be passed both my recommendations should both conditions be applied to any consented development. This would allow for the combination of any archaeological remains with the evidence provided by

	the standing building. The level of the historic building recording condition should be carried out with reference to the ALGAO Scotland <i>Historic Building Recording</i>			
	Guidance.			
Recommendation	Object	☐ Do not object	□ Do not object, subject to conditions	Further information required
Recommended Conditions	ARCH01 Ar	chaeology: Develo		Brief
	No development shall take place until the applicant has secured a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation outlining a Watching Brief. This will be formulated by a contracted archaeologist and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Access should be afforded to allow investigation by a contracted archaeologist(s) nominated by the developer and agreed to by the Planning Authority. The developer shall allow the archaeologist(s) to observe relevant below ground excavation during development, investigate and record features of interest and recover finds and samples if necessary. Results will be submitted to the Planning Authority for review in the form of a Data Structure Report. If significant archaeology is discovered below ground excavation should cease pending further consultation with the Planning Authority. The developer will ensure that any significant data and finds undergo post-excavation analysis, the results of which will be submitted to the Planning Authority Reason: The site is within an area where ground works may interfere with, or result in the destruction of, archaeological remains, and it is therefore desirable to afford a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site. ARCH03 Archaeology: Developer Funded Historic Building Survey No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work (which may include excavation) in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation outlining a Historic Building Survey which has been formulated by, or on behalf of, the applicant and submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Access should be afforded to allow archaeological investigation, at all reasonable times, by a person or persons nominated by the developer and agreed to by the Planning Authority. Results will be submitted to the Planning Authority for review in the form of a Historic Building Survey Report.			
Recommended Informatives		Scotland Historic Bui	Iding Recording Guida dance 2013.pdf.	nce can be found at;

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION



Comments provided by	SR		
comments provided by	Heritage & Design Officer		
	The manage of a soliding of the solid		
Date of reply	02/12/2021		
Planning Application	21/01690/FUL	Case Officer: PD	
Reference	,,		
Proposed Development	Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse		
Site Location	17 George Street, Eyemouth, TD14 5HH		
relate to the area of experti	se of that consultee and on the basis o	ee on the submitted application as they f the information provided. A decision on the formation, consultations and material	
Background and Site description	The building is within the Eyemouth Conservation Area. It is situated in the historic core of the town. Due to the irregular alignment of buildings and routes in the area, it terminates views along George Street, St Ella's Wynd and Tod's Court, whilst also being visible from George Square and the seafront. It is therefore a relatively prominent building. The area around Tod's Court in particular retains much historic integrity. Other elements of the surrounding streets are altered, but still retain their traditional character. The layout of streets and buildings, their traditional form and appearance contribute to the area. Although altered, 17 George Street retains its traditional character, form, materials and detailing. To Tod's Court it presents a relatively solid elevation and is lower in height than neighbours. It therefore appears as a secondary form and subservient/ancillary to surrounding houses in views from the streetfront and Court. A number of the surrounding buildings are listed at Category C, adding to the sensitivity of the area.		
Principal Issues (not exhaustive)	The principal legislative and policy considerations from a heritage perspective in this case are;		
	 (Scotland) Act 1997 requires "special attention shall be possible enhancing the character or of a conservation area in fulfilli One of the key outcomes for enhance our natural and cull use (Outcome 3, SPP). The siting and design of development (paragraph 143, SPP) The Council will support development 	the planning system is to help protect and tural assets, and facilitating their sustainable elopment should take account of all aspects of	

Conservation Area which are located and designed to preserve or

Assessment	enhance the special architectural or historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This should accord with the scale, proportions, alignment, density, materials, and boundary treatment of nearby buildings, open spaces, vistas, gardens and landscapes (Policy EP9). Therefore, the principal consideration(s) from a heritage perspective from this case are; • Whether the proposed works would preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area The proposed alterations and extension are not informed by, nor respond to, the historic character of the conservation area nor the traditional form and detailing of the building forming part of the conservation area. To the north elevation, the proposed balcony and glazed barrier are not traditional features of the conservation area. The dormer window is not traditionally proportioned. These features and the associated storage are located on a prominent elevation visible from the seafront and in relation to Tod's Court which retains much historic integrity. The building forms a secondary / ancillary 'backdrop' at present. The proposed alterations would present incongruous additions that are out of keeping with the conservation area and which would draw undue attention to the building. To the south, the proposed extension is very large and would have a considerable impact on the streetscene. It significantly increases the overall scale and prominence of the building, particularly as it rises near to ridge height. The design of the west elevation is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area, particularly due to the lean-to roof and up-and-over garage at ground floor and the proportions of the proposed windows. Upvc is generally not characteristic			
	of the conservation area although it is acknowledged the existing are upvc. For the reasons above, the submitted proposal is not supported.			
Recommendation	⊠ Object	□Do not object	☐Do not object, subject to conditions	☐ Further information required
Recommended Conditions			<u> </u>	•
Recommended Informatives				



CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION

Comments provided by	Roads Planni	ng Service	Contact e-mail/n	umber:
Officer Name and	Keith Patterson kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk		borders.gov.uk	
Post:	Roads Planning Officer 01835 826637			
Date of reply	19 th November 2021 Consultee reference		nce:	
Planning Application Reference	21/01690/FUI	L	Case Officer: Paul Duncan	
Applicant	Mr and Mrs C	raig Fletcher		
Agent	IRD Design Ltd			
Proposed		nd extension to dwell	inghouse	
Development	The father and extension to awaring house			
Site Location	17 George Street Eyemouth Scottish Borders TD14 5HH			
The following observa as they relate to the ar made after considerate	ea of expertis	se of that consultee	. A decision on the ap	plication can only be
Background and Site description				
Key Issues (Bullet points)				
Assessment	I have concerns regarding this proposal. The area in front of the existing store would appear to offer the possibility for a vehicle to park. The proposed extension and garage would remove this possibility. As we no longer consider garages to be parking spaces, I have to object to the proposal on the grounds of loss of parking.			
Recommendation	⊠ Object	☐ Do not object	☐ Do not object, subject to conditions	Further information required
Reason for refusal				

AJS