



David Paton Building Consultancy
Local Review Body Appeal
Land east of 7 Springfield Cottage,
Carberry, Whitecraig. EH21 8PZ

November 2024

CONTENTS

PLANNING APPLICATION	2
INTRODUCTION	2
REASON FOR REVIEW	3
CONCLUSION	3

PLANNING APPLICATION

Planning Application for Erection of Fencing at

Land East of 7 Springfield Cottages, Carberry, Whitecraig. EH21 8PZ

For Mr & Mrs Rory Shearer

Planning Application No. 24/00782/P - REFUSED 12 September 2024

INTRODUCTION

This woodland is owned by Mr & Mrs Shearer who live in the adjacent house at 7 Springfield Cottages, there is/was an existing post and wire fence on this the line we are proposing which has fallen into disrepair and this application was to continue an existing fence line at 7 Springfield Cottages along the applicants boundary of this woodland.

Planning Permission was refused under powers delegated to the officer for the following reasons.

1. The proposed length of fencing would appear as a visually prominent and harmfully imposing feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the woodland area. By virtue of its extent, height, solid form and its exposed roadside position, the proposed length of fencing would appear as a harmfully dominant and intrusive feature within its woodland setting which would detract from the character and appearance of the landscape of the area. It would not be appropriate to its place or in keeping with its surroundings. It would be harmful to the landscape character and visual amenity of the woodland area and would be incompatible with the surrounding countryside and landscape character of this part of the Edinburgh Green Belt, contrary to Policies 8 and 14 of National Planning Framework 4 and Policies DC7 and DP2 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.
2. The proposed length of fencing would result in the loss of, or damage to a number of existing trees within the woodland which positively contribute to the landscape character of the area, contrary to policy 6 of NPF4 and policy NH8 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

REASON FOR REVIEW

The Officer states that the new fencing is out of character with the landscape of the area and yet along this stretch of road there is an eclectic mix of different boundary treatments to all the properties including fencing or different types, stone walling, rendered walls and hedging.

The officer also states that this fencing would be a dominant and intrusive feature within its woodland setting, yet on the opposite side of the road a tall Stone wall bounds the woodland that exists there and indeed continues almost uninterrupted for 1 mile to just past Carberry Mains Farmhouse, so I fail to see how the new fencing could be dominant, I also fail to understand how or to who the timber fencing is intrusive to when in fact this is the only part of this stretch of road which has no boundary treatment

The officer also talks about It being harmful to the landscape character and visual amenity of the woodland area, as mentioned above the visual amenity of the rest of the woodland on this road are behind a stone wall so it is no more visually harmful to have the woodland protected behind fencing

The applicant owns this woodland and the reason for the fencing is to safeguard it as it forms an important screen for his property considering to the rear of his property is the Waste and Recycling centre and the A6124 is a main route for lorries travelling to this commercial facility.

The officer and the councils landscape officer have stated that the fence will result in the loss of, or damage to a number of existing trees and yet offer no evidence to back this up, this is merely a personal opinion based without facts. The verge will need tidied up and overgrown scrub removed along with the existing fence (or what remains of it) however the whole point of this fence being erected is to safeguard this woodland area not to destroy it by removing or damaging trees.

CONCLUSION

We are asking for the Local Review Body to overturn the refusal notice and approve Planning Permission for the following reasons;

- There are different boundary treatments to all the properties in the stretch of road, there is no set pattern
- The new fence will not be any more dominant than what exists already along this stretch of road
- The enclosure of the woodland area is no different in terms of dominance and being intrusive to what exists on the east side of the road with the existing woodland being protected by a Continuous Stone wall
- The enclosure of the woodland will protect it and safeguard its future
- This woodland is the only part of this stretch of road which doesn't have any boundary treatment
- The officers personal opinion on trees being lost, is not based on fact.

EXAMPLES OF BOUNDARY TREATMENTS ON A6124



