

F&B Cases Panel <fbcasework@ahss.org.uk>

Thank you for your consultation on this application. The members of the AHSS Forth & Borders Cases Panel have examined the application, and do not wish to comment on this proposal.

Kind regards,

James Seabridge-Cooper, Convenor
on behalf of the Forth & Borders Cases Panel





BERWICKSHIRE CIVIC SOCIETY

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR OBSERVATIONS ON PLANNING

Application Ref: 22/00371/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

Redhall Steading



PLANNING CONSULTATION

To: Archaeology Officer

From: Development Management

Date: 9th March 2022

Contact: Paul Duncan ☎ 01835 825558

Ref: 22/00371/FUL

PLANNING CONSULTATION

Your observations are requested on the under noted planning application. I shall be glad to have your reply not later than 30th March 2022. 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 30th March 2022, 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 by	Officer Name and Post: Keith Elliott Archaeology Officer	Contact e-mail/number: Keith.Elliott@scotborders.gov.uk 01835 824 000 ext 8886
Date of reply	17.03.2022	Consultee reference:
Planning Application Reference	22/00371/FUL	Case Officer: Paul Duncan
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Craig Fletcher	
Agent	IRD Design Ltd	
Proposed Development	Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse	
Site Location	17 George Street Eyemouth Scottish Borders TD14 5HH	
<p><i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></p>		
Background and Site description	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This follows on from a previous application (21/01690/FUL) that the Scottish Borders Council Archaeology Service was consulted upon last year. In essence for that below, there are no changes for the earlier conditions that were proposed recommended earlier.</p>	
Key Issues (Bullet points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Background to the site

The house and outbuildings are shown by the Ordnance Survey first edition of mid-19th century date, when much the same rabbit warren of irregular blocks and streets also shown. However the history of Eyemouth is much earlier than the Post-Medieval period alone, but the exact details remain unclear. The 1557 mapping of the town (British Museum Cotton Mss Augustus I i 60) which has been widely reproduced (such as [A Plan of Aymouth, or Eyemouth, \[Berwickshire\] taken in 1557, in which year it was fortified by Henri Clutin, Sieur d'Oysell et de Ville Parisis \(bl.uk\)](#) and in *Excavations in the fishing town of Eyemouth 1982-1984*) shows two rows of houses laid roughly north to south for the town west of the sand dune. This map shows nothing that can be said 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 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

	<p>building condition be carried out for the recording of the building, though the level of this is unclear.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Guidance</i>.</p>			
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
Recommended Conditions	<p>ARCH01 Archaeology: Developer Funded Watching Brief</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>ARCH03 Archaeology: Developer Funded Historic Building Survey</p> <p>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</p>			

	Survey Report. Reason: To preserve by record a building of historical interest.
Recommended Informatives	The ALGAO Scotland Historic Building Recording Guidance can be found at; ALGAO Scotland Buildings Guidance 2013.pdf .

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION



Comments provided by	SR Heritage & Design Officer	
Date of reply	11/04/2022	
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 on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee and on the basis of the information provided. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></p>		
Background and Site description	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A number of the surrounding buildings are listed at Category C, adding to the sensitivity of the area.</p>	
Principal Issues (not exhaustive)	<p>The principal legislative and policy considerations from a heritage perspective in this case are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that local planning authorities ensure that, "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of any buildings or other land in a conservation area in fulfilling its planning functions. • One of the key outcomes for the planning system is to help protect and enhance our natural and cultural assets, and facilitating their sustainable use (Outcome 3, SPP). • The siting and design of development should take account of all aspects of the historic environment (paragraph 140, SPP) • Proposal for development within conservation areas and proposals outwith which will impact on its appearance, character or setting, should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (paragraph 143, SPP) • The Council will support development proposals within or adjacent to a Conservation Area which are located and designed to preserve or 	

	<p>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).</p> <p>Therefore, the principal consideration(s) from a heritage perspective from this case are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the proposed works would preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area 			
Assessment	<p>The application follows a previous application for similar, which was withdrawn.</p> <p>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. The design statement should include analysis of the character of the conservation area and be used to inform the proposals.</p> <p>To the north elevation, the proposed large bifold doors and glazed barrier/Juliet balcony are not traditional features of the conservation area. The dormer window is not traditionally proportioned. These features 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. A traditional sized and detailed dormer and one or two small window openings could be supported on this elevation, but not openings of the scale and design proposed. The elevation should remain secondary to Tod's Court.</p> <p>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. Eaves height has been reduced to the left side of the proposed extension (relative to the previous withdrawn application), but only by increasing the width of the extension. This has increased the scale and massing of the proposed extension and results in an asymmetric gable. The scale and particularly ridge height of the extension should be significantly reduced.</p> <p>The design of the west elevation is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area, particularly due to the up-and-over garage at ground floor, the proportions of the elevation, and the inclusion of dormers and rooflights within the same roof plane. Although a feature of the main building, the dormers add further prominence and bulk to the extension. Upvc is generally not characteristic of the conservation area although it is acknowledged the existing are upvc.</p> <p>For the reasons above, the submitted proposal is not supported in its current form.</p>			
Recommendation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required

Recommended Conditions	
Recommended Informatives	

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

Comments provided by	Roads Planning Service	Contact e-mail/number:		
Officer Name and Post:	Keith Patterson Roads Planning Officer	kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk 01835 826637		
Date of reply	1 st April 2022	Consultee reference:		
Planning Application Reference	22/00371/FUL	Case Officer: Paul Duncan		
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Craig Fletcher			
Agent	IRD Design Ltd			
Proposed Development	Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse			
Site Location	17 George Street Eyemouth Scottish Borders TD14 5HH			
<i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i>				
Background and Site description	A previous application, 21/01690/FUL, for extension to the property was subsequently withdrawn.			
Key Issues (Bullet points)				
Assessment	I had previously objected to a proposal similar to this on the grounds that it would apparently remove an existing parking space. A subsequent visit to the site has confirmed that the area is not sufficient to park a vehicle off street and as such there would be no loss of parking caused by this proposal. I shall therefore not object to this application.			
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
Recommended Conditions				
Recommended Informatives				

AJS

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION



Comments provided by	SR Heritage & Design Officer	
Date of reply	22/06/2022	
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 on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee and on the basis of the information provided. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></p>		
Background and Site description	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A number of the surrounding buildings are listed at Category C, adding to the sensitivity of the area.</p>	
Principal Issues (not exhaustive)	<p>The principal legislative and policy considerations from a heritage perspective in this case are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that local planning authorities ensure that, "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of any buildings or other land in a conservation area in fulfilling its planning functions. • One of the key outcomes for the planning system is to help protect and enhance our natural and cultural assets, and facilitating their sustainable use (Outcome 3, SPP). • The siting and design of development should take account of all aspects of the historic environment (paragraph 140, SPP) • Proposal for development within conservation areas and proposals outwith which will impact on its appearance, character or setting, should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (paragraph 143, SPP) • The Council will support development proposals within or adjacent to a Conservation Area which are located and designed to preserve or 	

	<p>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).</p> <p>Therefore, the principal consideration(s) from a heritage perspective from this case are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the proposed works would preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area 			
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>These comments are made in relation to amended plans.</p> <p>No further analysis has been provided of the analysis of the character of the conservation area and the designs continue to respond to the historic character of the conservation area and the traditional form and detailing of the building forming part of the conservation area to a limited extent.</p> <p>To the north elevation, removal of the box dormer and replacement with two more traditionally detailed dormers is an improvement, although the alignment of the dormers sit slightly uncomfortably within the overall roofscape. The bifold doors and Juliet balcony are not traditional features of the conservation area although are an improvement from the previous withdrawn proposal.</p> <p>To the south, the proposed extension has been reduced in width and height from previous which is an improvement but remains a very large extension to what is effectively the principal elevation of the building. It retains a somewhat suburban character to its detailing and proportions (particularly the west elevation) which is at odds with the conservation area, the main building and that of the building it replaces. Its location at the terminus of views along a number of streets considerably increases its relative impact on this part of the conservation area, compounding the issues raised above.</p>			
<p>Recommendation</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
<p>Recommended Conditions</p>				
<p>Recommended Informatives</p>				