

**SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL**

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

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

**REF:** 22/01124/LBC

**APPLICANT:** Mr W Hannah

**AGENT:** Richard Amos LTD

**DEVELOPMENT:** Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

**LOCATION:** Dove Cottage Gate Lodge Press Castle  
Coldingham  
Eyemouth  
Scottish Borders  
TD14 5TS

**TYPE:** LBC Application

**REASON FOR DELAY:**

---

**DRAWING NUMBERS:**

<b>Plan Ref</b>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Plan Status</b>
22-B943-PL01 A-	Location Plan	Refused
22-B943-PL03 REV A	Proposed Plans & Elevations	Refused

**NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 1**  
**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

One member of the public wrote in support of both the planning and listed building consent applications. The full representations can be found on Public Access.

**CONSULTATIONS**

SBC Archaeology: No archaeological finds, features and/or deposits have been recorded in this area of Coldingham parish, and apart from the historic buildings clustered around Press Castle - in reality more country house than military castle - there is little in the immediate area of this application. The few archaeological sites that are more generally recorded to the area are unlikely to have been situated in this immediate area.

It is thought that there would be a low potential for any archaeological finds, features and/or deposits to be encountered, though the area of groundworks is comparatively large compared with the size of the existing lodge. The extension is to be constructed on the opposing side of the lodge to the entrance gateway, with little visible of the new extension if constructed. No features of archaeological note in the submitted photographs which show the area proposed for the extension to the northwest of the existing lodge building.

Therefore there are no archaeological conditions, informatives or recommendations to make upon this application.

SBC Built Heritage (1st response): The building in question is a Category C listed building of special architectural and historic interest as a representative example of an early 19th century gate lodge. It is

the gate lodge to Press Castle, which is category B listed and forms part of a B group with the Castle, Dovecote and Walled Garden. It forms part of the setting of these listed buildings, and of the locally identified designed landscape.

The relationship between the lodge building, adjacent gate piers/wall and the driveway is important to understanding its original purpose. The relationship between the lodge and Press Castle including their relative scales is also significant.

It is noted the area previously incorporated trees, and is shown as such on historic maps. This contributed to the character of the site and approach to Press Castle.

The existing gate lodge has been substantially extended previously (04/ 01640/FUL), leading to the footprint being almost double its original. This extension is located to the rear, so enables the relationship of the lodge, gate and driveway to remain. It however does extend to the full width of the rear elevation, obscuring the full rear elevation, significantly altering the original roof form and resulting in a significantly larger massing and altered form. The materials and design are intended to reflect the original, although the rhythm of openings and window detailing limits its success.

The proposed extension has a considerable footprint which is excessive relative to the scale of the original building. The impact of the extension is exacerbated by the presence of the existing extension.

Although it is acknowledged the height has been limited to reduce the impact on the lodge building, the large scale of the extension is still evident. It will still be apparent on the driveway and likely over the wall from the adjacent wall. The flat roof form relates poorly to the remainder of the building.

The proposed extension takes a very different approach to that of the existing extension. Modern forms and materials are proposed to ensure it remains legible as a modern extension. Whilst a clearly modern approach could be appropriate, the extension should still respond to the listed building. Such a response is not apparent in the proposed. The design is of limited quality with poorly proportioned elevations and openings. The flat green roof will have limited visibility itself but will likely leave to a deep eaves detail unless carefully detailed.

The legibility of applying a clearly modern approach is reduced by the presence of the existing extension which has taken a more traditional approach and results in an awkward and unclear relationship between old and new. The use of a link section in particular relates poorly to the existing extension as such a device is expected to link old and new.

Information on materials and detailing is limited but does not demonstrate sufficient quality for an extension of this scale in the location. A block base course and upvc are inappropriate materials. No associated planting is indicated which may soften the impact of an extension or provide a response to the historic character of the site.

SBC Built Heritage (2nd response following submission of amended plans): Whilst omission of Bedroom 4 does reduce the proposed footprint, the scale of extension to the original building nevertheless remains excessive. The reduction and amendment to window openings does not address concerns raised in my previous comments regarding the form and design of the extension. These continue to relate poorly to the architecture of the listed building.

It is noted that some justification has been provided that the proposed would be largely screened in views from the road due to the presence of the listed wall and a fence. It is understood that the planning status of the fence is unclear. The lodge's relationship with the road, walls, gates and driveway are important and the visibility of the proposed extension from these locations is therefore also an important consideration. Views from the road are however only one aspect of how the proposal would impact the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, including how the extension is viewed and experienced from elsewhere on the site, its impact on the primacy and integrity of the listed lodge and how the design responds to the architecture of the existing.

Given the extent by which the listed building has already been extended, it is considered difficult for further extension to be achieved successfully on this site and it is therefore not possible to provide suggested amendments to enable a more successful outcome.

SBC Roads Planning Service: Whilst I have no objections to the principle of this development, it would appear that the development will remove some of the available parking space within the site leaving room for only one vehicle which is less than we would normally accept. However, it would appear from the site photos that the existing parking area could be widened to allow for two vehicles.

Therefore, in order for me to fully consider this application, I require a drawing showing that two vehicles can be parked within the curtilage of the site.

AHSS: Object. The AHSS Forth and Borders Cases Panel has examined the proposal for a large extension to Category C listed Gate Lodge at Press Castle, a building known now as Dove Cottage, and we object.

Dove Cottage is a good example of a traditional gate lodge dating to the early C19, a building type characterised by modest scale and where much meaning is derived the lodge's position in relation to a larger dwelling (in this case Category B listed Press Castle), rather than in its architectural complexity or grandeur. In this sense, a gate lodge usually stands as a subservient signpost and as part of a broader architectural arrangement, and Dove Cottage is no exception.

The applicant acknowledges that Dove Cottage was extended heavily approximately ten years ago, effectively doubling the plan form of the C19 dwelling. This phase elongated the form of the modest gate lodge, causing harm to its special interest at the time. The applicant now proposes a further extension that will double the plan form of the whole (including the C21 extension), completely transforming its nature and scale. Using a link structure containing a boot room and new entrance, the applicant proposes to relocate the primary entrance to the dwelling's north-east elevation, with parking accommodated there. The affect will be to totally re-orientate the primary elevation of the house to the north-east, presenting an arrangement that is wholly unsympathetic to the scale and form of the historic building.

Internally, the removal of historic fabric from the oldest phase of the building is also excessive; a slapping has already been formed to the rear of the dining room and opening this further would see the unnecessary removal of early C19 fabric from this original rear wall.

The proposed materials lack the appropriate quality for use on an extension to a listed building. uPVC is not appropriate on both aesthetic and sustainability grounds, and thus the proposed rainwater goods are not suitable. Whilst no specification is provided for the doors and windows, uPVC would also be objectionable in this case. We accept that uPVC units have at some point been fitted to the original window openings; this is regrettable and should be reinstated in timber when those windows reach the end of their service.

The proposals unfortunately lack appropriate sympathy and will completely overwhelm the historic structure. We therefore object to the application and recommend that Listed Building Consent be refused.

Berwickshire Civic Society: Objects. Notes that this application relates to a category C listed residential building within the remnants of a planned landscape set about a category B listed building. The Press Castle estate has suffered a degree of creeping suburbanisation over many years. A completely rural location has been developed piecemeal under multiple ownership, with no coherent planning policy being imposed. To all intents and purposes, an informal hamlet now exists, without having had the benefit of infrastructure improvements associated with a planned community. This development continues that trend, if permitted.

The justification for the expansion is that the owners seemingly wish to convert a holiday home into a permanent dwelling and feel able to do so because they now have the space as a result of considerable tree losses after Storm Arwen. They propose to build an extension of a considerable size. The design of the extension has very little architectural merit, and it will be very clearly visible from the neighbouring public road. There has been some consideration of measures to reduce visible impact of the extension, but that will not disguise a substantial building completely at odds with the design of the listed building. This building was listed as a Gate Lodge for a reason, and that is the context of its purpose in relation to the principle building of the old estate. This proposal damages the

purpose of the listing. SBC has an erratic record in the protection of listed buildings and this proposal if granted would not assist that perception. The Society's position is opposed therefore.

Community Council: No response.

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:**

Local Development Plan 2016:

PMD1: Sustainability  
PMD2: Quality Standards  
HD3: Protection of Residential Amenity  
EP7: Listed Buildings  
EP8: Archaeology  
EP10: Gardens and Designed Landscapes  
EP13: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows  
IS7: Parking Provision and Standards

Other Considerations:

Privacy and Amenity Supplementary Planning Guidance 2006  
Placemaking and Design Supplementary Planning Guidance 2010  
HES: Managing Change in the Historic Environment  
Scottish Planning Policy 2014  
SBC Survey of Gardens and Designed Landscapes 2008

**Recommendation by** - Paul Duncan (Assistant Planning Officer) on 27th October 2022

### Site Description

Dove Cottage is a Category C listed gate lodge located in a rural location west of Coldingham, at the main gates to Press Castle. Its setting is characterised by the quadrant walls, gatepiers and gates of Press Castle, all of which are listed together at Category B.

The gate lodge is single storey, with an overhanging hipped roof. A large rear extension was built around ten or more years ago, also single storey and hipped. The gate lodge is harled, painted white with sandstone dressings. It fronts the long, winding access to Press Castle, which also serves other dwellings including numerous timber lodges. Press Castle itself more closely resembles a country house and is subdivided into flats.

Both Dove Cottage and Press Castle lie within the SBC designated Press Castle Designed Landscape.

### Planning History

Planning history at Dove Cottage can be summarised as follows:

03/01009/LBC - Installation of multi fuel burner and flue - Approved 2003  
03/01010/FUL - Installation of flue - Approved 2003  
04/01639/LBC - Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse - Approved 2005 and built around ten years ago  
04/01640/FUL - Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse - Approved 2005 and built around ten years ago  
17/01364/FUL - Installation of air source heat pump - Approved 2017 and now in place

### Proposed Development

This joint report relates to applications for planning permission and listed building consent to further extend Dove Cottage. The extension would be single storey and located to the rear. It would comprise two distinct flat-roofed sections: a short link off the existing hipped extension that was built around ten years ago; and a larger square footprint section that would be built off the link, and would accommodate a living room and en-

suite bedroom. The former would serve as a new entrance and would be zinc clad with large glazed side windows. The latter would be timber clad with a sedum roof.

It should be noted that the above described proposals were submitted for determination as revisions to the original scheme. The original proposals featuring a fourth bedroom were superseded and it is the revised proposals which require to be assessed.

#### Supporting Information

- Heritage and Design Statement;
- Sample material document.

#### Assessment

- Principle

Information online indicates the dwelling may have been used in part or whole as holiday accommodation in recent years. There is no suggestion in the applications that the proposed extension would be used for such purposes. It is assumed that the development is for ancillary residential use, and there are no policy principle concerns arising from this.

- Listed Building Impacts

The key consideration is the proposed development's impact on the character and appearance of the C listed building. Impacts to the setting of other listed assets, including the B listed Press Castle and its gated entrance, also require consideration. Due to the siting of the gate lodge at the entrance to Press Castle's former grounds, and its numerous flats and dwellinghouses, the proposed development would have a significant number of public visual receptors. Notwithstanding public visibility, the development must conserve, protect and enhance the character, integrity and setting of the listed building to satisfy Local Development Plan policy EP7 (Listed Buildings).

The submitted Heritage and Design Statement acknowledges that Dove Cottage increased significantly in footprint around a decade ago (planning references 04/01640/FUL and 04/01639/LBC). It describes that development as nearly doubling its size. The proposed development would be larger again, significantly greater in footprint than the original dwellinghouse. In combination with the previous extension, the footprint of the resulting dwellinghouse would be over three times that of the original dwellinghouse.

In their objection, the Architectural Heritage of Scotland Society (AHSS) noted that gate lodges are characterised by modest scale, acting as a subservient signpost as part of a broader architectural arrangement. It is agreed that scale, as well as siting, are key to the character of most gate lodges. Even following revisions, the scale of extension proposed here is considered to be wholly excessive, and would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the listed building. This view is shared by the Council's Built Heritage Officer, who objects to the proposals.

In form, the rationale for a flat roof is understood. This keeps the height of the building low but does relate poorly to both the original dwelling and its later extension, which are both hipped. Given the proposed extension's excessive footprint, simply keeping the roof low is insufficient to achieve a subservient design. As the Council's Built Heritage Officer identifies, the flat roof would instead produce a confusing assembly of traditional and contemporary style extensions, muddying the relationship between old and new. Whereas the link section should more appropriately sit between the two, instead it would link a recent traditional extension with a new contemporary extension.

A further concern raised by the AHSS is the new entrance, which they consider would re-orientate the primary elevation of the house to the north-east. Given the importance of the relationship of a gate lodge to an access, there is some sympathy with this view, though it should be noted that the gate lodge's existing frontage would remain unaltered. Detailed design features such as the square shaped windows on the north-east elevation of the extension would also lack sympathy for the listed building, relating particularly poorly to the original gate lodge. The objection from the Berwickshire Civic Society expressed further concerns in terms of design merit.

The application agent has referred to the screening effect of a timber fence within the curtilage of Dove Cottage that is visible from the public road. The fence appears to be relatively new. Planning permission would have been required for its erection. There is no record of any such permission. The application agent was asked to clarify when the fence was erected, but at the time of writing no response has been received. It is unclear whether the fence may remain in place. In any event, views from the public road are far from being a key consideration, and not one that would determine the outcome of this assessment.

Finally, the gate lodge contributes to the setting of Press Castle and its listed walls and gates. The harmful effect of the development to the character and appearance of the gate lodge would in turn be harmful to the setting of these other listed assets, though this is very much a lesser concern.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed development would not respect the original structure due to its excessive scale and poorly related design. The proposed development would not maintain the special architectural or historic quality of the building and is therefore contrary to LDP policy EP7 (Listed Buildings).

- Designed Landscape Impacts

The proposed site is located within the locally (Council) identified Press Castle Designed Landscape (DL). It is not identified within the national Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscape. The character of the DL has eroded somewhat over time for various reasons. The development would harm the character of the DL but this impact is not considered sufficient grounds for refusal.

- Archaeology

The Archaeology Officer was consulted and identified little of archaeological interest. The requirements of LDP policy EP8 (Archaeology) are considered to be satisfied.

- Residential Amenity

Dove Cottage is distant from any neighbouring dwellinghouses. There are no significant residential amenity concerns.

- Vehicular Access, Road Safety and Parking

The Roads Planning Service raised concern at parking provision shown on the proposed site plan. This drawing showed a red line around the land owned by the applicant on the west side of the access to Press Castle however it is understood that the applicant's land ownership extends to the far side of the access. Parking at the property does not appear to be an issue.

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

The proposed development is contrary to Local Development Plan 2016 policy EP7 (Listed Buildings) as it would not respect the original structure due to its excessive scale and poorly related design. The proposed development would not maintain the special architectural or historic quality of the building and would have a significant adverse impact on its special character and appearance.

**Recommendation:** Refused

- 1 The proposed development is contrary to Local Development Plan 2016 policy EP7 (Listed Buildings) as it would not respect the original structure due to its excessive scale and poorly related design. The proposed development would not maintain the special architectural or historic quality of the building and would have a significant adverse impact on its special character and appearance.

**“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.**