

**SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL**

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

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

**REF :** 15/01034/FUL

**APPLICANT :** Mrs Patricia Crippin

**AGENT :** Ericht Planning & Property Consultants

**DEVELOPMENT :** Erection of dwellinghouse

**LOCATION:** Land West Of Craigerne Coachhouse  
Ederston Road  
Peebles  
Scottish Borders

**TYPE :** FUL Application

**REASON FOR DELAY:**

---

**DRAWING NUMBERS:**

<b>Plan Ref</b>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Plan Status</b>
PLANNING SUPPORTING STATEMENT		Report Refused
SITE PHOTOGRAPHS Photos		Refused
2014/12/104	Elevations	Refused
2014/12/102A	Site Plan	Refused
2014/12/103	Floor Plans	Refused
2014/12/101	Location Plan	Refused

**NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0**

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

Roads Planning:

There is satisfactory space for the parking of 2 vehicles and turning within the curtilage of the site. The site is served by a single track road however there are several passing opportunities. Overall I have no objections to the above proposal provided the following conditions are adhered to :-

1. Parking for a minimum of two vehicles, excluding any garages, must be provided within the curtilage of the property prior to occupation and be retained thereafter in perpetuity.
2. A contribution of £1000 will be required for the development as per the Scottish Borders Local Plan revised Development contributions 2011.
3. No access, either pedestrian or vehicular, is to be taken directly off Ederston Road.

Landscape Architect: Response awaited.

Archaeology Officer: No implications.

Director of Education and Lifelong Learning:

Primary School Contributions

£9823

High School Contributions

£1383

Total = £11206

Rolls over 90% place strain on the school's teaching provision, infrastructure and facilities and reduce flexibility in timetabling, potentially negatively effecting quality standards within the school environment. Contributions are sought to raise capital to extend or improve schools, or where deemed necessary to provide new schools, in order to ensure that over-capacity issues are managed and no reduction in standards is attributed to this within the Borders Area.

This contribution should be paid upon receipt of detailed planning consent but may be phased subject to an agreed schedule.

Please note that the level of contributions for all developments will be reviewed at the end of March each year and may be changed to reflect changes in the BCIS index – therefore we reserve the right to vary the level of the contribution if the contribution detailed above is not paid before 1 April 2016.

Environmental Health:

Amenity and Pollution

Assessment of Application

Nuisance

This is an application for planning permission in principle for a new house.

It is proposed to utilise a solid fuel stove within the premises.

These can cause smoke and odour problems if not properly installed and maintained.

Recommendation

Delete as appropriate – Agree with application in principle, subject to Informative.

Informative

Solid Fuel Stove

These installations can cause smoke and odour complaints and any Building and Planning Consents for the installation do not indemnify the applicant in respect of Nuisance action. In the event of nuisance action being taken there is no guarantee that remedial work will be granted building/planning permission.

Accordingly this advice can assist you to avoid future problems.

The location of the flue should take into account other properties that may be downwind.

The discharge point for the flue should be located as high as possible to allow for maximum dispersion of the flue gasses.

The flue should be terminated with a cap that encourages a high gas efflux velocity.

The flue and appliance should be checked and serviced at regular intervals to ensure that they continue to operate efficiently and cleanly.

The appliance should only burn fuel of a type and grade that is recommended by the manufacturer.

If you live in a Smoke Control Area you must only use an Exempt Appliance <http://smokecontrol.defra.gov.uk/appliances.php?country=s> and the fuel that is Approved for use in it <http://smokecontrol.defra.gov.uk/fuels.php?country=s> .

In wood burning stoves you should only burn dry, seasoned timber. Guidance is available on - [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/eng-woodfuel-woodasfuelguide.pdf/\\$FILE/eng-woodfuel-woodasfuelguide.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/eng-woodfuel-woodasfuelguide.pdf/$FILE/eng-woodfuel-woodasfuelguide.pdf)

Treated timber, waste wood, manufactured timber and laminates etc. should not be used as fuel.

Paper and kindling can be used for lighting, but purpose made firelighters can cause fewer odour problems.

Scottish Water: Response awaited.

Peebles and District Community Council: Response awaited.

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:**

Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan 2011

Policy G1 Quality Standards for New Development  
Policy G5 Developer Contributions  
Policy G7 Infill Development  
Policy NE4 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows  
Policy H2 Protection of Residential Amenity  
Policy Inf4 Parking Provisions and Standards  
Policy Inf5 Waste Water Treatment Standards

"Development Contributions" SPG

"Trees and Development" SPG

### **Recommendation by** - Craig Miller (Lead Planning Officer) on 26th October 2015

Craigerne Coach House was previously a Category B Listed Building when extensions were consented to it to create an additional five dwellinghouses. This involved a new wing to the west towards Edderston Road and a reconfigured and enlarged wing to the east. The design was carefully negotiated during processing of the application to ensure that the character of the listed building and its landscaped, former parkland, setting were preserved. However, that development proceeded in an unauthorised manner with numerous changes which necessitated new applications for listed building and planning consent. Subject to conditions, consents were granted to rectify some of the less appropriate changes. A new application has now been submitted to attempt to keep some of the changes which were sought to be rectified by condition.

Before those conditions could be enforced, Craigerne Coach House was de-listed by Historic Environment Scotland for the reasons given by the agent in her Supporting Statement. Therefore, any assessment of this current application for a new house cannot take into account listings or the previous listed status of the house. Assessment must be based principally upon Local Plan Design, Infill and Tree Policies - G1, G7 and NE4. It is important to note that, although subsequent applications sought to create a cleared site without significant landscaping on the land between the proposed west wing and Edderston Road, no such approval has been granted for the final landscaping scheme on the overall site. Indeed, two TPO trees were removed within the site and an unauthorised retaining wall erected which is also the subject of this application.

The agent has submitted a Supporting Statement which gives the background to the site, justification for the application, reports on pre-app consultation and draws parallels with other recent infill developments. I have looked carefully at this Statement and the examples given elsewhere but do not believe that any of them can be considered direct comparisons which form a compelling case to allow this development. Despite Craigerne Coach House being delisted, the overall property, with extensions, would lie in attractive landscaped grounds whereby the amenity of the area is preserved by protected trees, walls, hedges and a general green apron and setting to the site. There is no doubt that these trees, hedges and walls form a strong positive characteristic of Edderston Road and the retention and protection of this setting was considered vital in the decisions to allow the enlargement and extension of the Coach House. Despite the western wing being allowed which would bring the built form nearer to the public road, it was felt that, with

retention and augmentation, the landscaped framework could enhance the attraction and amenity of the building despite its enlargement. Although there have been subsequent revisions and a delisting of the building, the landscaped framework is still considered essential to the success of the development and amenity of the area - and has never been finally consented through successive conditions and landscaping submissions.

Two trees were felled within and at the northern end of the site which have been agreed to be replaced. Five trees are shown on the plan at the northern end but it was also noted that services appear to run through this part of the site which also raises questions about the success and suitability of new planting in this area. Furthermore, only 6-7 metres space is given between the site boundary and the northern gable of the proposed house which is considered wholly inadequate for the replanting of appropriate tree replacements and their subsequent growth. The comments of the Landscape Architect on the revised application make it clear that the reservation of green apron and appropriately planted space with hedging and dry stone walling are essential to be retained in line with Local Plan Policy NE4 and the requirements of Policies G1 and G7.

Indeed, no matter what size, shape or height of house proposed on the site, the hardening of the space would be detrimental to the green setting of the enlarged Coach House, exacerbated by the intrusive retaining wall which has been formed along the length of the site and the circulation space required around the house. Although the wall and hedge are intended to be retained along the roadside, the face of the house will be no more than 3-4 metres from the hedging, its 15.5m length and 6-7m height dominating the boundary treatment and reducing the attraction and setting currently created by the wall and hedge. If the application is refused, then it is partially retrospective in relation to the retaining wall and this would need to be addressed in the overall discharge of the landscaping condition.

Although the agent has responded to these points and it is noted that the access and parking now occur to the rear without impact on the hedge and wall, the development removes the attractive green apron to the proposed Craigerne Coach House development from Edderston Road and provides both insufficient space for adequate replacement planting and creates a hard, congested and inappropriate setting. The final landscape treatment of this area has still to be agreed and should not be dictated by the achievement of a dwellinghouse on the ground.

The Landscape Architect opposes the proposal for the above reasons but also makes the point that due to the congested nature of the proposal and lack of garden ground around it, there would be increased pressure on the remaining and replacement TPO trees as a result, which will undermine the integrity and protection of the Tree Preservation Order.

Apart from the impacts on amenity, there are also issues of congestion and overdevelopment caused by the actual proposal on both the site and immediate surrounds itself and on the approved western wing of the Coach House development. Whilst the agent has sought to reference other plot ratios on modern developments elsewhere, none compare to this particular case where significant enlargement and development of Craigerne Coach House has already been allowed, partly on the basis of retention and augmentation of its landscaped and wooded grounds. To place a large house (over 200 square metres) on an intervening space of no more than 15m and within 5m of the new western gable of the Coach House would result in a congested and cramped visual relationship, to the detriment of the carefully design Coach House extension and the overall amenity of the area. The 5m separation between properties is further congested by the retaining wall, timber fencing and beech hedging. It is insufficient space without creating a strong impression of overdevelopment and congestion. Even if the house was proposed as a smaller single storey house, these impacts would still be considerable and considered inappropriate, the main restriction being the lack of depth of the site and the current house only being 6.5m deep - there is no further reduction possible in this respect.

The relationships of other existing houses to new houses referenced by the agent do not, in my opinion, create any compelling case for arguing that the relationship proposed at the application site is part of the general density or built fabric of the area. There is no accurate assessment of plot ratios on the other cases mentioned at Tintah Lodge or Craigmount and, in any case, both those cases involved retention of older houses to the site frontages where the relationship is already existing. The facts are that the relationship created by the proposal would represent overdevelopment and cramping both in terms of buildings to buildings and hard to soft buffer space and landscaping.

Impacts on residential amenity are not severe enough to warrant refusal of the application, the design of the proposed house limiting windows to the rear to ground floor level looking into the retaining wall. Three upper floor velux windows serve a bathroom and landing and there will be no significant detrimental impacts in this respect. In terms of the design of the house, however, there are improvements that could be made in terms of the fenestration which is dominantly horizontal in emphasis along the frontage. The dormers are oversized and the triple and quadruple window arrangements provide an inappropriate suburban form within the context of more vertical window patterns nearby and forming the character of the area. Had the application been acceptable in other respects, then there would have been further negotiation over the fenestration but, as it stands, the design represents a further reason to oppose the application, in line with Policies G1 and G7.

#### **REASON FOR DECISION :**

The application is contrary to Policies G1, G7 and NE4 of the Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan 2011 in that the proposed development will represent overdevelopment, and significant reduction, of an area of ground which is required for landscaped and wooded setting for the approved Craigerne Coach House development, resulting in an inappropriate congested appearance between the development and Edderston Road, providing insufficient space for new and replacement planting, undermining the retention of preserved trees and being out of character with the design of the Coach House development and the traditional houses in the area.

#### **Recommendation: Refused**

- 1 The application is contrary to Policies G1, G7 and NE4 of the Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan 2011 in that the proposed development would represent a cramped form of development, out of character with this part of Edderston Road. The proposed house would result in an overdevelopment and significant reduction, of an area of ground which is required for landscaped and wooded setting for the approved Craigerne Coach House development, resulting in an inappropriate congested appearance between the development and Edderston Road, providing insufficient space for new and replacement planting, undermining the retention of preserved trees and being out of character with the design of the Coach House development and the traditional houses in the area.

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



## Walling, Fiona

---

**From:** Miller, Craig  
**Sent:** 13 January 2016 14:53  
**To:** localreview  
**Subject:** RE: 15/01034/FUL

Fiona

I have none. I expect the agent may wish to argue that this single plot is a contribution towards the housing shortfall identified by the Reporter in the LDP – but I would simply argue back that other Policy breaches far outweigh the minimal benefit of the addition of one house towards the shortfall target,

Regards

Craig

Craig Miller MRTPI  
Lead Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Regulatory Services  
Scottish Borders Council

tel - 01835 825029 mobile - 07765 386404  
email - [cmiller@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:cmiller@scotborders.gov.uk)



Development.scot

The Scottish Government's on line portal for Planning applications is changing from January 2016

Make your Building Warrant applications on line from August 2016 using the Scottish Government's portal



Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary - SAVE PAPER

Find out more about Scottish Borders Council: [Web](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Flickr](#) | [YouTube](#)

---

**From:** Walling, Fiona **On Behalf Of** localreview  
**Sent:** 13 January 2016 14:40  
**To:** Miller, Craig  
**Subject:** 15/01034/FUL

Hi Craig

We have received a notice of review in connection with the above. Also attached is a copy of the acknowledgement sent to the agent today. This contains additional paragraphs asking for any representation on the review connected to the reporter's recommendations on the Local Development Plan.

If you have any comments to add about this application in respect of the LDP recommendations please could you let me have these by 29 January.

Thanks  
Fiona

*Fiona Walling*  
*Democratic Services Officer*  
*Scottish Borders Council*  
*Council Headquarters*  
*NEWTOWN ST BOSWELLS TD6 0SA*  
*Tel: 01835 826504 (Direct Line)*  
*Fax: 01835 825001 or e-mail [fwalling@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:fwalling@scotborders.gov.uk)*