

Planning Application : 23/01014/FUL - Refused
Local Review Body Appeal : Supporting Information

Introduction

Keith and Alison have been Redpath residents since 2003.

Nicola Robertson, the couple's daughter, is a single parent, with two daughters, aged 9 and 11 years and has owned Glenfield since May 2017.

Design and Planning Application Considerations

Policies, 4,7, 14 and 16 of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)
Policies EP4 and EP9 of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)
PMD2 and PMD5 of Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 (SBLDP2016)
Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Placemaking and Design 2010 (SPG 2010)

The above policies were considered, in detail, in conjunction with the reasons behind applying for Planning consent.

Reasons for Planning Application

Keith and Alison plan to stay in Redpath and continue to enjoy the particular way of life that the small, conservation village provides. They, also, wish to stay close to Nicola and their granddaughters in order to maintain their strong family bond, together with providing child/youth minding assistance, for Nicola, in her position as a neonatal nurse practitioner at the Borders General Hospital.

Keith and Alison currently live in Almakeni, Redpath. The house and garden are likely to become too onerous in terms of upkeep as the couple are now 68 years and 66 years old respectively.

Building the new dwelling is future proofing themselves against having to move out of the village, while continuing to provide independence and privacy to both them and Nicola.

This was explained to the neighbours who would be directly affected by the new development and other village residents who expressed an interest when advised of the proposed development. There were no objections, to the proposed development, from any resident within the village.

Planning Policy Considerations

Keith, Alison and Nicola Robertson carefully considered the design of the new build and its positioning on the site, prior to lodging the application. The siting of the building and the ridge height, maintains the linear nature, of the two buildings, in relation to the access road. The new build extends to the rear/south of the site (Similar to the majority of extensions to houses along the south side of the village access road) and seeks to create a degree of symmetry once both properties have been developed as planned.

Please refer to Planning Application 23/00407/FUL - Approved

There are only two, small, frosted windows planned for the west elevation, overlooking the Glenfield property, with rooflights installed to create light within the new build.

Planning Application : 23/01014/FUL – Refused
Local Review Body Appeal : Supporting Information

Planning Policy Considerations (Continued)

There are wide variations in house design, size and positioning within sites, throughout the village, however, thoughtful consideration was given to the existing house designs and house extensions, erected in recent years, within the village, namely; Harefield House, The Paddocks, Pear Tree Cottage, Ahlon House, Park Cottage, Glenview and Solstice, all on the same, south side of the village access road.

Design and Planning Application Considerations (Continued)

Careful consideration was, also, given to the proposed vehicle access and parking area on the proposed, new house, development site.

The objective was to keep the site access to a minimum width and retain as much as possible of the hedge boundary, between the village access road and the proposed development. The frontage, north gable end of the house will only be visible, from the village access road, approaching from the west end of the village. The sub-station and existing hedge blocks the proposed new build from directly in front of the new dwelling.

We believe that two vehicles can be parked within the area provided and manoeuvred in order for both to be turned around within it. To our knowledge, neither the Planning Department or Roads Planning Service representatives have visited the site to confirm whether this is the case or not.

The timber cladding, to the gable end, which would front the access road, was selected as a design affect and we are happy to change this to a cladding that is acceptable for Planning Policy in the area. The Planning Officer did not raise this as a specific issue prior to the Planning Refusal decision.

House Design, Previous Extension Sizes in Relation to Existing Properties and Site Layout Issues

It is suggested that the following information be considered in conjunction with viewing Google Maps and the attached photographs provided for each property.

The colour coded text addresses the Recommended Refusal clauses as follows ;

- 1. Blue (Policy 14 of NPF4) (PMD2 and PMD5 of SBLDP2016) (SPG2010)**
- 2. Green (Policy 7&14 of NPF4) PMD2, PMD5 and EP9 of SBLDP2016) (SPG2010)**
- 3. Yellow (Policy 7&14 of NPF4) PMD2, PMD5 and EP9 of SBLDP2016) (SPG2010)**
- 4. Purple (PMD2 & IS7 of SBLDP 2016)**

As you enter the village, the first property, on the south side of the access road, is Harefield House, a substantial, two story, detached property, with a large, 1.5 story, double garage extending to the north of the house. This has a gable end facing the village access road. The entirety of the west and north elevation is clearly visible from the access road. The orientation and layout of this building establishes a precedent for a new build being out of keeping with the established character and pattern of the street scene, resulting in adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

See attached photograph

Planning Application : 23/01014/FUL – Refused
Local Review Body Appeal : Supporting Information

The second property, The Paddocks, is a single story, detached property, which has had two, substantial extensions erected to the rear of the original dwelling and extends approximately 10 metres beyond the south wall of the original house. These extensions have almost tripled the size of the original property.

The West extension to the building runs approximately 2 metres from and along the line of the boundary fence with the neighbouring property, Cabrachan.

See attached photograph

The third property, Cabrachan is a 1.5 story, detached house, built in a town-like design.

See attached photograph

The fourth and fifth properties, Sundial Cottage and Pear Tree Cottage, respectively, are stone built, semi-detached cottages, on the roadside, which were built in the early life of the village.

See attached photograph

Pear Tree Cottage has recently had two extensions, erected to the rear / south of the house. These extensions take up a large part of a narrow site and more than double the size of the original, semi-detached building.

The timber cladding, to the west elevation, of the west extension, is clearly visible from the village access road.

See attached photograph

The sixth property, Ahlon House, is a 1.5 story building, with a double garage to the East and North of the house and set at a c45 degree angle to the house. The gable end and garage is clearly visible from the village access road.

See attached photograph

The seventh property, Old Post Office, is situated at the east end of three, single story, stone built, terraced cottages and, as such, is semi-detached. These cottages are on the roadside and were built in the early life of the village.

See attached photograph

The eighth property, Park Cottage, is the terraced cottage as described above, and has had an extension erected, to the rear / south of the original building, which has approximately doubled the size of the original cottage. This is a very narrow site. The east and west facing windows, on the extension, look onto the neighbouring gardens.

See attached photograph

The ninth property, Glenview, is situated at the west end of the row of terraced, roadside cottages. It has had two extensions erected to the rear / south of the property. This a very narrow site. The east and west facing windows, on the extension, look onto the neighbouring gardens.

See attached photograph

The tenth property, Solstice, has a double garage, situated to the east of the house, with the gable end facing towards the village access road. There is approximately 2 -3 metres distance between the house and the garage. This gable end elevation is clearly visible from the village access road.

There has been a substantial extension, erected to the rear/south of the original house.

See attached photograph

Planning Application : 23/01014/FUL – Refused
Local Review Body Appeal : Supporting Information

The eleventh property, Braeside, is the neighbouring house to the east of Glenbield and the proposed new house development. It is a two story house, with its west gable end being approximately 15 metres from the boundary shared with the proposed development. A well established, 2.5 metres tall hedge and a drystone dyke separate the properties. Only one, first floor window looks onto the proposed development in Glenbield.
See attached photograph

The twelfth property, Glenbield, is a single story house, with planning consent (23/00407/FUL) to extend upwards and to the rear/south of the house.
The New Build Planning Application (23/01014/FUL) is situated to the east of the house.
Detail of the "*Design and Planning Application Considerations*" is provided under this heading, within this document.
See attached photograph

The thirteenth property, Rowan Cottage, is a single story house and is one of a six house development, built in 2002/03. This house is the west neighbouring property to Glenbield and the properties have a shared, road access, from the village access road to the rear of the properties.
See attached photograph

The fourteenth (Birch Cottage) and fifteenth (Chapter Cottage) properties, are two of a six house development. Birch Cottage has a front elevation similar to others in the village access road and Chapter Cottage has a gable end, front elevation to the access road. They are joined by single garages and have off-street parking for one vehicle.
See attached photograph

Planning Application : 23/01014/FUL – Refused
Local Review Body Appeal : Supporting Information

Summary

The above information provides the rationale to support the appeal against Planning Application 23/01014/FUL - Refusal.

1. Sizeable house extensions, on similar, narrow and smaller sites, to that of the subject of this Planning Application, have been erected, in Redpath, in recent years.
2. The street scene or frontage to the south of the Village access road presents a very varied picture in relation to the design, size and linear nature of the properties on the south side of the village. The orientation, layout and density of the proposal is in keeping with that already present within other properties in the village.
The gable end frontage and proximity to Glenfield is replicated in the layout of the Ahlon House property, although this is a substantial garage, not a house. Harefield House, The Paddocks and Chapter Cottage have gable end elevations facing the village access road.
3. The design of the proposed house is sympathetic and in keeping with other design characters present in the village. The timber cladded, gable end frontage, to the village access road, seeks to support the introduction of timber cladding to parts of dwelling houses on the south side of the village and the fact that this type of cladding is visible, on the west elevation of Pear Tree Cottage, from the access road. This type of cladding is not a necessity and a cladding, similar to that on Glenfield, is acceptable to the applicant.
The gable end frontage and proximity to Glenfield is replicated in the layout of the Ahlon House property, although this is a substantial garage, not a house. Harefield House, The Paddocks and Chapter Cottage have gable end elevations facing the village access road.
4. The layout, of the proposed parking area, is designed to be sympathetic towards the current and future owners of Glenfield. The west end, car park area boundary has been restricted to keep it from overlapping a bedroom window in Glenfield.
It is believed that there is sufficient room, for two, sizeable vehicles to park, manoeuvre and turn within the site. We are happy to demonstrate this to the Roads Planning Service Department.

It is our opinion that thorough consideration of previous planning precedent, within the village, has not been undertaken. We were not offered the opportunity of consultation with the Planning Officer or Roads Planning Service Department, prior to the Planning Application Refusal.

We present the above rationale to support this appeal against the Planning Officer's decision.