

Ferguson Planning Ltd
38 Thistle Street
Edinburgh
EH2 1EL
E: georgia@fergusonplanning.co.uk
M: 07477864216

Fiona Henderson
Democratic Services
Council Headquarters
Newtown St Boswells TD6 0SA

20 July 2023

SBC Ref: 22/01905/FUL and 23/00031/RREF

RESPONSE TO FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES

Thank you for providing copies of the further representations from interested parties in response to the Notice of Review we submitted in respect of 22/01905/FUL.

We note that two further representations were made, both from neighbours of the subject site at Whiteburn. This letter is to respond to the matters raised therein, bearing in mind that the only reason given for the refusal of the planning application by SBC's Lead Planning Officer was due to their consideration that the proposed dwelling would not relate to the building group.

The further representations raised concerns which can be grouped into the areas as below:

- Boundary of Building Group
- Vehicle Access
- Servicing

1. Boundary of Building Group and Precedent

As set forth in the Appeal Statement submitted in support of the Notice of Review, it is our contention that the northern and western boundaries of the building group at Whiteburn are defined by the access track and planting/vegetation, respectively. Our contention that the existing building groups extends over the burn towards the west is further supported by the way in which the fields to the west of the subject site are used as ancillary to the land to the east of the subject site (occupied by 'The Roost'). As the proposed dwelling will sit within

GALASHIELS

Shiel House, 54 Island Street
Galashiels TD1 1NU
T: 01896 668 744

EDINBURGH

37 One George Street
Edinburgh EH2 2HN
T: 0131 385 8801

NORTHERN IRELAND

61 Moyle Road, Ballycastle, Co. Antrim,
Northern Ireland. BT54 6LG.
T: 02960 003 358

these natural, man-made and land-use boundaries of the Whiteburn building group, it will be in keeping with and enhance (through additional planting to the west of the site) the character, amenity and setting of the building group.

The existing boundary planting and the enhancement offered by the Appellant would also ensure that the western extent of the building group was clear. In any case, as each planning application must be judged on its own merits, the granting of a dwelling at the subject site does not, in itself, mean that further dwellings could be constructed to the west.

2. Servicing and Infrastructure

The proposed servicing of the development through on-site disposal of waste water is a common and widely practised approach, particularly in rural setting where reticulated infrastructure is not available.

The site is large enough for a soakaway field to be positioned so that no effluent will be discharged to the burn.

As stated in the Appeal Stated submitted in support of the Notice of Review, we agree with the approach of SBC's Lead Planning Officer that the specific details of the treatment/disposal systems are matters that are addressed through the Building Warrant process.

3. Transport and Access

We reiterate again that the bridge will not be used by heavy vehicles during the construction phase, or indeed occupation, of the proposed dwelling. The design of the proposed dwelling is to have minimal impact on the site and therefore can be predominantly fabricated and constructed off-site.

Nevertheless, as offered in the Appeal Statement, if the Local Review Body consider it appropriate, the Appellant is agreeable to a condition that required the structural integrity of the bridge be confirmed prior to construction works commencing.

We trust the above is of assistance, however, we are more than happy to response to any further enquiries or requests for clarification.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ferguson Planning', is written on a light-colored background.