

APPENDIX A – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION SUBMISSIONS ON MIR

General comments relating to Chapter 1 (Introduction) and Chapter 2 (The Changing Context for the Local Development Plan)

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.3 (& Paragraph 2.25) Demographic and Household Change | The respondent refers to a government projection of a 15% rise in population by 2032 generating an additional 12,000 households...but then in para 2.25 reference is made to the SESplan Proposed Plan calling for an additional 400 houses...a figure which...bears no relation to the estimated 12,000 households. (355) | <i>The rise in the number of households is based on General Register Office Scotland projections. The number of projected households then needs to be considered against the number of existing houses and the land already identified in the planning system. In the Borders, because there is an up to date Development Plan, the need for additional houses is quite limited. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to update the Plan in light of SESplan as approved by Scottish Ministers.</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| | | | <i>‘effective’ or ‘potentially effective’ with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i> | |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.4 Demographic and Household Change | The respondent refers to a need for affordable housing. However, the demand for all types of housing remains strong in the Borders, and it is strange that market demand should be ignored. The SESplan HoNDA shows a demand for c. 6000 homes from 2009-2019, and a further 2800 to 2024. This is the major residential driver for allocated land. (359 & 358) | It is not considered market demand is ignored as paragraph 2.5 states the position on mainstream housing. While there is demand for affordable housing the Council must seek to meet the requirement. The housing requirements in the HoNDA are adjusted in terms of market demand. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.9 Economic Progress, Transport and Infrastructure | The respondent refers to provision of high amenity business land as an essential component supporting the Waverley rail line. However the business case for the line is principally founded on the residential development which the line will attract...it is again perverse not to mention this key issue. (359 & 358) | It is not disputed that housing development provides an important element in delivering the Borders rail project. However the provision for housing figures, in support of the rail project, is already established in the previous Local Plan allocations. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.9 Economic | The respondent states that land availability for business and industrial property in the | Noted. The Council is aware of these issues. | It is recommended that the Council |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Progress, Transport and Infrastructure | Peebles area has been an issue for some time. Similarly the lack of suitable high amenity development sites for business use in the Galashiels area is likely to reduce the potential economic development impact of the Borders railway. (360) | | supports the proposals put forward for employment land in Galashiels and Peebles. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.11 Economic Progress, Transport and Infrastructure | The respondents concur digital connectivity is also key to future economic progress. (360 & 344) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.11 Economic Progress, Transport and Infrastructure | Northumberland County Council provided a formal response to the SESplan Proposed Plan in which support was stated for a new railway station at Reston as part of an improved semi-fast rail service between Edinburgh and Newcastle that serves local movements within SE Scotland and within Northumberland. Northumberland County Council would also welcome involvement with the relevant local authorities, Transport Scotland and Dept for Transport to promote this scheme. (344) | The comments on the proposed rail station at Reston are noted. | It is recommended that the Council supports the proposals put forward in the SESplan for a new rail station at Reston. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.13 Economic Progress, Transport and Infrastructure | The respondents find the statement on education provision 'presumptuous' as the SDP has yet to be subject of examination. (297,333) | The sites proposed have gone through a site assessment process and this has considered educational capacity. All of the sites contained in Appendix 2 of the MIR have been assessed in this process. The assessment can be seen in Appendix G of the Strategic Environmental Assessment. | It is recommended that the Council supports the proposals for education put forward as part of the report on the |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | Proposed Plan. No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.14 Sustainable Development and Climate Change | The respondent supports this paragraph. (130) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.15 Sustainable Development and Climate Change | The respondent commends the proposal to integrate important open space and greenspace, including SLAs (Special Landscape Areas)...further commend the ecosystem approach to building resilience to climate change, although clarification and detail of this will be required. (353) | The MIR is a strategic high level document and further detail of the proposals within it will be given through the Proposed Plan/LDP and the Action Programme where appropriate. | Further detail of the ecosystems approach should be detailed as part of the report on the Proposed Plan. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.15 Sustainable Development and Climate Change | The respondent feels strongly that the Pentland Hills Regional Park designation as an AGLV should be retained and that any potentially adverse development should be directed away from this area in order to preserve its intrinsic value. Also support the direction of resources towards improved management of this area. (240) | The Pentland Hills was approved as a Special Landscape Area at the Planning and Building Standards Committee on 6 August 2012. The SLA status will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications which could affect the designated area. In addition, the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) provides for management recommendations for conservation and enhancement of all SLA areas designated. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.15 Sustainable Development and Climate | The respondent states that paragraph 140 of the SPP outlines the purpose of Local Landscape Areas and highlights their role in safeguarding and promoting important settings for outdoor recreation...encourages | The work on SLAs was intended to provide an update and review of the existing AGLVs in line with the Reporter's recommendation made in the Local Plan inquiry. Each of the SLAs designated have | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | Change | <p>SLAs to perform a similar role presenting a real opportunity to provide policy protection for important outdoor sites in the Borders.</p> <p>In assessing the impact of development on recreational interests within SLAs it is important to appreciate that this is not just about impacts on the scenic or aesthetic qualities that recreational users benefit from...enjoyment of the outdoors recreation can also be affected by impacts on the physical qualities of the landscape that are integral to sport and recreation provision. (202)</p> | a Statement of Importance which gives detail on what forces for change are acting upon the SLA and management recommendations to help improve the landscape within the SLA; outdoor recreation is provided for within the respective Statements. | |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.17 Sustainable Development and Climate Change | The respondent states that an improved and extended public transport network is a priority if private transport is not to make an increasing contribution to greenhouse-gas emissions. (353) | Comments noted. The requirements of private and public transport will continue to be considered in the plan. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.18 Sustainable Development and Climate Change | The respondent states that details, including locations, of flood mitigation measures should be provided in the LDP. Natural flood management techniques should be employed wherever possible in preference or in addition to traditional hard engineering. (353) | It is considered that the Proposed Plan will provide further detail on flood mitigation issues carried forward from the MIR. For any site proposals where flooding may be an issue, site requirements will be drafted to detail any mitigation proposed. | Further detail on possible requirements relating to flooding should be included as part of the report on the Proposed Plan. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.19 Sustainable Development | The respondent states that domestic initiatives to improve energy efficiency should be encouraged and developed. (353) | It is considered that the Renewable Energy policy is generally supportive of a range of renewable energy mechanisms. This will remain the case in the Proposed | Continue to support renewable energy development |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | and Climate Change | | Plan. We will continue to support this issue. | where appropriate. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.21 The SESplan Framework | The respondent states that there is an urgent need to improve the infrastructure of the Carlops area by introduction of an enhanced broadband specification. (240) | One of the main issues identified in the MIR is the need to improve broadband and other digital networks. | No further action required. |
| Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 | Paragraph 2.25 The SESplan Framework | The respondent states a concerted effort should be made to ensure that new buildings and their settings are as environmentally-friendly as possible...should make generous provision for open space...to accommodate biodiversity features...native tree and shrub species, native wildflower meadows. (353) | Through the production of SPG such as Placemaking and Design, Sustainable Timber and Design and the Biodiversity SPG the Council confirms its stance on ensuring environmentally friendly developments with open space that can contribute to biodiversity and landscape. | No further action required. |
| General Comment on MIR and LDP Production | Graphics | The respondents state that in terms of the form of the document, we found its presentation to be commendably clean and fresh, but we felt it could have benefitted from more engaging graphical content. (339) | This comment is noted and will be considered further for the production of the Proposed Plan. | Graphics will be considered further for the production of the Proposed Plan. |
| General Comment on MIR and LDP Production | Production of LDP with SESplan | The respondents state that the emerging LDP must be consistent with the SESplan...you will need to be alive to the possibility for changes to SESplan as you manage the risks associated with the LDP going forward Proposed LDPs may be published on the basis of a proposed SDP, but should not be submitted to Ministers until the SDP has been approved. (339) | <i>The Council is aware of this requirement. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to update the Plan in light of SESplan as approved by Scottish Ministers.</i> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p><i>equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> | |
| General Comment on MIR and LDP Production | Difference between preferred and alternative | The respondent asks what the difference between a 'Preferred' and 'Alternative' option is. (96) | Essentially 'preferred' approaches, i.e. to policy direction or housing site proposals, are what the Council feels should be included in the future Local Development Plan and alternative options are considered less desirable when compared to 'preferred' sites. The site at Hutton, referred to by the respondent is included as an 'alternative' option; therefore the Council feels that it is not as suitable as other 'preferred' options. One of the purposes of the MIR was to gauge opinion on the options. These options will then be | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | considered before moving forward to the Proposed Plan. | |
| Other General Comment | Broadband | The respondent states that there is reference at several points to high importance of the Borders having access to fast broadband but that they believe the target date of 2020 really needs to be reviewed...is nothing like ambitious enough for a plan which is supposed to deliver economic growth...should be brought forward and significant effort put into finding mechanisms to deliver it. (355) | Provision of faster internet services is currently being rolled out in the Borders but this is being done settlement by settlement. It is considered 2020 is a realistic Borders-wide target, especially given that BT have already allocated 2013's programme for improvements. | No further action required. |
| General Comment | Local Plan/MIR and environmental sustainability | The respondent states that they have looked at the LDP available on the internet and fail to see any mention of environmental sustainability within the document. (96) | The Scottish Borders has an up to date Consolidated Local Plan (adopted 2011) and this plan provides detailed policies which back up the Structure Plan for the Borders. The Structure Plan sets the strategic vision for land use in the Borders. In both documents sustainability is a core theme covered through environment policies which deal with a range of topics. The MIR contains a Vision (2012:14) which states that development will be sustainable in the face of a changing climate. In addition many of the Main Aims and Issues i.e. Green Space, Green Networks and Climate Change propose options that promote greater sustainability. | No further action required. |
| General Comment | Local Plan/MIR and environmental | The respondents state that sustainable development and climate change is discussed between paragraphs 2.14 and 2.19. Whilst | Paragraph 2.19 states that "Encouraging renewable energy is seen to be a key part of the Government response to climate | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| | sustainability | <p>there is recognition of the Scottish climate change targets within this section of the MIR there is no recognition of the Scottish Government's 100% renewables target by 2020 or to the extent of the challenge that lies ahead if this target is to be met.</p> <p>In addition the respondents state it will be very important when drafting the LDP to have appropriate recognition of the following: Draft Electricity Generation Policy Statement, 2020 route map for renewable energy development and the Draft Electricity Generation Policy Statement. (346)</p> | <p>change..." It is noted that Scottish Government targets are subject to continued review/update.</p> <p>The government view is that Development Plans should not be a compendium of references to other strategy documents but will be a consideration of the preparation of plans where appropriate.</p> | <p>The policies will be a consideration in the preparation of the Proposed Plan.</p> |
| General Comment | Education Provision | <p>The respondent states that plans are being made to make a bid for Scottish Future Trust (SFT) funding for Kelso High School...people are upset about the fact that Jedburgh Grammar School is as of yet still unfinished and demand that a review should be implemented on the completion of phase six, this last phase would include refurbishment of the old Art-Deco primary school building to include a proper Assembly Hall and acceptable up-to-date canteen facilities. (365)</p> | <p>The Council's Education and Lifelong Learning (E&LL) department had bid for funding from within the Council's capital programme to improve social dining space within Jedburgh Grammar School, however with limited funding available it has not been possible to progress this scheme at this time.</p> | <p>No further action required.</p> |
| General Comment | Education Provision | <p>The respondent states that there is strong feeling in (Jedburgh) that Parkside Primary School is "bursting at the seams". In order that long term plans can be made to prevent this problem getting any worse, it has been suggested that the Council owned site at Oakieknowe, which is no longer zoned for</p> | <p>The E&LL Department indicate that the school roll has dropped recently and that Parkside Primary School is operating around 70% occupancy. E&LL are planning to take forward a project to review the whole school estate to determine where investment priorities</p> | <p>No further action required.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | housing, would be perfect as a new primary school site. (365) | should lie into the future. The needs of Parkside will be taken into account in this process. | |
| General Comment | Affordable Housing | <p>The respondents state that the Scottish Government advises that the updated HoNDA identifies a continued need for affordable housing in the Scottish Borders, amounting to some 100 houses per annum over the next 5 years</p> <p>...we maintain that it is the early identification of sites for residential development within the development plan with clear indication about allocation and phasing that enables developers to take account of and plan for the provision, as a part of their proposals, of an element of affordable housing.</p> <p>...limiting allocations in the development plan, in areas with an acute shortage of affordable housing, to a limited number of small 'short term' sites will simply exacerbate the problem of affordable housing provision for the Council and will stall the deliverability of such accommodation which is recognised as being necessary.</p> <p>...we maintain there is benefit in SBC having a more proactive approach to land identified in the existing development plan for future 'longer term' development...such development can be implemented in a considered and comprehensive manner that will address significant infrastructure issues such as affordable housing provision. (297,</p> | <p>The current situation is that the Council recognises the national baseline for affordable housing at a rate of 25%, which is stated in the Developer Contributions SPG. The requirements set within each HMA are reviewed periodically.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan will identify a range and choice of housing sites that provide a generous supply. This will provide the context for development. The longer term sites are identified as potential areas for future development subject to review. They provide a sign post as to where development could take place in the future.</p> | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | 333) | | |
| General Comment | Demographic and Household Change | <p>The respondent is very concerned that the Scottish Borders Strategic Local Development Plan – MIR does not take the ageing demographic profile of the area into consideration....provision of owner occupied retirement living housing for the elderly will widen the housing choices for older persons within the Scottish Borders...suggested that a policy be introduced that positively supports the delivery of specialised accommodation for older people including sheltered housing. Appropriate wording might be: <i>“Development proposals for accommodation designed specifically for the elderly will be encouraged provided that they area accessible by public transport or a reasonable walking distance to community facilities such as shops, medical services, places of worship and public open space”</i></p> <p>The respondent also states an additional method of encouraging the provision of specialist housing for the elderly could be in the form of a development incentive...private sheltered housing could be given an enhanced planning status, similar to affordable housing, to encourage sufficient levels of delivery from the private sector.</p> <p>(330)</p> | <p>The Council already has Policy BE7 which provides for “Proposals for new or extended care homes or supported accommodation provision...” and recognises that there is a growing proportion of older people in the Borders.</p> <p>It is considered that it is outwith the scope of the Council to change the planning status of care homes, as we deal with these on a case by case basis through planning applications. However as part of the production of the proposed LDP a policy review is being undertaken and this will include examination of Policy BE7.</p> | No further action required. |
| General Comment | Housing Land Supply | The respondent states the housing land supply position outlined in the SDP is | <i>The Council is aware of this requirement.</i> | <i>It is recommended</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | seriously contested. There is every likelihood that the housing land supply figures will change and that this will be reflected in changes to the supply within the SDA's, the supply outwith the SDA's and also the timing of delivery in bringing sites forward to the period of 2024. (274) | <i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i> | <i>that the Council agree to update the Plan in light of SESplan as approved by Scottish Ministers.</i> |
| General | Demographic | The respondents are concerned that SBC is | <i>The Council is aware of this</i> | <i>It is</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| <p>Comment</p> | <p>and Household Change</p> | <p>pressing ahead with the MIR for the new LDP at a time when there is great uncertainty about the overall strategy and proposed housing requirement contained within the Proposed SESplan...consider it is premature of SBC to press ahead with the publication of the LDP MIR in its current form...recommend that SBC awaits the outcome of the Examination of the Proposed SESplan. (297,333)</p> | <p>requirement. <i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> | <p><i>recommended that the Council agree to update the Plan in light of SESplan as approved by Scottish Ministers.</i></p> |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| General Comment | Heriot | <p>Heriot Community Council considered the general form of the community in the next 10 years and future of the school. Both of these are considered important to residents. To secure the future of the school there is a need to have an adequate school roll...considered best solution would be small-scale organic growth of the community...do not want to propose areas for development and do not feel areas should be delineated but believe a sensitive approach by adopting a relaxed attitude to housing in the countryside policy could achieve the growth without adversely affecting the amenity of the local area. (354)</p> | <p>It is noted that the Community Council support organic growth of the community.</p> <p>The MIR does not propose any formal housing allocations within Heriot Station (which is allocated in the Local Plan) and any proposed development within the settlement boundary (i.e. infill development) of Heriot Station would be tested by the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>The Housing in the Countryside policy already provides flexibility within the context of supporting existing settlements and at this stage it would not be considered appropriate to make a further exception to this policy within the Heriot area.</p> | No further action required. |
| General Comment | Transport | <p>The respondent provides a number of recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marketing plan to particularly address the Irish Market and generate jobs - Plan to use the Borders as a sports centre with Ireland close links on rugby, golf, joint competitions and joint support with Borders and Ireland - Review of all Borders trunk roads with necessary improvement plans to be submitted - Review of roads such as the A72 from Gala to Peebles. Improvements should be made | <p>In response to the recommendations put forward:</p> <p>Development of specific marketing strategies are outwith the scope of the LDP, but will be considered as part of the Council's economic development function.</p> <p>A number of key road infrastructure proposals are put forward within the SESplan and within the MIR for the LDP. The Council agrees that development of road infrastructure helps business growth</p> | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | <p>to Dirtpot corner between Innerleithen and Peebles. Make the case that the A72 be a Trunk Road and leave cost responsibility to the Scottish Government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make the case for the Scottish Government to increase electric car charging points. Take this into account in local plans in the Borders. (183) | <p>and exporters. One particular project that has been identified to help improve the local road network in the Northern SDA is the A72 Dirtpot Corner road improvement scheme between Innerleithen and Peebles.</p> <p>The Scottish Government has announced two rounds of funding in the last two years to allow public sector bodies access to low carbon vehicles and to build infrastructure to support these; SBC has taken advantage of this funding. At the time of writing no announcement has been made on any extension of this funding in 2012.</p> | |
| General Comment | Transport | <p>Midlothian Council state that the transport network does not feature as a main issue in the MIR, particularly as this is a key SDP issue. They have significant concerns that the impact of this scale of development on the strategic road network through Midlothian has not been assessed and transport interventions identified for incorporation into the Proposed Plan and Action Programme...SBC is requested to assess the impact of this scale of development and to enter dialogue with this Council and Scottish Government to seek solutions. (135)</p> | <p>The Council is content that the MIR focuses on the main issues for the Borders and many of the key themes address related transport network issues.</p> <p>In line with the SESplan spatial strategy SBC have made provision for the identification of the strategic infrastructure improvements identified for the Midlothian/Borders. The Council has commissioned a modelling exercise from independent consultants and is content that any impacts on traffic arising from the proposed development in the Borders would be minimal.</p> | No further action required. |
| General Comment | Leisure and Entertainment | <p>The respondents state they are surprised that the document makes no mention of leisure</p> | <p>The MIR and proposed LDP will support measures that help to ensure the vitality</p> | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | (Town Centres) | and entertainment, recreation and culture in its town centres other than with regard to Green Spaces... therefore suggest the inclusion of guidance for your existing and future leisure and entertainment facilities (but not in the Retail section) in relation to town centre vitality and the evening economy for the wellbeing of residents and visitors to reflect national planning policy. (122) | and viability of town centres and it is considered that appropriate cultural and recreational facilities contribute to this. Applications for such facilities are dealt with on a case by case basis and it is not considered guidance is necessary. | |
| General Comment | Environment | We support environmental improvements generally. We are extremely concerned by the increase in sitka spruce plantations and urge SBC to stand firm on good mixed planting around and through these forests. We are assured the Ettrick valley will now be protected from further afforestation in the new plan. The MIR is about urban and suburban environment and does not address the rural areas or give them any great value. The beautiful landscape in the Valleys is one which can encourage tourism. (284) | Comments noted. Proposals for tree planting and the plantation type are not directly under the control of the planning process. The Council is consulted by the Forestry Authority when new planting proposals are submitted. It is considered many of the issues raised in the MIR do directly relate to the countryside, e.g. sustainability principles, protection of the environment, wildlife, and the landscape. The Council will continue to safeguard the Ettrick and Yarrow Valleys where appropriate. | No further action required. |
| General Comment | Closure of SBC Planning & amalgamation with Dumfries and Galloway | The respondent states there is a structural problem to consider that of the closure of the SBC planning department, its amalgamation with D&G and the establishment of a more cost effective unit for all of the Borders. (183) | Whilst both authorities are in Southern Scotland and face many similar issues, they are large areas that have poor transport linkages. This was accepted by the Scottish Government with their decision to include Scottish Borders within the south east Scotland Strategic Development Plan Area. | No further action required. |

Vision Statement

Question 1: Do you agree with the Vision for the LDP? Do you have any alternative proposals?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Question 1: Vision | General support/ agreement | Respondents agree with the vision as proposed. (316, 349, 368, 290, 202, 226, 286, 327) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Support of particular elements | The respondent supports improvement of transport accessibility and digital connectivity. (344) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Support of particular elements | The respondent welcomes recognition of the role of sustainable development such as renewable energy in mitigating climate change, contributing to climate change obligations. (200) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Economic development/ job creation | The respondent asserts that the vision does not go far enough as it does not take into account learning or raising the income of the lower paid or improved job opportunities. (288) | The Vision statement must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement. Within the Vision economic development is mentioned and it is considered the Economic Development chapter (p19) elaborates further on work in this area. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Economic development/ job creation | The respondent agrees with the Vision but queries whether it is achievable in current economic climate? (289) | The nature of Vision statements is that they should be aspirational to some degree. There is a degree of continuity in | It is recommended that the Council support the broad |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>The respondents assert they are not convinced the 'Vision'...will be achieved in terms of '...improved job opportunities, housing availability and connectivity.' (297, 333)</p> <p>The respondent states that the focus (of the vision) should be to secure economic stability... and build on the past success of the local economies in the plan area...as such the plan and the growth strategy... should be ambitious & seek to stimulate economic development through facilitating opportunities for development. (334)</p> | <p>the Vision, in that the Borders is already an excellent place to live and the built and natural environment is of a high quality. In addition there is already evidence of improvements to connectivity (Borders Rail) and progress towards sustainable development (Langlee waste recycling, renewable energy production). There will be challenges to overcome, for example the struggling housing market.</p> | <p>thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR.</p> |
| Question 1: Vision | Economic development/ job creation | <p>The respondent queries what measures of economic growth or prosperity might be used and would there be linkages to any economic strategies approved by the Council. (350)</p> | <p>The Action Programme and Monitoring Statement, produced later in the LDP process, provide a measurement function including cognisance of economic growth.</p> | <p>No further action required.</p> |
| Question 1: Vision | Economic development/ job creation | <p>The respondents consider that the growth strategy pursued in the SESplan Proposed Plan is flawed and that it is counter-productive for SBC to proceed with an LDP when there are so many uncertainties surrounding the SESplan. (297, 333)</p> | <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to update the Plan in light of SESplan as approved by Scottish Ministers.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</p> | |
| Question 1: Vision | Economic development/ job creation | The respondent states that the last sentence of the Vision statement should be reworded to read: <i>"The built and natural environment will continue to be high quality, will provide for recreational and leisure activities and will support increasing new economic development"</i> . (334) | It is not considered necessary to add "increasing new" to the statement already contained on economic development, as it would not alter the thrust of the statement. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Economic development/ job creation | The respondent states that the Vision does not go far enough in accepting the influence of technology on development nor does it fully acknowledge the policy aims of the Scottish Government for mixed use development within rural areas. (331) | The vision is intended to be a high-level strategic statement which influences the direction of the production of the LDP. The MIR puts forward sites for mixed use development in Appendix A2 and the relevant policies are being reviewed as a part of the production of the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Question 1: Vision | Climate, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Development, Biodiversity | The respondent states that given the climate change imperative, they welcome recognition of the role of sustainable development such as renewable energy in mitigating climate change and contributing to our national and international climate change obligations. (200) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Climate, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Development, biodiversity | The respondent asserts clarification is needed on climate: Is this natural or economic? (288) | The 'climate' refers to the natural climate, it is hoped this becomes clear as the Vision is elaborated upon in the rest of the MIR. | No further action required. |
| Question 1: Vision | Climate, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Development, Biodiversity | The respondent asks for biodiversity and nature conservation interests to be specifically included in the aims of this statement. (353) | The Vision statement must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement and it is considered it is fit for purpose. The chapters on Green Space (p37) and Green Networks (p41) provide further details on measures to help achieve the Vision. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Climate, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Development, Biodiversity | The respondents assert that the Vision should acknowledge the potential renewable energy development has to attract further inward investment to the Scottish Borders and contribute towards ensuring that the LDP's stated Vision is achieved. (286) | The Vision statement must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement and it is considered it is fit for purpose. Within the Vision it is stated that "Development will be sustainable and meet the challenges of a changing climate". The MIR sets the stage for further renewable energy development in the Economic Development (p19) and Climate Change (p45) chapters. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Climate, Renewable Energy, | The respondent asks if there are environmental/climate targets that are relevant? (350) | The Vision statement must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement. The Climate Change (p45) chapter makes | It is recommended that the Council support the broad |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Sustainable Development, Biodiversity | | reference to the policy/targets context. | thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Climate, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Development, Biodiversity | The respondent encourages a reference to this aim (Zero Waste Plan's, zero waste society) i.e. "... <i>Development and lifestyles will be sustainable, supportive of the zero waste philosophy and meet the needs of a changing climate...</i> " (357) | The Vision statement must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement. The Climate Change (p45) chapter makes reference to the policy/targets context. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | People and Communities | The respondent asserts that there is no reference to the people of the Borders themselves which are one of the region's greatest assets. (288) The respondent is concerned that the individual sense of identity, heritage and intrinsic character of all Borders communities must be recognised and protected by the final wording of the agreed vision. (342) | The Vision must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement but there are words to the effect that the Borders 'will continue to be an excellent place in which to live and work' and that the 'built and natural environment will continue to be high quality'. It is considered that the people of the Borders are central to this. In addition, the new LDP is designed to serve the people of the Borders and the MIR and LDP will be influenced by responses received. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | People and Communities | The respondent states that a key weakness in the way the plan is presented is its failure to link/integrate development aspirations/vision to the internal capacities of communities to support development – limitations in physical and service infrastructures, and community institutional infrastructures. The respondent also states that they are of the view that local capacity and physical planning processes are inseparable and that | The Vision must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement but it is considered that the following chapters that detail the Main Issues help to articulate the Vision statement, although there is no formal signposting that links them, and that this includes proposals at settlement level, where appropriate. The MIR is a land use plan and the points raised in the representation may better | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | statements of community capacity should be included and linked to physical development proposals. (289) | refer to community planning. | |
| Question 1: Vision | Levels of Development/ Housing/ SESplan | The respondent states that the Scottish Borders should be aiming for exemplars of new development, particularly ...throughout the Central area. The last sentence of the vision statement should therefore be amended to “the built environment will offer exemplar standards of quality of place with ease of access to transport, employment, services, recreation and the existing high quality landscape”. (332) | The Vision must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement but it is considered that high quality of new development would fall under “the built and natural environment will continue to be high quality”. In addition to this the Council has Local Plan policy, a Placemaking and Design SPG and planning briefs that are designed to encourage high quality development and these will be continued in the new LDP. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Levels of Development/ Housing/ SESplan | The respondent states that the SESplan HoNDA shows a demand for c. 600 homes from 2009-2019 and a further 2800 to 2024. This is the major residential driver for allocating housing and should be a component of the vision. (350) | The Vision must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement. The spatial strategy (p15-16) and the Housing main issue (p25-28) chapter elaborate on the approach to housing, in line with the SESplan. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Levels of Development/ Housing/ SESplan | The respondent states that success of the vision will depend in part on a measure of flexibility in realising sites for housing, subject to development being sustainable and to a quality of design which respects the built and natural environment. (351) | The Vision references the “built and natural environment will continue to be high quality”. The Spatial strategy (p15-16) and the Housing main issue (p25-28) chapter elaborate on the approach to housing, in line with the SESplan. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Levels of Development/ Housing/ SESplan | The respondent states that for land to be identified in Local Plans it needs to be ‘effective’ as per PAN 20. Whilst the plan suggests that land for over 10,000 housing units is identified within the Borders it fails to determine what percentage is effective. (336) | The Vision must be a short, relatively high-level strategic statement and it is considered further detail on housing at this point would be inappropriate. The SESplan HoNDA includes assessment of sites based on effectiveness. In addition to | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | this the Council produces an annual Housing Land Audit which also provides detail on effectiveness of housing sites. These findings are fed into the development plan production process. | |
| Question 1: Vision | Levels of Development/ Housing/ SESplan | The respondent expresses concern that...with only very modest housing land being proposed in the Western SDA between 2019 and 2024, the Scottish Borders will potentially lag behind other regions that are pursuing a more ambitious growth strategy. They further consider that the growth strategy pursued in the SESplan Proposed Plan is flawed and that it is counter-productive for SBC to proceed with an LDP when there are so many uncertainties surrounding the SESplan. (397,333) | The Council is aware of the SESplan situation and it is proposed to delay key decisions on future housing land allocations pending examination on the SESplan Proposed Plan. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | Tourism | The respondent states that the Vision should show the clear indication that the (previous Government's) drive to increase investment into tourism is supported in the Scottish Borders. As such they would like the LDP to place more emphasis on the role of tourism in the Borders and linkages with the emerging tourism strategy. (326) | The Vision must be a relatively high-level strategic statement. Tourism is covered within the Consolidated Local Plan and will continue to be covered in the economic development section of the Proposed Plan. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | General | The respondents assert that the statement is lost on Jedburgh as the town centre has had scaffolding on Dalgleish building for years. (296) | Although this point is not considered relevant in discussion of the Vision, there are current proposals to deal with the Dalgleish building. | No further action required. |
| Question 1: Vision | General | The respondent states that the vision is a very general statement with little to distinguish it from many other "visions" in plans and | The Vision statement must be aspirational to some degree as well as being relatively high-level. It is intended to influence the | It is recommended that the Council support the broad |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---|---|--|
| | | strategies. The remainder of Section 3 gives no outcomes or measures by which this vision could be assessed...Without outcomes and measures, visions are meaningless. (350) | direction of the production of the Proposed Plan and in that respect the Vision is considered to have the appropriate level of detail. The Action Programme and Monitoring Statement, produced later in the LDP process, provide a measurement function. | thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | General | The respondent asserts that a more defined statement of objectives should be included. They also consider that the vision statement should link to 'headline' figures beneath the main statement, outlining the proposed extent of available business land/space, housing land and key transport/communication improvements deemed feasible within the period to 2024. (311) | The Vision statement must be aspirational to some degree as well as being a relatively high-level strategic statement. It is considered that the Main Aims further the detail contained within the Vision statement. It is also considered that it is unnecessary to list 'headline' figures beside the statement, this information is largely detailed under the relevant main issues and will be further articulated through the production of the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | General | The respondent asserts that the current statement is somewhat anodyne and fails to paint a distinctive picture of the type of place the Scottish Borders will be in 10 to 20 years time. (339) | Comments noted, although it is considered the Vision is satisfactory for its purpose. However this can be re-examined in the preparation of the proposed LDP. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |
| Question 1: Vision | General | The respondent states that it is to be expected that this report is largely concerned with those areas and issues over which the Council either has control or at least considerable influence but we suggest there is a need to look beyond those limits and to set out a vision that embraces all the main activities in the Borders – including forestry and farming. | It is considered that the Vision must balance being aspirational with being realistic. It is hoped that the positive measures put forward in the MIR will benefit the main activities in the Borders. The vision statement contains a degree of continuity, in that it is considered the Borders is already an excellent place to | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|--|---|--|
| | | They therefore suggest there is a need for something more visionary...it would be interesting to get the views of some of the younger generation...perhaps the Borders could be amongst the first carbon-neutral Local Authority areas. (355) | live. There are also a number of policies and plans (such as renewable energy, zero waste, NPF 2, SESplan) that have an impact on the Borders and although pursuit of these will not result in carbon-neutrality, it is considered that their achievement will be a significant challenge for the Local Authority. | |
| Question 1: Vision | General | The respondent states that the emphasis is on increasing the central 'corridor', including establishing green belts around the corridor towns and smaller eastern towns, but with no green belt protection for the rural settlements, areas such as ours (Ettrick and Yarrow) are left out. (284) | There is no green belt policy proposed in the MIR. Green Networks are proposed in the central and western strategic development areas and for key settlements elsewhere. However their purpose is to encourage sustainable transport links and environmental improvements, as well as to protect areas identified as being under pressure from development. It is considered that rural areas have accessible countryside that is protected from inappropriate development by a range of Local Plan policies that will be continued into the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Vision as presented in the MIR. |

Question 2: Do you agree with the Main Aims for the LDP? Do you have any alternative proposals?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Question 2: Main Aims | General Support | The respondents agree with the Main Aims. (288, 296, 290, 327, 349, 353, 368) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aims, subject to |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | any revisions detailed in this report, should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 1: To provide an adequate range and quality of land and premises for business | The respondents state that businesses should be encouraged but not to the detriment of the landscape. (288) | The Council has a range of policies that protect the landscape and setting of the Borders. The Council will presume against development that has an adverse impact on the landscape. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 1: To provide an adequate range and quality of land and premises for business | The respondent states that the “policy” does not go far enough...especially in terms of SPP in offering a range and choice of marketable sites for business (paras 46 & 47) and PAN 73 Rural Diversification...LDP needs to recognise the changing circumstances of today due to changing technology and thus promote opportunities that complement a conventional approach of providing land and premises. (331) | <i>The Aim is only intended to provide a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will take. As a part of the LDP process a parallel policy review was undertaken (Appendix C of the MIR), and this has been further informed by a study into the supply and demand for industrial land and premises. It is further noted that the LDP is intended to include appropriate reference to digital connectivity as part of the move towards promoting economic development.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim.</i> |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 3: To promote the development and regeneration of town | Fully support aim to promote development and regeneration of town centres. (285) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | centres | | | MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 3: To promote the development and regeneration of town centres | The respondent does not agree that regeneration should only happen in town centres “where the benefits are most significant”. They also query what does most significant mean? (288) | It is not intended that regeneration should occur only in town centres, only that it should be promoted in these locations, the Council identifies a range of redevelopment options in the MIR and existing Local Plan. The benefits are considered to be “significant” in town centres because the majority of the Borders population and visitors will use the respective settlement town centres and therefore regeneration to contribute to their vitality is considered important. If regeneration sites are identified in smaller settlements, without town centres, the Council would consider inclusion of them in the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 4: To provide land for mainstream and affordable housing | The respondents state that the aim related to housing land is expressed in weak terms. While other forms of development are “promoted” or “encouraged” housing is merely dealt with through the provision of land. They assert it could be expressed more forcefully as <i>“To meet housing need and demand by allocating a generous supply of land in appropriate locations”</i> . (350,359,358) The respondent states that the aim should be amended to refer to a “generous supply” of land for housing. (334) | Although a ‘generous supply of land’ is referred to under para 3.4 of the MIR and is stated to be a core ingredient of the Plan, it is reasonable to add the suggestion to the stated Aim. | It is recommended that the Council agree a revision to the respective Aim to reference a generous supply of land. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 4: To provide land | The respondents state that the Aim should be reworded as follows: “To provide sufficient | The Main Aims are intended to give a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will | It is recommended that the Council |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | for mainstream and affordable housing | land for mainstream and affordable housing which is considered effective or can become effective during the course of the next five year period”. (297,333) | take, and it is considered that the proposed rewording is not required in this part of the plan. The SESplan HoNDA includes assessment of sites based on effectiveness. In addition to this the Council produces an annual Housing Land Audit which also provides detail on effectiveness of housing sites. These findings are fed into the development plan production process. | only agree a revision to the respective Aim to reference a generous supply of land. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 4: To provide land for mainstream and affordable housing | The respondent states that one amendment that is considered important is to add, “well-located and deliverable” to the sentence “to provide land for...” (332) | The Main Aims are intended to give a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will take. It is considered the wording of the Aim is appropriate (taking in the revision proposed under issues 350,359,358 and 334), especially when read with the Housing chapter (p25-28). | It is recommended that the Council only agree a revision to the respective Aim to reference a generous supply of land. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 5: To encourage better connectivity by transport and digital networks | The respondent highlights the need for a high speed broadband connection to encourage business. (296) The respondent states that better transport links and broadband are essential. (288) The respondent states “Digital connectivity” can be a “radio” rather than cable. (94) | Comments noted. The term “digital connectivity” includes improving high speed broadband connections and provision of wireless connectivity. It is considered that this and better transport connectivity is a critical aim for the development of the Borders to 2024. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 6: To protect and enhance the natural and built | The respondents support Aim 6. (110,130) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | environment | | | as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 9: To integrate climate change adaptation requirements such as flood prevention and renewable energy production | The respondent states that the Aim should include 'promotion of further renewable energy generation' and that renewable energy provision is not adaptive but preventative. (286) | The Council considers Aim 9 is appropriate as stated without inclusion of the suggested wording. Comments are noted about renewable energy being preventative not adaptive. The Climate Change chapter of the MIR elaborates further on support for renewable energy development (para 5.75, p47). | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 9: To integrate climate change adaptation requirements such as flood prevention and renewable energy production | The respondent states that the approach set out within the MIR for integrating policy support for renewable energy production within the LDP is considered to be very much contrary to this Aim of the plan. (346) | It is considered that the Aim is suitable when read with the Climate Change chapter, which elaborates further on support for renewable energy development in appropriate locations (para 5.75, p47). In relation to renewable energy the MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from this further work is anticipated before the end of 2012, | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | and it is therefore proposed that the Council considers this issue as part of the overall content of the Proposed Local Development Plan in spring 2013. | |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Aim 10: To make adequate provision for waste management | The respondent recommends this Aim is changed as follows: "To use the waste hierarchy as the basis for ensuring adequate provision for waste management". (357) | The Main Aims are a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will take. With regards to waste management, further detail is given in the Climate Change chapter (para 5.77 p47) which states production of a Waste Management Supplementary Planning Guidance is possible and in Appendix C (p141), where it is stated that incorporation of the waste hierarchy will be considered further through the review of Policy Inf7. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Renewable Energy and Climate Change | The respondent states that the 'Main Aims' section of the LDP should make clear the link between renewable energy and climate change mitigation, clearly referencing our national and international climate change targets. They suggest wording as follows: "To support the sustainable development of renewable energy in order to contribute to the Scottish Government's target of generating equivalent of 100% of our electricity consumption from renewable energy, in line with the Climate Change (Scotland) Act which sets out an emissions reduction target of 42% by 2020. (200) | The Main Aims are a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will take. The climate change issues to be addressed are elaborated on pages 45-48 of the MIR. It is noted that Scottish Government targets are subject to continued review/update. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Tourism and leisure | The respondents request that added to the Main Aims are efforts to promote the area for tourism and leisure opportunities. (316) | It is considered that, although there is no explicit reference to tourism and leisure opportunities, that a number of the Main Aims relate to it and as such it is covered. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | The respondents suggest the added comment that tourism is also hugely important to the Scottish Borders and is very much a sustainable 'industry/business'. (342) | Tourism is covered within the Consolidated Local Plan and will continue to be covered in the economic development section of the Proposed Plan. | Aim should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.2 | The respondents seek to amplify the importance of having a supply of appropriately sized and located strategic development land. (360) | It is considered that the paragraph is suitable for purpose. The economic development section gives more on detail for appropriate size employment land. | No further action required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.3 | The respondent agrees strongly with this statement...The attractiveness of town centres is vital for all the reasons stated. (130) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.3 | The respondent would like to propose very much lower speed limits in all Borders towns and villages, creating an atmosphere of mutual respect between car drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. (118) | It is considered that setting lower speed limits in Borders towns is outwith the scope of the MIR/proposed LDP. | No further action required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.4 | The respondent states that it is vitally important that this (supply of land for new housing and employment land) is tempered by existing and proposed infrastructure. Additional development without planning for infrastructure will continue to add to the already creaking load there currently is, leading to deterioration of living standards and therefore moving in a different direction to that captured in the Vision. (289) | It should be noted that the continued economic troubles mean there is very little development demand arising. Consideration of infrastructure has taken place through the site assessment process for the development sites that have been put forward in the MIR. One of the key aspects of the Vision is for sustainable development and this relates to development which is appropriate to existing and proposed infrastructure. | No further action required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.4 | The respondent cautions against...view contained in the MIR that there is a generous supply of land for housing...does not automatically equate to effective housing land coming forward to deliver new housing on the | <i>The MIR takes cognisance of the SESplan HNDA in the allocation of housing land and the proposals put forward include a built-in flexibility. The SESplan HNDA also takes cognisance</i> | <i>It is recommended that the broad thrust of the aim description is</i> |

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>ground...some flexibility in land allocations for housing may be required to support deliverable development.</p> <p>The respondent also questions the delivery of affordable housing when mainstream housing sites are failing to come to fruition. The affordable housing simply will not happen unless the Council allocates sufficient land for housing (mainstream) which is effective. (351)</p> | <p><i>of affordable housing. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> | <p><i>taken into the Proposed LDP.</i></p> |
| Question 2: | Paragraph | Northumberland County Council supports the | Support noted. | No further action |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| Main Aims | 3.5 | improvement of transport accessibility and digital connectivity within the Borders, including cross border linkages with Northumberland. (344) | | required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.6 | The respondent particularly endorses the words: "The Borders environment is its special quality. The plan must seek to protect and improve the legacy". (130) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.6 | Leisure and sports provision lags well behind many other areas of Scotland, poor quality pitches and indoor provision, shortage of artificial surfaces. (289) | Comments noted. The Council has a Sports Facilities and Pitches Strategy designed to ensure the high quality and innovative facilities are available in the Borders. | No further action required. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.7 | The respondent states that more needs to be done to encourage renewable energy and energy conservation by reducing unnecessary barriers especially in conservation areas and on listed buildings that would benefit greatly from use of modern ideas and materials to improve their carbon footprint (i.e. windows and doors). (289) | <i>It is acknowledged there is sometimes a conflict of interest between supporting domestic sustainable technologies and protecting the built environment. However, Scottish Planning Policy requires a balanced and proportionate approach to the encouragement of renewables.</i> | <i>No further action required.</i> |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Paragraph 3.7 | The respondent states that flooding is a serious issue...it is important flooding of a development site is considered, but also the consequential flooding that such a development would create elsewhere...now would be a good time to...ensure adherence to current flood prevention legislation standards but particularly for housing, hospitals and strategic developments...ensure | It is considered that Main Aim 9 sets the scene for the provision of policy to tackle future flooding. The Council is well aware of flood risk and consequential flooding from building in flood plains. Any application or proposal for allocation is considered against flood risk data, in consultation with the Council's Flood Prevention Officers. | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | an even stricter standard is applied to ensure that developments will remain safe for the times of predicted extremes of weather. (289) | | |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Range of Aims | The respondents state that the Main Aims... need to apply to all towns and areas within the Plan area. (252,336) | It is considered that the respective Aims cover the Borders. This must be seen within the necessary context of guiding development to Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) as proposed by the SESplan. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aims, subject to any revisions detailed in this report, should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Range of Aims | The respondent states that all the Aims should closely relate to the conservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment. (342) | Protection of the built and natural environment has its own Aim and will cover all of the Borders but it is considered that there is a degree of crossover because some of the other aims will help to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aims, subject to any revisions detailed in this report, should remain as drafted in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Structure of Aims | The respondent considers that more emphasis on flood prevention, renewable energy and energy conservation is required by having them as separate bullet points in the Main Aims rather than 'lumping' them together. (289) | The Main Aims are intended to be a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will take. The respective points are elaborated upon within relevant sections in the rest of the MIR. Flooding and Renewable Energy will have separate policies in the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aims, subject to any revisions detailed in this report, should remain as drafted |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | in the MIR. |
| Question 2: Main Aims | Structure of Aims | The respondent states that an application of detail to each aim should provide elaboration on what the Council view as a benchmark for 2024 and how the 'aim' can be seen to have been achieved...may involve linking the broad statements to a particular section which would then specify a list of key projects/improvements based on a sliding scale of availability. (311) | The Main Aims are considered to be a strategic guide to the direction the LDP will take. As the production of the LDP progresses the Action Programme and Monitoring Report will provide a "measurement" of how the context of the LDP will be implemented and how it can be monitored in years to come. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the broad thrust of the Aims, subject to any revisions detailed in this report, should remain as drafted in the MIR. |

Question 3: Do you agree with the Spatial Strategy for the LDP? Do you have any alternative proposals?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General Support | The respondents agree in principle to the Spatial Strategy. (226,290,327,334) The respondents agree with the Spatial Strategy for the LDP, which acknowledges in addition to the Central SDA, the importance of the Western SDA, centred on Peebles. (297, 311, 333) | The support from these respondents is noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General Support | The respondent agrees with the preferred option, whilst noting the continuing importance of recognising 'brownfield' sites as a prime focus for development. (342) | The support and comments on brownfield sites are noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: | Use of | The respondent does not agree with the | Development planning in Scotland is | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Spatial Strategy | Strategic Development Areas | <p>Spatial Strategy...it makes no mention of Coldstream or other important settlements outside of those identified as priorities in the SESplan. (252)</p> <p>The respondent asserts that the Spatial Strategy limits development of both housing and business land to central areas and neglects those areas outwith the main hubs. This is not sustainable development strategy as it restricts the local markets for housing and employment increasing the need to commute and abandons rural economies. (336)</p> | <p>hierarchical. The Local Development Plan is set below the SESplan and therefore must reflect the Spatial Strategy that is set out in that document. However the production of the Local Development Plan will also introduce a local context i.e. through site allocations, settlement boundary changes and protection of greenspace. Consequently the needs of settlements, including Coldstream, which already has a substantial allocation of land for housing in the Consolidated Local Plan, outwith the Strategic Development Areas will be adequately dealt with in the LDP.</p> | <p>that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR.</p> |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Central SDA Kelso | <p>The respondent states that further significant growth of Galashiels, Jedburgh and Selkirk is restricted due to topography or flooding concerns and Hawick is less marketable with a significant level of existing supply and that Kelso is therefore the only remaining settlement that offers developable land and which is one of the most marketable locations in the Borders along with being a strategic employment location. (350)</p> <p>The respondent states that Kelso...offers an opportunity to provide additional land in the short term to counter on-going delays with the Newtown St Boswells expansion and restriction of other larger sites in Gala, Hawick, Jedburgh and Selkirk. (311)</p> | <p>Scottish Planning Policy requires that a range and choice of sites are identified. The Council is also required to identify a generous supply of land to meet identified housing need (including affordable housing) across the Strategic Development Areas. In doing this a rigorous site assessment process is used to identify the best sites possible.</p> <p>There are site constraints in Galashiels, Jedburgh, Selkirk and Hawick but subject to identified mitigation measures planned for these towns development land can be identified.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR.</p> |
| Question 3: | Central SDA | The respondent supports the inclusion of | Support Noted. | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|--|---|
| Spatial Strategy | Selkirk | Selkirk as a key element of the Central SDA and its important role as part of the Spatial Strategy. (335) | | that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General | The respondents agree that the emphasis should be on improving connectivity across the Borders. (316) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General | The respondent states that linkage to the Borders rail connection is clearly advantageous but given the delays in the implementation of this major infrastructure and the extensive land allocations in its direct vicinity, it is considered that the focus should not be overly narrow. (311) | The railway line is now confirmed and is targeted to be implemented by 2014. The Council is required to identify a generous supply of land and a range of choice of sites to meet identified housing need (including affordable housing) across the Strategic Development Areas. In doing this a rigorous site assessment process is used to identify the best sites possible. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General | The respondent accepts the focus (of development) should continue to be within the Central SDA but it needs to be on the basis of recognising the changed development market needs which may not sit comfortably with the approved SPG Countryside Around Towns (CAT) but nevertheless solutions that promote SPP (paragraphs 46 & 47) and PAN 73 need to be examined. (331) | <i>The Council will consider if there are development requirements that may have impacts on the CAT area as part of the Proposed Plan process.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to amend the CAT extent where new development proposals are identified in the Proposed Plan.</i> |
| Question 3: | Western | The respondent states that the Western SDA | The Central SDA is the primary centre of | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Spatial Strategy | SDA as secondary to Central SDA | <p>is described as secondary, which does not accord with the evidence of market demand. The Peebles area, with its closer connections to Edinburgh, is an attractive environment, with strong settlements generating good market demand and that if demand is not catered for in such areas, some at least of the demand will be lost to the Borders altogether, and this would be contrary to the Vision and the Aim of growing the population and the economy. (350)</p> <p>The respondent states that the approach to the Western Borders undermines the opportunity to focus future development in the area, and plays down the transport links that are provided to the rest of the Borders and the wider south of Scotland. The Spatial Strategy should therefore be reconsidered to recognise the potential opportunity this area provides. (235)</p> <p>The respondent states that as a town with strong administrative and employment role and good transport links, Peebles should be considered as a primary focus for future strategic growth in the Borders, alongside such towns as Hawick, Kelso, Jedburgh and Selkirk. (199)</p> | <p>population, has the main business base, contains key facilities, is the administrative centre and is at the centre of the roads network. In the years 2007-2011 the Central HMA has had 1571 housing completions compared against 664 for the Northern HMA. It is therefore considered logical for this area to be the main focus for future development in the Borders. It is noted that the northern part of the Western SDA has good transport links to Edinburgh. However, links to Edinburgh can only form one part of the consideration of the best areas for future development.</p> <p>It is considered that there is potential for development in all three of the SDAs and the Council will support appropriate development in all of them.</p> | that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Cardona and Western SDA | The respondent states that it would be more accurate to describe the Western SDA as including Cardona, which now seems to be a | The Western SDA does include Cardona. It is acknowledged that Peebles, | It is recommended that the Council support the broad |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | lost cause. Allowing the settlements of Peebles, Cardona, Innerleithen and Walkerburn to coalesce, as seems to be the policy in practice, is contrary to the letter and spirit of the 6 th Main Aim: "To protect and enhance the natural and built environment" (130) | Cardrona, Innerleithen and Walkerburn are separate settlements, and it is not considered there is evidence of coalescence. | thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Transport links to Edinburgh | The respondent asserts that whilst the report states that there are good links to Edinburgh, this is not the feeling of many residents, especially with ongoing concerns about the safety at Leadburn Junction...the road network must be prioritised for improvement. The respondent also asserts the Western SDA provides shorter commuting distance to the centre of Edinburgh than the Central SDA. It is important that the necessary infrastructure is in place to deal with current and future developments. (289) | In comparison to some areas of the Scottish Borders the northern part of the SDA has reasonably good transport links with Edinburgh. However, noting that our road network is particularly important in terms of promoting and enhancing the economic vitality of our area, we would agree that the continuous improvement of the road network is required throughout our area. One particular project that has been identified to help improve the local road network in the Northern SDA is the A72 Dirtpot Corner road improvement scheme between Innerleithen and Peebles". | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Transport links to Edinburgh | The respondent states that the (Western SDA) is "a commuter belt for Edinburgh". (94) | The 2001 Census, Travel to Work Data found that 20% of Peebles resident employed adults worked in Edinburgh and of these 92% were car drivers or passengers, 6% used the bus and 2% used other transport means (including motorbikes). | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General | The respondents suggest the definition and housing numbers used for the Western SDA and Northern HMA are finally consolidated | The SESplan shows housing allocations by SDA. The boundaries of the Western SDA differ from the Northern HMA. The | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | into one clear quantity to avoid confusion in the future. (368) | HMA can't just be redrawn to match the SDA so at present the MIR has a requirement by SDA but the sites are shown by HMA. | |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Eastern SDA Rail station at Reston | The respondent supports the introduction of a new railway station at Reston. (344) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Eastern SDA Rail station at Reston | The respondent states "station at Reston = slower journey via Berwick". (94) | Unclear of exact point. On assumption that the point is that the proposed stop would create a delay on the trip from Berwick to Edinburgh; it is considered the economic and sustainable transport benefits outweigh any potential delay. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Settlements outwith Eastern SDA | The respondent states that more thought is needed for the forgotten eastern Borders settlements. (288) | Development planning in Scotland is hierarchical. The Local Development Plan is set below the SESplan and therefore must reflect the Spatial Strategy that is set out in that document. However the production of the Local Development Plan will also introduce a local context i.e. through site allocations, settlement boundary changes and protection of greenspace. Consequently the needs of settlements, such as Coldstream, which is situated outwith the Eastern SDA and which already has a substantial allocation of land for housing in the Consolidated | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy as set out in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | Local Plan, will be adequately dealt with in the LDP. | |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General | The respondent states that in terms of Figure 5 “the spatial strategy”, we feel that this should be amended to show the “primary development locations” identified in SESplan, which include Reston within the Eastern SDA. (103) | As the production of the LDP progresses there will be inclusion of Proposals maps, these will include Reston. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | General | The respondent states that the eastern hub would be better aligned towards Edinburgh than Melrose and or/should be regarded as the hinterland of Berwick along with Wooler, Alnwick etc. Unless very great improvements to the roads from Eyemouth to BGH for example. The Border is a crazy idea and its getting worse! (102) | It is not within the scope of the MIR/proposed LDP to change Local Authority or National Borders. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Structure of SDAs | The respondent asserts that it is incorrect to suggest that all the towns within it are equally-capable of growth. There are quite distinct and localised markets within the SDA...fine grain of land allocations within the SDA is critical to ensure an effective land supply will be available to meet future needs. (350, 358, 359) The respondent asserts that in reality the key SDA in the Borders encompasses the Western SDA plus the north and north/west parts of the Central SDA, excluding settlements such as Hawick and Jedburgh. This would accord more fully with market demand. (350) | Development planning in Scotland is hierarchical and as such the LDP must reflect the spatial strategy set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. In allocating sites for development it should be noted that Scottish Planning Policy requires a range of choice in sites as well as a generous land supply. The previous Local Plan established the four Housing Market Areas in the Borders and flexibility in housing allocations is built in through the HoNDA process. It is considered that the continuing economic situation has resulted in limited demand for development across the Borders. It is also | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | thought that subject to the required mitigation measures Border towns are capable of accommodating further development. | |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | SESplan and flexibility of housing figures | The respondent states that from reviewing the representations lodged, a consistent theme of under-provision particularly in the early stages of the Plan, has been highlighted by objectors...we feel that the LDP Spatial Strategy must remain flexible to accommodate any increase in the strategic requirement. (103) | The preferred and alternative proposals in Appendix A2 of the MIR provide for the SESplan requirements and also for additional flexibility to meet any changes arising from the SESplan examination. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Purpose of SDAs | The respondent states that the purpose of priorities for these SDA's are not clearly defined more information of the kinds of development proposed within the SDAs should be given. (200) | It is considered that 'development' is a general term that applies to housing, employment, services and supporting infrastructure. Further detail will emerge with the production of the proposed LDP. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Purpose of SDAs | The respondent states the old and tired strategy of having hubs from which development is managed has to be questioned as to its cost effectiveness and potential lack of cohesion on major issues. (183) | As development planning in Scotland is hierarchical, the spatial strategy must reflect what is set out in the SESplan. It is also considered that hubs operate well in practice. | It is recommended that the Council support the broad thrust of the spatial strategy as set out in the MIR. |
| Question 3: Spatial Strategy | Badgers | The respondent believes that early notice of possible conflicts between Badger setts and development will in due course save both time and money when proposed projects are submitted to the Local Authority for consideration...in relation to housing there is bound to be some impact locally in the designated areas and in all probability those | Comments noted. Sites put forward into the LDP have gone through a rigorous site assessment process and this includes assessment of protected species. It is also the case that there is inclusion of policy to protect nationally protected species. | No further action required. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | areas identified in the SESplan SDAs. (349) | |
|--|--|--|--|

The Main Issues

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING MIXED USE)

EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY – ADDITIONS

PREFERRED OPTIONS:

- a) Central Borders – Restructure and remodelling of Tweedbank Industrial Estate
- b) Western Borders – Continued identification of the longer term mixed use opportunity at Whitehaugh, Peebles
- c) Western Borders – Possible opportunities at Cardrona (mixed use).

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

- a) Central Borders – Possible small scale opportunities at Broomilees.

Question 4: Do you agree with the preferred option for the provision of additional employment land in the LDP? Do you agree with the alternative options? Or do you have other alternative options?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Economic Development | Provision of Employment Land | <p>A majority of contributors support the preferred option. (172, 94, 290, 336, 226, 235, 342, 288, 297, 360, 289, 368, 327)</p> <p>The following contributors agree with the preferred option and but have also put forward additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional land needs to be allocated, specifically in Western Borders SDA (235) • Selkirk to be included as potential source | <p>The support for the preferred option presented in the Main Issues Report, and the recognition that additional land is required in a number of locations, is noted</p> <p>New sites in areas highlighted in the MIR and already allocated sites will make up the employment land supply, which will meet the requirements in all areas. Sites submitted will be assessed for potential</p> | <p>It is recommended to include additional employment land in the LDP. It is also recommended that the Council agree that the final decision in relation</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>of employment land, (1) at brownfield redevelopment sites at Riverside (2) define line for bypass to be investigated and committed to facilitate zoning (3) zone land without the commitment to the bypass to enable incremental development (342)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mention of Eastern Borders even if there is no additional employment land. Re-designation of employment land (288) • Endorse importance of providing allocation in Peebles area and Central Borders. General area east of Tweedbank would be optimum location (360) • Seeking suitable employment land elsewhere in Western Borders (297) • Agree with preferred option for b) and c) (289) • Agree with b) (368) <p>Contributor (252) asserts that existing allocations must be maintained, particularly in settlements not promoted in MIR, such as zRO18 in Coldstream which has potential for redevelopment. (252)</p> <p>Contributors (336) and (364) considers the policy to limit future employment land to the central hub areas and this disadvantages communities out-with the central hub and increases need to commute.</p> <p>Employment land review: Contributor (335) supports a review of employment land and requests a review of</p> | <p>inclusion in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>The MIR is moving forward from the Local Plan Amendment and identified two areas in the Borders where additional employment land is required.</p> <p>The sites in the employment land supply will offer a range and choice of sites throughout the Borders.</p> <p>Employment land review: The review of policy ED1 and the establishment of and employment land</p> | <p>to specific sites in the Central Borders should be presented as part of the report on the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>It is suggested that sites in the Western Borders are taken forward to the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>It is also suggested that a requirement related to the existing planning approval for site ACARD006 is added.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>existing employment land supply, and where no longer considered appropriate or marketable sites should be reallocated.</p> <p>Environmental comments: SEPA is satisfied that the preferred option to provide additional employment land at Tweedbank Industrial Estate and Whitehaugh will not give rise to any significant environmental effects. SEPA have not identified any issues in relation to the alternative site at Broomilees. (357)</p> <p>General comment: Development design and boundaries between employment and other uses would be important, as would the employment uses that will be permitted. (289)</p> <p>Transport: Traffic volumes needs to be assessed strategically. Requirement for overall strategy or Masterplan including timeline for completion of new crossing and upgrading of the existing road network needs to be defined (289)</p> | <p>hierarchy will identify a number of sites where mixed use development is encouraged.</p> <p>Environmental comments: Noted.</p> <p>General comment: The layout and location of specific uses on a mixed use site will be dealt with at planning application stage.</p> <p>Transport: Work is currently being undertaken to establish the best options for the location of a new crossing over the Tweed in Peebles. This includes assessment of traffic in the area. It should be noted that it is intended that a separate report on the issue of a new bridge for Peebles will be taken to the Environment and Infrastructure Committee in November 2012. It is intended that the Plan will be updated inline with the progress of the new bridge following the STAG 2 Report. Any</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Site specific comments: Support for Cardrona Employment Land (364)</p> <p>Whitehaugh area next to White Bridge is more suitable for employment land than South Parks, because of access, provided new crossing is focussed at the Eastern extremity of settlement area (289)</p> <p>Depending on exact line of new crossing it may still be appropriate to give consideration to Eshiels for employment use (289)</p> <p>Allocation for part employment would have fundamental impact on viability on residential development and level of contributions towards delivery of new bridge (297), (333)</p> <p>Land at South Parks/Edderston Road is not suitable for employment (229)</p> <p>Use and design of employment land to west and north of Horsbrugh Ford (MCARD006) must be such it does not deteriorate amenity</p> | <p>decision on the new bridge will be taken into the new Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Site specific comments: Support noted. Land at Cardrona is proposed for mixed use and this could include employment land.</p> <p>Support noted. The area next to White Bridge is included in the mixed use opportunity at Whitehaugh as included as a preferred option in the MIR.</p> <p>Support noted. Land at Eshiels has been assessed for employment land but is not seen as suitable.</p> <p>The level of contribution for the new bridge is not a material consideration when making a decision about sites inclusion/non-inclusion in the plan.</p> <p>Not accepted. Land at South Park/Edderston Road is allocated for employment in the Consolidated Local Plan and no changes will be proposed to remove the site.</p> <p>Noted. There is a planning application approved for development of ACARD006.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>of existing houses (289)</p> <p>Employment land in Jedburgh is satisfactory, it is hoped owners develop accordingly (296)</p> <p>Employment land should focus to compliment Waverley Line and allow for mixed use to add sustainability but should include Ettrick Riverside, Selkirk and area west of BGH should be for health related development only (316)</p> <p>Contributors (172) and (327) disagree with the alternative option.</p> | <p>Noted. The LDP can ensure availability of land for employment, but not guarantee that the land is developed within the plan period.</p> <p>Noted. Central Borders employment land portfolio includes a number of areas including Riverside, Selkirk. A study into future requirement for strategic sites in the Tweedbank/Melrose are will help to determine the approach to be taken into the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

MIXED USE

PREFERRED OPTION:

The establishment of an employment land hierarchy to more clearly identify those locations that should be retained solely for employment use, and those which may have potential for mixed (non-retail) use.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

Retention of the current policy position that protects all employment land from alternative or mixed use.

Question 5: Do you agree with the preferred option to establish an employment land hierarchy? Do you agree with the alternative option to retain the current policy position? Or do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| Economic Development | Employment Land Hierarchy | <p>A number of contributors have agreed with the approach of establishing an employment land hierarchy. (360, 335, 290, 368, 226, 342, 288, 316, 252, 289)</p> <p>Some of the responses have included detailed comments in relation to the establishment of a hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of Selkirk in agreed hierarchy (342) • Clearly define what employment land and mixed-use (non-retail) is (288) • Support mixed use to give employment centres sustainability (316) • Need for certain classes. Need for flexibility of allocations to meet market requirements (252) <p>Consider infrastructure capacity in Peebles (289)</p> <p>Regeneration sites: Other comments relate to preference of Mixed Use (94), and that the review should be broadened to consider regeneration opportunities. (285)</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The hierarchy will include all allocated employment sites and place them in different classes depending on their suitability for mixed use. It is recommended that policy ED1 will include the table with the sites within the hierarchy. The policy will also include the requirements for mixed use sites.</p> <p>Promoting mixed use sites is in line with national policy and gives an opportunity to create more sustainable areas with residential and non-retail employment activities.</p> <p>Infrastructure capacity issues are considered in the site allocation process.</p> <p>Regeneration sites: Regeneration sites already have a degree of flexibility when it comes to appropriate uses.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to include an employment land hierarchy in policy ED1 to identify sites with potential mixed use (non-retail) development.</p> <p>The hierarchy sets out the level of appropriate protection of employment land and provides an indication to where mixed use might be acceptable.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The area at Bridge Street, Galashiels was specifically mentioned because of the close proximity to the proposed railway station. (285)</p> <p>Work/life: Consultee (331) considers that today's market needs are not addressed, no acceptance of concept of work/life or small scale businesses in residential areas and mixed use in policy.</p> <p>Other comments relate to: Contributor (336) considers it important to encourage regeneration on former industrial/business areas but not at the expense of outlying communities.</p> <p>Flexibility within employment land in smaller towns to encourage retailing of goods manufactured on site to the general public. (296)</p> <p>Keep written policy instead of review and be clear and firm in assessment of any proposals.</p> | <p>The Council has produced an Urban Design Framework for Stirling Street, Galashiels. This sets out the vision for the development of the Stirling Street area including the proposed Transport Interchange, the town centre and the Gala Water Corridor. The area covered in the Supplementary Planning Guidance is allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan as zCR3 and zTI1.</p> <p>Work/life: Work/life and home working alternatives are addressed in the revised policy ED1 as residential development will be allowed on some employment sites as part of mixed use sites. Mixed use development can be part of regeneration of an area.</p> <p>Policy ED1 does not discourage regeneration of sites outwith the Strategic Development Areas.</p> <p>Policy ED1 sets out the position where retail would be acceptable in relation to employment land.</p> <p>Current policy includes presumption in favour of the retention of industrial and</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | (364) Contributor (135) is concerned that employment land could be lost for future employment uses. (135) | business use on strategic high amenity, strategic, district and local sites, including new land use proposals for employment land. This is to maintain a supply of employment land allocations in the Scottish Borders. | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY

PREFERRED OPTION:

A policy to be included in the Plan to require the provision of appropriate digital network infrastructure for new development.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

The requirement for digital network infrastructure alongside new development to continue to be 'ad hoc'.

Question 6: Do you agree with the preferred option to include a policy requiring the provision of digital network infrastructure in the LDP? Do you agree with the alternative option? Or do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------------|----------------------|--|---|--|
| Economic Development | Digital Connectivity | The contributor supports improvement of broadband and mobile phone coverage. (284) | Support noted. | It is proposed to pursue the preferred option to include a policy on the provision of digital infrastructure |
| Economic Development | Digital Connectivity | There is support for the preferred option presented in the Main Issues Report. (336,226, 290, 288, 342, 296, 331, 360, 316, | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree to include a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>94, 172, 289)</p> <p>Some of the responses have included detailed comments in relation to the inclusion of a new policy on provision of digital network infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any network must be sufficiently flexible to respond to windfall opportunities (342) • Digital network is an ever changing communication tool and all new methods needs to be embraced (296) • Fundamental to the future and would help development and support more live/working. Promoted by Scottish Government (331) • In principal support any measures aimed at the encouragement of digital infrastructure, although any policies will have to be carefully framed in order to avoid the risk of favouring investment in obsolescent technologies (360) • Digital network infrastructure should be rolled out across the Borders as soon as possible (316) • Essential, but would prefer “radio” i.e. non-tangible other than communications masts (94) • Agree, or alternatively only certain prescribed types of development are required to provide digital network infrastructure (172) • Where possible future proof and have | <p>The following is a general response to issues raised:</p> <p>A new policy within the Economic Development section of the LDP should be included to give developers and other stakeholders directions on what is required in relation to the provision of digital network infrastructure.</p> <p>Digital communication is a fast moving sector and to meet the challenges of future digital connectivity developers are together with major infrastructure providers encouraged to work with the Council to guarantee that new development in the Borders is future proofed in relation to digital connectivity.</p> <p>Currently fibre connection and broadband is only an aspirational standard in building regulations. A new policy on Digital Connectivity can help improve connectivity in the Borders.</p> | <p>new policy on Digital Connectivity in the Economic Development section of the LDP.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>spare capacity for future development (289)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy proposal is unclear. The infrastructure is the property and responsibility of telecommunication providers such as BT (350, 359, 358) • Unclear how developer can provide especially when main trunk infrastructure is not immediately available locally (358, 359) • Would be helpful if the policy was caveated along the lines of “whenever practicable...” (350) • Not appropriate to place onus on house building industry to provide/implement because of developer contributions and precarious economic situation (297, 333) • If proceeding with the Preferred Option the Council should make it clear that the Council and digital network providers to agree a solution to implementation (297, 333) • Target date of 2020 is not ambitious enough for a plan which is supposed to deliver economic growth. Overall objective should be brought forward and significant effort put into finding mechanisms to deliver it (355) | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

HOUSING

HOUSING LAND SUPPLY – SCALE

PREFERRED OPTION:

The scale and broad location of additional housing land should be in line with that set out in the SDP.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

The scale of additional housing land should be increased from that set out in the SDP.

Question 7: Do you agree with the preferred option for the scale of additional housing land in the LDP? Do you agree with the alternative option? Or do you have an alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Housing Land | Question 7 Preferred Option (Support) | <p>The contributor agrees with the preferred option. (364, 275, 276)</p> <p>Some of the responses agree with the preferred option but have provided additional comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contributor agrees with the preferred option subject to the Council continuing to monitor the rate of potential housing development and respond to signs of improvement in the economy. Increased numbers of economically-active residents will support commercial and social facilities | <p>Support noted. The Proposed Plan should identify land to meet the housing requirement set by SESplan following Examination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support and comments noted. The Council will continue to monitor housing land supply and development through the annual Housing Land Audit. | <p>It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward.</p> <p>The general approach proposed is to carry forward all existing undeveloped allocations within</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | | <p>and support sustainable development. (290)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees with the preferred option subject to the formal examination of the SESplan Proposed Plan. The contributor suggests clarification and research is needed on the future needs of the community i.e family homes or single person homes, more sheltered housing? (288) • The contributor agrees with the preferred option subject to the following observations - SBC is urged to be prepared to respond to eventual economic recovery and identify appropriate housing land for residents who are key to supporting the business, social and sustainable networks of the Borders. Also a formally recognised line for the Selkirk by-pass will enable suitable land to be allocated for longer term development. (342) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support noted. The Council regularly undertake a Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA) which provides robust evidence to inform policies aimed at providing the right mix of housing across the whole housing market. • Support and comments noted. The scale of new housing allocations has been set by the SESplan Proposed Plan. Policy 6 of the Plan serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. The potential line for Selkirk by-pass is identified in the current adopted Local Plan and this will be continued into the Proposed Plan. However, it should be noted that there is no commitment on behalf of either the Scottish Government or Transport Scotland to the delivery of the bypass, and it is only at that stage that an agreed line would be identified. | <p>the Consolidated Local Plan.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees with the preferred option. The contributor would like the housing requirement for the Western SDA and Northern HMA to be consolidated to a finalised total. The contributor acknowledges there is pressure for development in Peebles and would like this to be controlled and alternative housing options considered. (368) • The contributor supports an element of new housing land being allocated outwith SDAs and endorses the provision of 80 units outwith SDA areas. The contributor has put forward sites to meet this requirement. (275, 276) • The contributor states that historic allocations that have not come forward through previous plans are carefully considered to establish whether they are deliverable in the LDP timeframe. Only by ensuring this can confidence be had that the LDP sets out a robust and deliverable land use strategy. (275, 276) • The contributor agrees with the preferred | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and comments noted. The outputs of the spatial strategy assessment exercise undertaken by SESplan have been developed into the Strategic Development Area (SDA) approach. Therefore the housing requirement will be shown by SDAs within the LDP. Alternative housing options have been considered within Peebles and those presented within the MIR are considered the most suitable for development. • Support and comments noted. • The Council undertakes an annual Housing Land Audit that monitors the effectiveness of housing land. This will continue to be used to assess the appropriate allocations in the plan. Existing housing allocations within the Consolidated Local Plan which remain undeveloped will be carried forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan. • Support and comments noted. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>option for the scale and broad location of housing land supply to be in line with that set out in the SDP. The contributor states due to the number of objections to the housing section in the SESplan Proposed Plan this is an issue which needs to remain flexible to accommodate changes by the Reporter at Examination. (180)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor does not object to the preferred option for the scale and broad location of additional housing in line with the SDP. Although any increase made during the SESplan Examination should be distributed as per the SESplan Spatial Strategy. (103) • In relation to the preferred option, the contributor is in agreement that the broad location of additional housing land should be in line with the SDP. (334) | <p>Paragraph 5.22 of the MIR acknowledges that the housing requirement may be subject to changes following the SESplan Examination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and comments noted. • Support and comments noted. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 Preferred Option (Object) | <p>The contributor disagrees with the preferred option and states there is a need to identify additional housing land opportunities within the Western Borders area to ensure that the demand in Peebles is met in full and a generous supply is provided in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy. (199) 1 of 2</p> <p>The contributor does not believe that sufficient land has been allocated to tie the supply-scale up with the supply sites. (316)</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain</p> | <p>It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|
| | | | economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 Preferred & Alternative Option (Object) | The contributor disagrees with the preferred and alternative option. There is no evidence to support either the scale or location of the allocations proposed. The contributor states construction has restarted in other areas within SESplan but there is little evidence of demand for new housing in the Central Borders. (172) | Comments noted. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Question 7 Alternative Option (Support) | The contributor agrees with the alternative option (105, 123, 336, 311) Some of the responses agree with the alternative option but have provided additional | Comments noted. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees with the alternative option. The provision of further housing will allow for regeneration for the region, economic growth and allow the housing market needs to be met. (252) • The contributor agrees with the alternative option and suggests anyone who is prepared to invest in the current economic climate should be actively encouraged. (226, 2 of 2) • The contributor does not agree with the preferred option and agrees with the alternative option. The distribution of sites should not be focused on SDAs allowing other towns and settlements to accommodate more organic growth. Site must be chosen to reflect local circumstances and proactively resolve known issues. (345) • The contributor states the alternative option should be the preferred option and the scale of housing land should be increased from that set out in the SDP. (274) • The contributor supports the alternative option that the scale of housing should be increased from that set out in the SDP. (335) • The contributor supports the alternative option. The contributor considers the 100 units required for the Western SDA is too | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. • Comments noted. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The | <p>forward.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>low. The Council's Housing Land Audit shows almost half of the sites allocated and/or with planning consent will not come forward in the next 5 years and are not effective. SPP sets out that a supply of effective land for at least 5 years should be maintained in orders to ensure continuous supply of land. (326)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributors support the alternative option and suggest the scale of additional housing land to be increased from the allowances identified within the SESplan Proposed Plan. The contributor states by maximising the number and choice of development opportunities which can be delivered it will promote economic development. (300, 302, 304, 306, 308, 309) • The contributor suggests there is a housing land shortfall of at least 2,814 homes from 2009-2024 in the Scottish Borders and has submitted a detailed assessment of the housing land shortfall. The contributor states the proposed development strategy is inadequate and the proposed housing allocations are insufficient. Therefore further housing sites need to be identified in the period 2019-2024. (311) • The contributor states the shortfall has arisen due to three factors. Firstly, due to the housing land requirement for the Borders to 2024 is not stated and | <p>SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is vital that SESplan provides enough land to cater for any eventuality in future house building trends. SESplan provides a suitable level of housing to | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>substantiated in the SESplan Proposed Plan. Secondly the scale of effective housing land set out in SESplan is substantially higher as it does not accord with PAN2/2010. Thirdly the Housing Land Audit process is overly optimistic about actual levels of completions on short term sites. (311)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees with the broad location of additional housing however the scale should be in line with the alternative option that being increased from that set out in the SDP. (334) | <p>accommodate future trends but while a level of delivery has been identified, based on the 2010 Housing Land Audits, this is only an estimate of what might happen. The policy provides the mechanism for the re phasing of housing land to take place should market recovery begin to take place at a faster rate than anticipated. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP and LDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase.</p> | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | <p>The contributor states Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) requires the provision of a generous supply of housing land providing a range and choice of sites. SPP requires councils to have regard to effectiveness when allocating sites and sites deemed non-effective should be removed from the plan. (336)</p> | <p>Comments noted. In the current economic climate there may be challenging circumstances around the delivery of some existing allocations. These sites have been through lengthy and comprehensive consultation exercises and remain key elements of the SDP development strategy. It is therefore appropriate to include these existing levels of supply in the Plan and not replace or augment existing housing provision with further large housing land requirements.</p> <p>The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous</p> | <p>It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | The contributor accepts the need set out in the SDP. However considers the annual completion rate of 487 units in 2010 is not a true reflection of the trend post 2007. This trend will continue for some years as result of various factors including lack of development finance, availability of mortgages and declining sales. A market assessment of deliverability of the identified land is required as the cumulative impact of the economic downturn is to compress the undeveloped supply within a delivery period that is unachievable. A very thorough examination of deliverability of all sites in the projected housing land supply is needed. The result of which will provide a true picture of effective supply which can then address the issue as to whether this is in line with the SDP or it should be increased. (331) | Comments noted. The Council monitor housing land supply and development through the annual Housing Land Audit (HLA). The annual completion rate has averaged at 593 completions over the five year period covering 2007-2011. The sites within the audit are reviewed annually and programmed accordingly. The current economic downturn has been taken into account when programming sites within the HLA which feeds into the housing land calculations. However, a key issue that must be taken into account is the scope of the house building industry to deliver new development. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>Housing Land</p> | <p>Question 7 (General)</p> | <p>The contributor considers a relaxed view has been taken in the MIR which states there is a generous supply of land for housing. This does not automatically equate to housing land coming forward timeously to deliver new houses on the ground. (297, 333)</p> <p>The contributor refers to a letter from Jim Mackinnon of 29 October 2010 which reiterates that Scottish Ministers continue to place a strong emphasis on the provision of new housing and therefore maintain a supply of land in the right places and free of constraints. (297, 333)</p> <p>In the changed economic climate, maintaining a five year land supply will require a flexible and realistic approach. Constraints may have to be reassessed and the deliverability of sites reconsidered. (297, 333, 336)</p> <p>The contributor makes reference to Homes for Scotland and who have advised that some sites are impossible to progress for a variety of reasons and many sites are now controlled by banks who are unlikely to bring them to the market in current conditions. The contributor therefore questions the assumption made in the MIR that there is a generous supply of housing land and this supply with automatically lead to housing delivery. (297, 333)</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation.</p> <p>It is vital that SESplan provides enough land to cater for any eventuality in future house building trends. SESplan provides a suitable level of housing to accommodate future trends but while a level of delivery has been identified, based on the 2010 Housing Land Audits, this is only an estimate of what might happen. The policy provides the mechanism for the re phasing of housing land to take place should market recovery begin to take place at a faster rate than anticipated. The policy</p> | <p>It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward.</p> |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP and LDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | The contributor seeks clarification on what 50 units mean, does this mean 50 houses or 50 building sites. (288) | The term 'units' refers to the number of individual houses being allocated. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | <p>The contributor states much of the existing supply did not deliver housing development at the peak of the housing markets and by adopting a low growth strategy as within the SESplan SDP it runs the risk of stifling the housing market and hindering recovery. There is strong possibility that the SESplan strategy will be subject to significant change following examination and the LDP team should be ready to make adjustments. (334)</p> <p>The proposed expansion at Newtown St Boswells represents a large proportion of the 7,000 housing supply in the Central Borders SDA which has not yet and is unlikely to deliver anything in the foreseeable future. (334)</p> <p>In line with SPP sufficient flexibility must be factored into the development plan to allow for maintenance of an effective land supply should changes in the housing market occur. (334)</p> | <p>Comments noted. In the current economic climate there may be challenging circumstances around the delivery of some existing allocations. These sites have been through lengthy and comprehensive consultation exercises and remain key elements of the SDP development strategy. It is therefore appropriate to include these existing levels of supply in the Plan and not replace or augment existing housing provision with further large housing land requirements.</p> <p>Policy 6 of the SESplan Proposed Plan serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. It is vital that SESplan provides enough land to cater for any eventuality in future house building trends. SESplan provides a suitable level of housing to accommodate future trends but while a level of delivery has been identified, based on the 2010 Housing Land Audits, this is</p> | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | In the event of the scale of growth proposed by SESplan does not change following the outcome of the examination, the LDP should be drafted with in-built flexibility to allow for a continuous supply of effective land should the existing supply not deliver as forecast. This could be done by increasing the capacity of effective where possible or by identify additional sites. (334) | only an estimate of what might happen. The policy provides the mechanism for the re phasing of housing land to take place should market recovery begin to take place at a faster rate than anticipated. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP and LDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | The contributor duly notes and supports the use of the most recent housing land supply data updating the position from 2010 as used in the SDP. (334) | Support and comments noted. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | The contributor states that any masterplan process for large development sites should encourage sport and physical recreation. The demand for sports facilities should be considered, the sportscotland's Facility Planning Model can assist in assessing the demand along with pitch and facilities strategies. (202) The contributor emphasises the importance for new development to align with the guidance set out in Designing Places and Designing Streets. New development should incorporate existing and provide for new walking and cycling infrastructure. (202) | Comments noted. Policy BE6 Protection of Open Space is the primary policy in relation to the protection of outdoor sports facilities and amenity opens spaces. This is supported by policy Inf12 Public Infrastructure and Local Service Provision which encourages the retention and improvements to public infrastructure and local services. Supplementary planning guidance including Designing Places and Designing Streets is taken into account when producing masterplans, planning briefs and considering planning applications. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | The contributor states the housing section is based on the SESplan Proposed Plan which is | The MIR was based upon the SESplan Proposed Plan housing requirement. The | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|--|--|---|
| | | subject to Examination and change. The contributor details their objections to the SESplan Proposed Plan. (350) | SESplan Proposed Plan is now at Examination and this will consider the issue of future housing land requirement across the SESplan area. Because the Local Development Plan requires to conform to the SESplan Strategic Development Plan, the finalisation of the housing supply within the Proposed Local Development should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination. This is anticipated in spring of 2013. It is therefore proposed that the finalisation of the housing land supply within the Local Development Plan should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination, and be subject of the report to Council on the overall content of the Proposed Local Development Plan in spring 2013. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 (General) | The contributor states whilst the 200 units for Central Borders are currently apportioned to the 2019-2024 period there is scope to bring this allocation forward into the first period of the LDP. This would ensure a deliverable land supply should programming and feasibility issues with a number of larger sites restrict output. Opportunity should be taken to ensure an adequate effective land supply is facilitated on fresh sites, free of pre-recession land contracts. (332) | Comments noted. It should be noted there is no identified housing need for the Scottish Borders during the period 2019-2024. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | |
| Housing Land | Question 7 – Western SDA | <p>The contributor states the scale of housing land release of 100 units in the Western SDA is agreeable. The contributor states flexibility should be built in to enable any future changes (anticipated upward changes) to be accommodated rather than resisted. (229)</p> <p>The contributor suggests amending the housing land requirement as follows: Western SDA – 150 units, Eastern SDA –100 units, Central SDA – 100 units. (94)</p> <p>The contributor is disappointed at the scale of the housing requirement in the Western SDA. The contributor considers this to be lacking in ambition for the area which has greater development potential. As the SESplan Proposed Plan is not yet approved, the contributor suggests the Council take a proactive step to addressing the housing need within the LDP. The LDP should be progressed once the SESplan land supply requirements have been clarified. (235)</p> | The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

HOUSING LAND SUPPLY – SITES

PREFERRED OPTION:

The preferred sites for additional housing land as set out in Appendix A.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

Other possible sites for additional housing are set out in Appendix A.

Question 8: Do you agree with the preferred options for additional housing sites in Appendix A? Do you agree with any of the alternative options? Or do you have other alternative options?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Housing Land | Question 8 Preferred Option (Support) | <p>Some of the responses have included detailed comments in relation to question 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contributor agrees with the preferred option subject to encouragement of prompt development of gap sites and emerging gap sites. (290) The contributor agrees with any proposal to create additional housing sites to generate business and employment in the current economic climate. (226, 2 of 2) The contributor agrees there is a need for further housing. As a minimum those sites presently allocated for redevelopment need to be carried forward as they have potential to provide housing. Flexibility is important to | <p><i>Support noted and comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>allow an appropriate form of development to be sought for each site, dependent on market conditions and site constraints. (252)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees with the preferred option subject to the following observation – to encourage prompt development of gap sites as identified in Appendix A, other greenfield sites and housing land for residents who are key to supporting the business, social and sustainable networks of the Borders. (342) • The contributor has provided site specific comments in relation to the housing sites in Appendix A2. The contributor is satisfied that the majority of preferred housing options will not give rise to any significant environmental effects. (357) | <p><i>housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> | |
| Housing Land | Question 8 Preferred Option (Object) | <p>The contributor does not agree with the preferred option. (335)</p> <p>Some of the responses object to the preferred option and have provided additional comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor disagrees with the preferred option stating housing allocations should reflect market demand. (336) • The contributor does not agree with the preferred option. Restricting new housing development is suggested as a means of limiting commuting but does nothing to | <p>Comments noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. The SDP considers the question of housing requirements and market considers in setting the allowances for the SESplan area. • Comments noted. The MIR allocates housing land to meet the requirement set out in the SDP. The LDP aims include promoting strategically important | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>address any existing issues. The LDP should be used as a tool to foster positive change, by creating the conditions for enhanced local services, business opportunities and community enterprise. (345)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor raises concerns regarding sites at Netherbarns, Galashiels, Birks View, Galashiels and Hawick. (332) • The contributor does not object to any of the preferred options in Appendix A. The contributor is of the view the SDP housing requirement is likely to increase and therefore additional sites will be required. (180) | <p>business opportunities, encouraging better connectivity, and protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. The responses to these sites are detailed in the individual settlement section of the response matrix. <p><i>Support and comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | <i>principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i> | |
| Housing Land | Question 8 Alternative Option (Support) | The contributors prefer other alternative options for the supply of housing land. The contributor proposes sites for development in Chirnside, Kelso and Greenlaw which the contributor states are deliverable in the short term and are free from constraints. (300, 302, 304, 306, 308, 309) The contributor supports identification of alternative sites for advancement through the preparation of the LDP. (276) | <i>Comments noted. The responses to these sites are detailed in the individual settlement section of the response matrix.</i> | <i>No further action required.</i> |
| Housing Land | Question 8 (General) | The contributor raises concerns that there is no mention of the proposed housing land at the Old High School in Eyemouth. Sites which have been identified need to be agreed with those local communities directly affected. (288) | Comments noted. The Former High School, Eyemouth is allocated as a redevelopment opportunity in the Consolidated Local Plan. As part of the MIR the site area has been increased to include land to the west of the site. A map of the site is included in Appendix A4 of the MIR. A planning brief has been produced for the Former Eyemouth High School site which was subject to public consultation. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site continues to be identified for redevelopment within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Housing Land | Question 8 (General) | The contributor states the next step in identifying land would be to look in the | <i>Comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a</i> | <i>It is recommended</i> |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>constrained supply for potentially effective land as well as identifying possible additions to the land supply. The contributor suggests all proposed allocations in Appendix A would be required and should be allocated to ensure a generous supply. (350)</p> | <p><i>housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas. As part of the LDP process the Council has considered both brownfield and greenfield options for development.</i></p> | <p><i>that the Council agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option.</i></p> |
| Housing Land | Question 8 (General) | The contributor states the preferred sites do not currently provide an additional 200 units as | <i>Comments noted. A housing technical note was produced as a background</i> | <i>It is recommended</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>per the SESplan requirement. (332)</p> | <p><i>paper of the MIR. This technical note updated the housing land supply from the 2010 data which was used to calculate the housing requirement within the SDP. The technical note details the number of additional units contributing to the land supply through approved planning applications since 31st March 2010. The Central SDA included an additional 78 units which contribute towards the 200 unit requirement. The preferred sites have a total site capacity of 165. Therefore the additional units plus the preferred sites totals 243, exceeding the 200 unit requirement. This position has been further updated following publication of the approved SESplan. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At</i></p> | <p><i>that the Council agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option.</i></p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------|--|--|---|
| | | | 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas. | |
| Housing Land | Question 8 | The contributor suggests all additional housing sites are to be brownfield. (94) | Comments noted. Brownfield land is the first consideration when identifying additional sites. As a result of limited land availability there is pressure of greenfield land for development, especially in areas where demand for housing is high. The Council therefore seeks to allocate brownfield sites as a redevelopment priority. The MIR identifies regeneration opportunities across the Borders which are suitable for a variety of uses including housing and employment. | It is recommended that the Council agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option. |
| Housing Land | Question 8 | The contributor suggests there is a housing land shortfall of at least 2,814 homes from 2009-2024 in the Scottish Borders. The | Comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole | It is recommended that the Council |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>contributor states the sites proposed in Appendix A are insufficient to meet the housing land shortfall and argues a generous land supply has not been provided. The contributor suggests the sites in Appendix A should be allocated in the short term. Then further sites would be required to meet any residual housing land shortfall up to 2024. (311)</p> <p>The contributor states the sites considered are required to be effective and capable of development during the plan period and meet the tests of effectiveness set out in PAN 2/2010. (311)</p> | <p><i>of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> | <p><i>agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option.</i></p> |
| Housing Land | Question 8 | <p>The contributor states that to evaluate whether the proposed allocations are sufficient to maintain a 5 years land supply at all times, the Council must programme the expected annual delivery and test whether this meets the</p> | <p>The housing sites allocated within the Proposed Plan will be capable of delivery during the 2019-2024 time period.</p> | <p>No changes recommended.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | housing land requirement. (311) | | |
| Housing Land | Question 8 – Western SDA | The contributor states there is greater demand for housing in Peebles than that outlined by SESplan of 100 units and the overall level of housing provision should be increased. (199) 1 of 2 | <i>Comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council’s annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were ‘effective’ or ‘potentially effective’ with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to take forward the Proposed Plan on the basis of the preferred option.</i> |

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PREFERRED OPTION:

That the baseline requirement for affordable housing should continue to be 25 per cent.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

That the baseline requirement for affordable housing should be reviewed to take into account the current economic downturn.

Question 9: Do you agree that the baseline requirement for affordable housing should continue at the level of 25 per cent? Do you agree with the alternative option? Or do you have other alternative options?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------|--|---|---|--|
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing (Preferred Option - Support) | <p>The contributor supports the preferred option. (103, 172, 180, 229, 290, 342, 368)</p> <p>Some of the responses agree with the preferred option but have provided additional comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contributor agrees with the baseline requirement of 25% although the Council should consider alternative mechanisms for bringing forward affordable housing. (336). The contributor agrees with a minimum baseline of 25% requirement if not more. (288) The contributor states the baseline requirement is acceptable provided there is flexibility where local circumstances dictate. | <p>Support noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support and comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need for 25%. | <p>It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Where infrastructure or abnormal development costs are excessive a lower level of contributions may be appropriate. (345)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees the baseline requirement for affordable housing should remain at 25% but should be subject to a consideration of its implications on development viability. The contributor states for the Council to have a successful approach to its affordable housing policy then it should adopt a number of principles of good practice drawn from working practices within Councils across Scotland, the contributor details these principles within their response. (311) • The contributor has no difficulty with a policy target of 25%, although resources are limited and the target has to be negotiable. Viability of developments should not be threatened by unrealistic requirements and where developments cannot sustain 25% affordable housing then planning authorities are expected to be flexible and realistic. (350) • The contributor supports the preferred option. However if sufficient isn't done to meet the underlying need the contributor suggests the baseline figure should be increased to nearer 50%. The contributor suggests there should be no ghettoisation of affordable housing. (130) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of affordable housing is a policy requirement. • Support and comments noted. • The Council has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Placemaking and Design to encourage good design and sustainable development in the Borders. This SPG relates to all tenures including affordable housing to ensure a cohesive mix of | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | tenures and avoid the creation of social segregation. | |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | <p>Developers and landowners need to be encouraged to build better quality affordable housing for sale or rent; this could include a specific land allocation or encouraging land owners to come forward with sensible proposals. (336)</p> <p>Councils should make it easier for developers to build quality affordable housing in sustainable locations. (336)</p> | The Council has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Placemaking and Design to encourage good design and sustainable development in the Borders. This SPG relates to all housing tenures including affordable housing. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | The contributor concurs with the difficulty in delivering affordable housing as a result of current funding restrictions. The SDP reaffirms the 25% benchmark, promoted as the preferred LDP approach. (135) | Comments noted. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | The contributor does not think any deterrents should be put in front of anyone willing to invest in the Borders region. (226, 2 of 2) | Comments noted. The provision of affordable housing is a policy requirement. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | The contributor states public resources to subsidise affordable housing are limited and delivery is more important than policy targets. The contributor suggests the Council revise its SPG to reflect the new realities of funding. (350) | Comments noted. The Council's Affordable Housing SPG is regularly reviewed and necessary changes made where considered appropriate. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable | The contributor raises concerns in relation to affordable housing in rural communities. The | Comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable | It is recommended to take the |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | Housing | demand for rural housing is such that it is difficult for young people on low wages to stay in rural communities. As a result the demography of rural communities is becoming increasingly biased towards the older end and where there are rural jobs there can be a shortage of local labour. The contributor suggests a more innovative approach to development in rural locations where affordable housing is linked to small industrial/work units for example. (355) | housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need for 25%. | preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | The contributor states affordable housing contributions need to be agreed on a site by site basis. Flexibility is especially important when it is known there are growth areas within the Scottish Borders with high infrastructure costs. The contributor states the LDP should set an affordable housing figure for each Housing Market Area based on an up to date housing needs assessment. (358, 359) | Comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need for 25%. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | The contributor suggests affordable housing should be adjacent to public transport links. (94) | Comments noted. Affordable housing will be located in areas where there is an identified need. Where possible such housing will be sustainable in relation energy efficient design and connections to the public transport network. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing | The contributor suggests that the percentage of affordable housing is area specific rather than a straight percentage across the board and based on accurate audits. (316) | Comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | for 25%. | |
| Housing Land | Question 9 - Affordable Housing (Alternative Option - Support) | <p>The contributor supports the alternative option. (105)</p> <p>Some of the responses agree with the alternative option but have provided additional comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor strongly disagrees with the preferred option and agrees with the alternative option. Any affordable housing contribution needs to take into account market circumstances at the time. Without viability being assessed development of any kind is threatened. (252) • The contributor states that the 25% baseline for affordable housing has made sites uneconomic to develop. The contributor suggests lowering the requirement on a temporary basis until the housing market returns to normal. The contributor suggests a baseline of 10% which is reviewed on an annual basis with a view to raising it back to 25% as the housing market returns to normal. (98) • The contributor believes that the affordable housing baseline requirement should be reduced to 15%. The contributors consider that this will reduce the burden on developers and encourage development. The contributors also states that due to the current economic conditions, market | <p>Comments noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need for 25%. • Comments noted. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor states the LDP should make allowance for the provision of reduced levels of both affordable housing and other developer contributions where this would impact upon the financial viability of development opportunities. (334) • The contributor states whilst the LDP anticipates a 25% affordable housing requirement there is no evidence as to how this will be delivered outwith the SDA's. The contributor states the requirement should reflect the current economic restraints however further consideration needs to be given to the delivery of affordable housing. Housing provision for local people is preferable. The requirement for any affordable housing policy should be evidence based. (274) • The contributor acknowledges the current economic climate brings challenges in securing a 25% contribution from developers. The contributor refers to the letter from the Chief Planner of 15 March 2011 which called upon authorities to consider whether contributions of 25% remain deliverable, and how far affordable housing needs can be met with little or no public subsidy. It is unhelpful to maintain | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. • Comments noted. • Comments noted. | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>requirements that deter development from happening at all. (339)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contributor states the Council should acknowledge there is a range of options for delivering affordable housing some rely on less or no public subsidy and can be promoted by developers. Therefore the Council has to explicitly acknowledge that these all contribute to meeting needs, widening choice and promoting diversity in the housing stock. (350) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. Details of the options for delivering affordable housing are included within the Affordable Housing SPG. | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

General comments relating to Housing

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------------------|-----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| Developer Contributions | General | The contributor suggests more creative approaches to developer contributions should be considered such as the provision of affordable business space. (345) | Comments noted. The Developer Contributions SPG is subject to periodic review and suggestions such as this can be addressed at that time. | No changes recommended. |
| Developer Contributions | General | <p>The contributor states the MIR must consider in conjunction with the development industry how to manage the lack of supply of finance to the house building industry and seek alternative methodologies which will produce housing completions. (358, 359)</p> <p>The contributor considers that to facilitate development in the short term alternative funding mechanisms must be sought and sites which will not incur prohibitive infrastructure or developer contributions should be allocated</p> | Comments noted. The MIR acknowledges the challenging economic climate of the past five years. Constrained sites are mainly categorised as such due to the inability of the market to bring them forward for development. At the current time there is normally no inherent problem with the individual sites and issues normally revolve around developer finance. Therefore they should continue to be included as part of the housing land supply and as the Scottish Government | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| | | and promoted. This means smaller sites in or on the edge of existing settlements. (358, 359) | highlighted, if the impediment to delivery is the development and mortgage finance and low levels of demand in the market, then this does not justify the allocation of further or replacement housing sites. | |
| Earlston | General | The contributor states that concerns have previously been raised by Transport Scotland regarding the level of development in Earlston and have objected to any future sites. The contributor states that it was understood that the Council would undertake an appropriate transport appraisal and masterplanning during the next review of the Plan. The contributor seeks confirmation that this will now be undertaken to ensure that any potential trunk road interventions needed to support sites will be included within the Proposed Plan and how they will be delivered. (339) | Comments noted. It is still the intention to carry out a masterplan for the longer term site on the extreme eastern side of Earlston. Transport Scotland would be consulted on this work. However the MIR does not identify any short term housing land within Earlston and therefore Transport Scotland's comments are not considered an issue at this point in time. The only new proposed allocation in Earlston is a regeneration site at Halcombe Fields which already has an existing use which generates a degree of traffic. | No changes recommended. |
| Georgefield, Earlston | SEARL006 | The contributor would like to re-iterate their support for a longer term site at Georgefield, Earlston which is allocated in the Consolidated Local Plan. Recognition should also be given to the opportunity to bring forward land identified for later phases earlier than currently envisaged due to the need to maintain a five year land supply. (358, 359) | Support noted. This site is an existing allocation within the Consolidated Local Plan. The site is identified as an area for potential longer term mixed use development. | The general approach proposed is to carry forward all existing undeveloped allocations within the Consolidated Local Plan. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor believes the housing land supply has been understated. The contributor believes the preferred strategy should be to plan for recovery but with a flexibility | Comments noted. Policy 6 of the SESplan Proposed Plan serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. It is vital that | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------|--|--|---|
| | | allowance of a further 30%.Therefore further consideration needs to be given to the overall housing land supply target for the Borders, appropriate locations for development, the criteria for selecting and assessing alternative sites and the need to support and expand the rural economy. (358, 359) | SESplan provides enough land to cater for any eventuality in future house building trends. SESplan provides a suitable level of housing to accommodate future trends but while a level of delivery has been identified, based on the 2010 Housing Land Audits, this is only an estimate of what might happen. The policy provides the mechanism for the re phasing of housing land to take place should market recovery begin to take place at a faster rate than anticipated. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP and LDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. | Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor is concerned that the redefinition of the Housing Market Areas, the SPG on 'Countryside Around Towns', pressure from the anti-development lobby and a political desire to use housing to stabilise towns outwith the travel distance to the stations will result in land allocations being made too far from the rail stations to benefit from it or support it. (358, 359) | Comments noted. Although it is acknowledged there are some constraints to be addressed for new development within the Central Housing Market Area near the railway terminals, it is considered there remains an adequate choice of appropriate housing land supply within their proximity. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor reference to similar objections to the to the Glasgow and Clyde Valley SDP which resulted in housing requirements for all tenures being set out by LDP area and treating land supply from the most recent audits as 'preliminary and indicative' | Comments noted. Policy 6 of the SESplan Proposed Plan serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. It is vital that SESplan provides enough land to cater for any eventuality in future house building | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | <p>indications of supply to be verified in the LDPs. The Reporters also made it clear that generosity and flexibility were required and should the effective land supply fall to below five years then land from later time periods could be brought forward or additional sites identified. The contributor states similar changes maybe required to the SESplan housing section which would mean using the HoNDA gross demand figures set against only the known effective supply from the most recent audit plus completions from 2009. The contributor states in their estimation this would show only a marginal surplus of sites over requirement to 2019, based on its view of the 2011 audit. (350, 358, 359)</p> <p>The contributor finds it unfortunate that the Council continues to disregard the industry's input into the audit resulting in substantial differences in view as to the effective supply. (350, 358, 359)</p> | <p>trends. SESplan provides a suitable level of housing to accommodate future trends but while a level of delivery has been identified, based on the 2010 Housing Land Audits, this is only an estimate of what might happen. The policy provides the mechanism for the re phasing of housing land to take place should market recovery begin to take place at a faster rate than anticipated. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP and LDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase.</p> <p>The Council welcomes any developer input into the Housing Land Audit (HLA) process. In relation to the HLA the Council can not reasonably take a view in relation to sites that are effective in terms of PAN 2/2010 as to which will come forward through the development process. A site is effective under the terms of the PAN if it can be developed within the programme period.</p> | |
| Housing Land | Affordable Housing | <p>The contributor states the lack of affordable housing in terms of quantity and quality is a continuing issue and should be addressed by quotas in developments, the percentage of which should be negotiated according to site specific circumstance. (351)</p> | <p>Comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need</p> | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | for 25%. | |
| Housing Land | Affordable Housing (Western SDA) | In the Western SDA, especially the Peebles area, the contributor considers that a higher baseline than 25% is required. As there are already many unsellable large houses in the area and a shortage of affordable houses. (289) The contributor proposes that the level of affordable housing should be increased to 35%. In West Linton there is a shortage of affordable housing. (118) | Comments noted. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and the SDP include an affordable housing benchmark figure of 25%. The benchmark was given detailed consideration as part of the Affordable Housing SPG and this confirmed a need for 25%. | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |
| Housing Land | Appendix A2 | The contributor suggests that housing allocations are assessed to establish scope for mixed use. (364) | Comments noted. Mixed use would be encouraged on large scale housing sites. Although this will be assessed on a site by site basis and included within the site requirements where appropriate. | No change recommended. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states it would be difficult to assess how the alternative approach could be consistent with the SDP unless it is intended to promote such additional housing land through the provisions of SDP policy 7, i.e. small scale and outwith the SDAs. It would be helpful to state this if it is the intention. (135) The contributor suggests it would have been useful if the MIR had listed how the SDP requirements would be met both through the preferred housing sites but also how the alternative sites may contribute. It would appear the separately identified preferred sites when totalled exceed the SDP | Comments noted. In effect, the identification of alternative sites provides flexibility to the Council in meeting any possible revisions to the housing allowances within SESplan as a consequence of the Examination into the Proposed Plan. Comments noted. A housing technical note has been produced as a background paper of the MIR. This technical note updates the housing land supply from the 2010 data which was used to calculate the housing requirement within the SDP. The technical note details the number of | No change recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | requirement for the Eastern SDA and do not meet the requirement in the Central or Western SDA (although it may be proposed this shortfall is made up by additional capacity on existing sites as set out in the Technical Report rather than the MIR, however the contributor considers this to be unclear. (135) | additional units contributing to the land supply through approved planning applications since 31 st March 2010. The Central SDA included an additional 78 units which contribute towards the 200 unit requirement and the Western SDA an additional 46 units which counts towards the 100 unit requirement. Therefore the additional units plus the preferred sites meet the housing land requirement. | |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states by setting out how the SDP requirements could be met would clarify the likely LDP Proposed Plan Strategy. (135) | Comments noted. The allocations to meet the SDP housing requirement are detailed in Appendix A2 of the MIR. A housing technical note has been produced as a background paper to the MIR, this technical note details the housing calculations and explains how the preferred sites meet the SDP requirement. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor considers it wrong for the LDP to rely wholly on SESplan as the content is uncertain and may be subject to major changes. The contributor considers the provision of housing land is at best modest compared to the requisite provision of a 'generous' supply outlined in Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). (274) The MIR is flawed as it cannot reflect the likely changes to housing land supply that will evolve through consideration of the SDP. Most significantly it does not provide for a generous housing land supply. (274) | Comments noted. The MIR was based upon the SESplan Proposed Plan housing requirement. The SESplan Proposed Plan is now at Examination and this will consider the issue of future housing land requirement across the SESplan area. Because the Local Development Plan requires to conform to the SESplan Strategic Development Plan, the finalisation of the housing supply within the Proposed Local Development should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination. This is anticipated in spring of 2013. It is therefore proposed that the finalisation of | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | <p>The element of choice in tenure and location is fundamental to SPP. In the case of Stow the LDP fails to deliver in its current form by not providing land for mainstream or affordable housing as set out in the main aims of the LDP. The contributor objects to no housing land being proposed in Stow. In a community with the provision of a rail halt this is at odds with Government's sustainable development agenda. (274)</p> <p>Although housing will be focused in SDAs consideration must be given to housing in other locations particularly where a rail halt is provided. (274)</p> <p>It is not for the Council to speculate on the current or future economic position they are obliged to provide a 5 year housing land supply at any given time. (274)</p> | <p>the housing land supply within the Local Development Plan should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination, and be subject of the report to Council on the overall content of the Proposed Local Development Plan in spring 2013.</p> <p>Comments noted. A number of sites have been assessed outwith the SDAs, the sites within the MIR have been assessed as the most suitable. A housing site at Craigend Road, Stow was recently allocated within the Local Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Comments noted. Sites have also been identified within the MIR located outwith the SDAs.</p> <p>Comments noted. The provision of site allocations to meet the SESplan requirements is intended to achieve this.</p> | |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor raises concerns regarding programming within the proposed Borders rail corridor and ownership and/or marketability issues in Jedburgh and Hawick. The contributor considers that the Central Borders | Comments noted. In allocating sites to satisfy the housing land requirement and provide a range and choice of opportunities it is contended that the MIR does give sufficient consideration to | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | will require to subsume further housing in a range of smaller and medium sized settlements. The contributor states villages in the vicinity of the A68/A698 in the Kelso and Jedburgh area offer small-scale opportunities for limited settlement expansion which can contribute to the housing land requirement. (239 1, 2, 3 of 3) | opportunities within smaller settlements. However cognisance should also be given to ensuring smaller settlements are not over developed with inappropriate scaled proposals. | |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states more could be said about the identified housing sites regarding the type of places that these are intended to be, key design requirements and how the sites will relate to and integrate with surrounding areas. (339) | Comments noted. All allocations within the Proposed Plan will have detailed site requirements. These requirements will include key design requirements and site considerations. | The general approach proposed is to update site requirements where appropriate. Furthermore, it is the practice of the Council to produce planning briefs to provide placemaking detail. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states the MIR fails to recognise commercial lending has changed significantly and only modest sites with low upfront costs will secure funding. Therefore some of the larger sites allocated prior to 2007 are no longer appropriate. Therefore runs the risk of failing to deliver housing in the numbers required. The contributor proposes the MIR acknowledges the importance of commercial funding in allocating effective sites. The | Comments noted. In the current economic climate there may be challenging circumstances around the delivery of some existing allocations. These sites have been through lengthy and comprehensive consultation exercises and remain key elements of the SDP development strategy. It is therefore appropriate to include these existing levels of supply in the Plan and not replace or augment | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | contributor this requires the identification of several modestly sized sites rather than focusing on undeliverable large sites. (234) | existing housing provision with further large housing land requirements. | |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people should be considered/ identified in the proposed plan. (339) | Comments noted. The Council regularly reviews the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people. At present there is no identified need to adjust the existing provision. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states there is a requirement for a generous supply of housing land and it may fall to LDPs to identify a land supply beyond the core SESplan requirement to demonstrate a generous supply is achieved. (339) | Comments noted. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | General | The contributor states windfall sites should only count towards meeting the requirement once they have consent and are considered effective as stated in paragraph 62 of Circular 2/2010. (339) | Comments noted. A housing technical note has been produced as a background paper of the MIR. This technical note updates the housing land supply from the 2010 data which was used to calculate the | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | | housing requirement within the SDP. The technical note details the number of additional units contributing to the land supply through approved planning applications since 31 st March 2010. Therefore only windfall sites with consent are included within the housing land requirement calculations. | |
| Housing Land | Housing Land (General) | The contributor states there are deliverability issues with many sites allocated in the Local Plan Amendment. The contributor assesses a shortfall in excess of 1,000 units by 2018 and falling far short of the 3,400 unit 2018-26 requirement. The contributor states only Kelso has scope for early completions which could off-set the pre-2018 shortfall. (239, 1 of 3) | Comments noted. In the current economic climate there may be challenging circumstances around the delivery of some existing allocations. These sites have been through lengthy and comprehensive consultation exercises and remain key elements of the SDP development strategy. It is therefore appropriate to include these existing levels of supply in the Plan and not replace or augment existing housing provision with further large housing land requirements. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Housing Land Audit | The contributor has submitted detailed site specific comments relating to the Finalised 2010 Housing Land Audit and Draft 2011 Housing Land Audit. The contributor raises specific concerns in Earlston, Galashiels, Jedburgh, Hawick, Newtown St Boswells and Selkirk relating to programming, completions and constraints. The contributor considers projected completions in the HLA are unrealistic and their own site by site assessment results in the effective land supply dropping to under a 4 year supply. | Comments noted. The Housing Land Audit is not part of the consultation document. The Council accepts that the higher level of completions in itself is not a realistic programme. However, it can not reasonably take a view in relation to sites that are effective in terms of PAN 2/2010 as to which will come forward through the development process. A site is effective under the terms of the PAN if it can be developed within the programme period. | No changes recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | (239, 1 of 3) | | |
| Housing Land | Housing Land Supply | The contributor has submitted detailed comments relating to the SESplan Housing Land Supply Assessment and the Scottish Ministers' Position on SESplan. (274) | These comments are noted but relate to the SESplan Proposed Plan rather than directly to the MIR. | No changes recommended. |
| Housing Land | Jedburgh | The area highlighted in Jedburgh for potential new housing is sited close to the River Jed and therefore always at flood risk. (296) | The MIR does not identify any new housing sites within Jedburgh. A potential redevelopment opportunity has been identified at Riverside Mill (RJEDB002). The site will be fully assessed to ensure it can be developed and any requirements will be incorporated into the site requirements in the Proposed Plan. | It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site RJEDB002 for redevelopment within the Proposed Local Development Plan. The necessary site requirements will be included in the site requirements. |
| Housing Land | Paragraph 5.17 | The contributor raises concerns regarding the "trickle down" effect of 100 additional units in the period 2019-204 for example in the Western SDA this results in only 20 housing units per year on average. The contributor states this is a prescriptive result which should be tempered by flexibility to adjust to local circumstance. To be so precise at 100 units for the years 2019-2024 is not tenable. (351) | Comments noted. The Housing Land Requirement within the LDP is set out in the SESplan Proposed Plan. The SESplan authorities have identified, through the SDP a generous supply of land that will meet the housing demand over the period to 2024. Policy 6 of the SDP serves to emphasise the flexibility in the approach that has been adopted by SESplan. The policy promotes flexibility in housing land delivery which is vital in an uncertain economic climate. As such it will make the SDP more responsive to the needs to the | It is recommended to take the preferred option from the Main Issues Report forward. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | | housing market should delivery rates increase. A housing technical note was prepared as a background paper to the MIR and clearly outlines the methodology taken in arriving at the housing figures for consultation. | |
| Housing Land | Paragraph 5.22 | The contributor states the Council's comments on market conditions in paragraph 5.22 are irrelevant in the context of a 20 year strategic plan and a 10 year LDP. The issue remains planning for the SDP requirement by identifying a generous land supply. (350, 358, 359) | Comments noted. The MIR acknowledges the challenging economic climate of the past five years. It is appropriate to bear in mind future development of the SESplan process through the HNDA, future demand and the capacity of the house building industry. | No changes recommended. |

RETAIL

TOWN CENTRE NETWORK

PREFERRED OPTION:

Establish a network of centres in the form of a hierarchy, outlining the function and role of each of the centres:

- Strategic town centre – Galashiels
- Sub-Regional town centres – Hawick, Peebles, Kelso, Selkirk, Melrose, Jedburgh, Duns and Eyemouth.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

Retain the existing shopping development policy using the sequential test to assess proposals. This approach would provide no strategic guide for future development and may result in retail development in inappropriate locations which could compromise future retail development.

Question 10: Do you agree with the preferred approach to recognise the network of town centres? Do you agree with the identified towns within the network? Do you agree with the alternative option, or do you wish to put forward an alternative proposal?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Retail | Retail - Network of Town Centres | <p>There is support for the preferred option presented in the Main Issues Report. (336, 289, 368, 199, 312, 236, 316, 215, 236, 288, 347, 342)</p> <p>Some responses have included detailed comments in relation to network of town centres: Essential to keep flexibility to ensure preferred retail frontages are kept occupied even if this means changes of use (316)</p> <p>Network should be widened to include other types of centres (215) and include full retail aspects into all areas of commercial centres. (347) Does the Council intend to have a wider network of centres which would denote any local and/or commercial centres. (199)</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Retail in the Borders is focused in the town centres. The town centre boundaries and areas of prime retail frontage promote flexibility within the town centres to improve the town centres as a place.</p> <p>There are some areas with retailing outwith the town centres, although these are considered to be too small to be classed as commercial centres. The largest area of retailing outwith a town centre is in Galashiels where a quarter of the total retail floor space in the town is located outwith the town centre.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the approach of establishing a network of centres is carried forward to the LDP.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Amend wording to make explicit the continuing requirement for sequential assessment (236)</p> <p>Consultation with local community should take place for commercial uses in sub-regional centre. Contributor (288) also agrees with the preferred option as long as it is not affecting character, vitality and viability of existing retail frontages.</p> <p>The contributors agree with preferred option subject to; role of each sub-regional town needs to be clear and positive so retail offers are attuned to character and unique opportunities (290), (342) Each sub-regional centre has its own character and a one fits all approach would not work. Object to the words 'sub-regional' as it doesn't create the right impression. 'Satellite'? (288)</p> <p>Settlements/areas in network of centres: Agree in principle, local flexibility needed for settlements not included in the network. (252)</p> <p>Retail policies should take account of need and opportunities for rural retailing; proposals</p> | <p>The requirement for a sequential test for location of retail in other areas than a town centre will be included in policy ED3 Town centres and Shopping Development.</p> <p>If a change of use (outwith permitted changes) goes through the planning application process and gives the general public an opportunity to raise any issues. In the planning application process proposals will be assessed against the impact on the character of the town.</p> <p>The inclusion in the network of town centres does not prohibit individual towns to promote themselves and to work to attract new retail and business opportunities. Sub-regional is part of the terminology used in the policy to explain the network of centres.</p> <p>Settlements/areas in network of centres: The SDP identify the regional and strategic town centres for the SESplan area. The LDP provide more detail and focus on the function of the town centres within the Scottish Borders.</p> <p>Leisure retail, especially in rural areas, may be acceptable as long as there is no</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>for village services should be supported, support for diversification of rural businesses which may involve retail outlets in rural areas. (300, 308, 309)</p> <p>Roles in network: The status of centres in the network of retail centres in not consistent with the SDP. (135)</p> <p>Contributor (285) fully supports Galashiels as a Strategic Town Centre. Although contributor (342) thinks that Galashiels does not necessarily provide a strategic function for outlying communities. Role of other communities is undermined by this assumption and report text should be amended. Designating Gala as a strategic town centre would serve to increase demand for sites on car-served retail parks outwith the traditional centre to its further detriment. (172)</p> <p>Site specific comments: Contributor (312) promotes inclusion a network of centres within Galashiels to complement town centre. The area around B&Q performs as a Commercial Centre with focus on retail. Contributor (324) promotes Sainsbury's Kelso supermarket and filling station as a retail destination and to be included as a</p> | <p>detrimental impact on the network of town centres.</p> <p>Roles in network: The SDP identify the regional and strategic town centres for the SESplan area. The LDP provide more detail and focus on the function of the town centres within the Scottish Borders.</p> <p>There have been concerns about Galashiels strategic function. Galashiels position as a strategic centre is based on the outcome of the Retail Capacity Study, which is very clear in its identification of Galashiels as a centre that is significantly stronger than any other towns in the Borders. A strong centre in the region reduces the spending leakage to other regions and also the use of cars to travel to centres outwith the region.</p> <p>Site specific comments: There are some areas with retailing outwith the town centres, although these are considered to be too small to be classed as commercial centres. The largest area of retailing outwith a town centre is in Galashiels where a quarter of the total retail floor space in the town is located</p> | |
|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Commercial Centre in the Network of Centres and if not, as a Local Centre.</p> <p>A number of general comments have been made; There are a number of unoccupied shops in Jedburgh and contributor suggests that rents should be reduced to increase occupancy. Residential use would not be a preferred option (296), encouragement should be given to retailing on the web alongside shop retailing (296), facilities in some shops is poor (inadequate toilets etc) (296), retailers should set up where they choose. (94)</p> | <p>outwith the town centre.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES

PREFERRED OPTION:

Review the town centre boundaries in Hawick and Galashiels taking account of recent developments in order to encourage new shops into specific areas of the town, in order to support sustainable economic growth.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

Retain the existing town centre boundaries.

Question 11: Do you agree with the preferred option to review the town centre boundaries within Galashiels and Hawick? Do you agree with the alternative option? Or, do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Retail | Retail - Town Centre Boundaries | <p>There is support for the preferred option presented in the Main Issues Report. (336, 316, 324, 199, 172, 236, 385, 342)</p> <p>Some of the responses have included detailed comments in relation to the review of town centre boundaries:</p> <p>Contributor (236) supports a review of town centre boundaries within Galashiels as set out in MIR on the basis that the boundary in Appendix 3 is appropriate and reflects the function and facilities of the centre, including ASDA store.</p> <p>Contributor (285) supports in principle, the Council should consider linkages between Galashiels and the area surrounding the new railway station as footfall will increase.</p> <p>Boundaries should reflect the effective centre of gravity which result from unique evolving development focus and dispersal of retail and business. Planning policy and infrastructure improvements have altered emphasis of town centres, in particular Galashiels and Hawick.</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The town centre boundary for Galashiels includes the retail developments completed in the last few years along Currie Road and Huddersfield Road and also the area around the proposed Transport Interchange.</p> <p>The prime retail frontage boundary has been reviewed to take into account recent developments, mainly in Galashiels and Hawick.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the town centre boundaries presented in the Main Issues Report are taken forward to the Proposed Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | (342) One contributor disagree with the option presented in the MIR: Let retailers set up where they choose (94) | The town centre boundaries are included in the plan to, in line with national policy, promote retail and other town centre activities in the area of the town with the highest footfall and best links to and from the centre. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

PRIME RETAIL FRONTAGES

PREFERRED OPTION:

- a) Revise the current policy approach to take a more proactive approach to appropriate uses within prime town centre frontage areas that would allow consideration of uses that provide public activity in the core retail areas where the demand for shops may be insufficient
- b) Identify prime retail frontage areas within all towns in the town centre network.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

- a) Retain the existing policy approach of resisting non Class 1 units within prime retail frontage areas
- b) Continue without a prime retail frontage within Jedburgh, Selkirk, Eyemouth and Duns.

Question 12: Do you agree with the approach to allow non Class 1 uses in prime town centre frontages in prescribed circumstances? Do you agree that prime town centre frontage areas should be identified in all towns in the town centre network? Do you agree with the alternative option? Or do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Retail | Prime Retail Frontage | There is support for the preferred option presented in the Main Issues Report. (336, | <i>Support noted.</i> | <i>It is recommended</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>316, 172, 252, 288, 368, 290, 342)</p> <p>Some of the responses have included detailed comments in relation to Prime Retail Frontage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference should always be given to Class 1 and Prime Retail Frontage should be identified in every town in the town centre network (368) • Retail as a priority use. Ratios for non-Class 1 to 30%, limit clustering, ensure diverse range of non retail issues, and consider measures for change, renewal and review (290) • First preference must be for retail, policy should be set out with help of stakeholders, including Chambers of Trade. Policy should be part of overall vision, non retail use (30%), opening hours, encourage diversity and reflect/anticipate economic/shopping change (342) • Agreed provided that consideration is not mandatory (288) <p>The document does not mention leisure and entertainment, recreation and culture in its town centres other than regarding to Green Space. Include guidance on leisure and entertainment activities in relation to town centre vitality and the evening economy. (122) Contributor (289) believes the definition of</p> | <p><i>All towns included in the network of town centres are proposed to have an area of prime retail frontage.</i></p> <p><i>In the MIR, the Council promoted a wider use of the town centre to increase the footfall and vitality and viability of the town centres and at the same time protect the ground floor in the prime retail frontage area for uses appropriate for town centres. This will be subject to further assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has to assess each application for change of use as they come in and can therefore not guarantee that Class 1 uses gets priority over Class 3 uses.</i></p> <p><i>Changes from Class 1 to Class 3 require a 'change of use' application. The general public and other businesses can make comments during the application process.</i></p> <p><i>Extending acceptable uses to Class 3 opens up for uses such as cafes and restaurants. Leisure and entertainment activities are allowed in town centres</i></p> | <p><i>that the Council agree to the preferred options to the include areas of prime retail frontage in all the towns included in the network of centres along with the extension of the acceptable uses from Class1 only to Class 1 and 3 to increase footfall, viability and vitality in town centres.</i></p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>prime retail frontage is too strict.</p> <p>Contributor (209) welcomes development in the Commercial Road area, but only wants to see large item retailers on the site.</p> <p>Disagree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any non-contentious use of premises should be encouraged and facilities as parking and public toilets should be available (226) • Retailers obliged to take what is available (94) • All towns has prime retail frontage and every effort should be made to have maximum occupancy (296) | <p><i>but outwith the prime retail frontage.</i></p> <p>It is not seen as appropriate to safeguard retail development on Commercial Road to bulky goods. There are good pedestrian links to the town centre and restriction of non-bulky goods would change the character of the area.</p> <p>The Council aims to protect town centres and promote a wider use of the town centre to increase the footfall and vitality and viability of the town centres and at the same time protect the ground floor in the prime retail frontage area for uses appropriate for town centres. This leads to restrictions on uses of units within the prime retail frontage area.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

REGENERATION

PREFERRED OPTION:

- a) Identify and promote redevelopment opportunities across the Borders including the key projects identified in para 5.43.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

- b) Categorise redevelopment opportunities to relate to a specific use such as retail or commercial redevelopment opportunities.

Question 13: Do you agree with the approach to identify and promote redevelopment opportunities and key projects? Do you agree with the alternative option? Or do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------|-------------|--|---|--|
| Regeneration | Question 13 | The contributor states the existing redevelopment allocations within the Consolidated Local Plan should be carried over with sufficient flexibility eg: zRO18. (252) | Existing redevelopment opportunities allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan which remain undeveloped will be carried forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan | The general approach proposed is to carry forward all existing undeveloped allocations within the Consolidated Local Plan. |
| Regeneration | Question 13 | <p>The contributor agrees with the preferred option. (289, 368, 290, 172, 336, 226, 252)</p> <p>Some responses have included additional comments in relation to question 13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor supports the regeneration of brownfield sites. (94) • The contributor agrees with the approach to identify and promote key sites and projects. The contributor considers the key to regeneration is to undertake the process in an environmentally friendly way and adhere to the Local Development Plan Vision for 2024. The contributor states development should be sustainable | <p>Support noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support noted. • Support and comment noted. | It is recommended that the preferred option is taken forward to the Proposed Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>teamed with an environmentally friendly approach should provide a high level of protection to fauna and flora throughout the Borders. (349)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor agrees with the preferred option, in particular the implementation of the THI/CARS scheme in Selkirk. (342) • The contributor agrees with this approach in close conjunction with the retail policy. (316) • The contributor supports the preferred option but would like the identification of brownfield sites for regeneration to remain open to allow for the inclusion of sites which are not currently completely redundant or not known to the Council although they may become so during the life of the LDP. (299, 300, 306, 307, 308) • The contributor supports the identification of redevelopment opportunities however states that this should not be at the expense of harming existing retail frontages within a town centre. (296) • The contributor states the LDP should contain a specific brownfield policy to support the redevelopment of previously developed land. (299, 300, 306, 307, 308) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support noted. • Support noted. • Support noted. This is currently covered by general policy G7 – Infill Development and policy G8 - Development Outwith Development Boundaries. • Support noted. • Comments noted. Within existing policies there is specific reference to the support of development on brownfield sites. | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contributor agrees with the preferred option and states future projects should be identified eg: Gunsgreenhill Eyemouth “Fish Park” development. The contributor is concerned that only one potential site/project has been identified in Eyemouth in paragraph 5.43. (288) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted. Paragraph 5.43 identifies the Harbour Road/ Manse Road/ Church Street area as an area for redevelopment potential. Also in the paragraph all town centres have been identified as key potential projects, including Eyemouth. Appendix A4 identifies three additional regeneration sites within Eyemouth. | |
| Regeneration | Question 13 | The contributor raises an issue in relation to some of the key potential sites/projects identified in paragraph 5.43 regarding flood risk. The contributor states that the development of these sites for housing could result in adverse effects in relation to flood risk and the SEA topic water. The contributor has identified ten sites where flooding may be an issue and where a Flood Risk Assessment is required. The contributor states that less sensitive uses such as employment, industrial or greening initiative should be considered more favourably in areas of medium to high flood risk. (357) | These comments are noted. All sites will be fully assessed in relation to flood risk. Where appropriate, site requirements will state the need for a Flood Risk Assessment. Mitigation measures and appropriate uses will also be detailed within the site requirements in the Proposed Local Development Plan where necessary. | It is recommended that all redevelopment sites allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan have the appropriate detailed site requirements. |
| Regeneration | Question 13 | The contributor agrees regeneration opportunities should not be limited to a particular use and a mix of uses may be appropriate. The contributor would like key site requirements to be shown for each regeneration site in relation to local placemaking. (339) | Support noted. It is not the intention of the Proposed Local Development Plan to limit uses within regeneration allocations and where appropriate a mix of uses will be encouraged, as stated in paragraph 5.44 of the MIR. All regeneration allocations within the | It is recommended that the preferred option is taken forward to the Proposed Plan. It is recommended that all redevelopment |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---|--|---|
| | | | Proposed Local Development Plan will have site requirements. The site requirements will detail key issues which need to be addressed when the site is developed. Design and local placemaking of each site will be assessed during the planning application process. | sites allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan have the appropriate detailed site requirements. |
| Regeneration | Question 13 | The contributor states the LDP should contain a policy to promote the use of buildings at risk. The contributor believes this policy should emphasise that some discretion may be applied in the determination of planning, listed building and building warrant applications. (299, 300, 306, 307, 308) | It is not considered appropriate for the LDP to contain a policy to promote the use of buildings at risk. Such a policy could be seen to encourage building decline. | No changes recommended. |
| Regeneration | Question 13 | The contributor supports the focus on the regeneration of brownfield sites and agrees with the preferred option. (335) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the preferred option is taken forward to the Proposed Plan. |
| Regeneration | Question 13 | The contributor does not see any benefit in the proposed work at Abbey Place. The contributor has concerns regarding the effects of the through traffic into the town centre and would discourage tourists from coming into Jedburgh. The contributor also states that visitors may also be unaware of the free Cannongate car park due to the lack of proper signage. The contributor considers this one of the few areas of the town centres that does not require further work. (365) | There is a key link to the town centre from Cannongate car park. This offers real opportunity to improve the environment of the existing connection which has a natural advantage of sunlight and a lightly used road. | No changes recommended. |

General comments relating to Regeneration

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------|----------------------|---|---|--|
| Regeneration | General | <p>The contributor supports the redevelopment of brownfield sites as a sustainable option that can provide multiple benefits in term of environmental improvements, such as the remediation of contaminated land. The contributor also suggests that sites adjacent to waterways may provide an opportunity to deliver enhancements in accordance with the River Basin Management Plan and contributions to the green network. (357)</p> <p>The contributor did not previously provide comments on the provision of buffer strips and restoration. The contributor welcomes the opportunity to review the sites in the adopted local plan prior to the publication of the proposed plan and encourages the Council to update the site requirements accordingly. (357)</p> | <p>Support noted. Where appropriate, site requirements will include opportunities to deliver enhancements in accordance with the River Basin Management Plan and contributions to the green network.</p> <p>The contributor's comments are welcomed. It is intended that all site requirements will be updated as part of the Proposed Local Development Plan</p> | The general approach proposed is to update site requirements where appropriate. |
| Regeneration | Windfall Development | The contributor suggests the regeneration sites identified in the MIR could contribute to windfall housing development as expected by the SDP. The contributor recommends clarifying the SDP support for windfall development and the scope for regeneration opportunities to meet the housing requirement. (135) | These comments are noted. Paragraph 5.44 states 'it is the Council's preferred option that the LDP should allocate land for redevelopment for a variety of uses including housing and employment'. The justification text in relation to the policy on infill development will refer to the potential contribution to the housing supply. | It is recommended that the justification text of policy G7 Infill Development will refer to the potential contribution of regeneration sites |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | to the housing supply. |
| Regeneration | High Street, Jedburgh | The contributor states that any funding that can be gained to help re-vitalise Jedburgh town centre should be aimed at a regeneration programme for Jedburgh High Street. The Community Council would like plans to be drawn up to help achieve this. (365) | Paragraph 5.43 within the MIR identifies all town centres as key potential projects for regeneration, this includes Jedburgh town centre. | It is recommended that the preferred option is taken forward to the Proposed Plan. |
| Regeneration (General) | Galashiels | The contributor considers there is an opportunity for the Council to produce a Development Brief to examine the wider regeneration opportunities in the area surrounding Bridge Street, the proposed transport interchange and the river. The contributor sees this as an opportunity to enhance the economic and regeneration benefits resulting from the development of the railway station. The contributor states it will also encourage investment in the area and ensure connectivity between the transport interchange and the town centre. (285) | In May 2012, the Council produced an Urban Design Framework for Stirling Street, Galashiels. This sets out the vision for the development of the Stirling Street area including the proposed Transport Interchange, the town centre and the Gala Water Corridor. The area covered the Supplementary Planning Guidance is allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan as zCR3 and zT11. | No changes recommended. |
| Regeneration (General) | Para. 5.43 | In relation to the redevelopment of Eyemouth town centre the contributor would like the town boundary amended to include the expansion of the existing commercial areas and industrial complex to allow for the inclusion of commercial areas with retail development for instance garden centre, supermarket, car sales room. (347) | The town centre boundary of Eyemouth is already widely defined and includes the key regeneration opportunities associated with the Harbour Road area. | No changes recommended. |
| Regeneration, | Edinburgh | The contributor welcomes the decision to | Comments noted. | No changes |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Jedburgh | Road (Supermarket Application zEL33) | <p>reject a supermarket at the Oregon site but would welcome competition within town centre. (296)</p> <p>The contributor encourages the Council to remove ED1 status from the former Oregon Timber Frame site on Edinburgh Road (site code zEL33). The contributor states the site is an isolated industrial site surrounded by retail uses and there is adequate industrial elsewhere in Jedburgh. (253)</p> <p>The contributor states that a significant number of residents in Jedburgh were disappointed at the refusal of planning consent for a supermarket at Bankend North. The contributor states residents would like to see a relaxation of the planning status of the site to allow for the development of a retail unit. (365)</p> <p>The contributor would like the Council to prove the need for a supermarket through and independent survey showing leakage to other Border towns. (365)</p> | <p>The site referred to is allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan as Employment Land Safeguarding. There have been numerous applications for a retail foodstore on this site. However there is a requirement to ensure the retention of a portfolio of industrial land and therefore the applications have been contrary to policy ED1. Policy ED1 clearly states that retail activity will not be permissible on employment land unless it is ancillary to some other acceptable activity. This is not the case in this instance. Therefore the proposals do not meet the requirements of Policy ED1.</p> <p>A Retail Capacity Study was undertaken by the Council in September 2011. The study concluded that it would be desirable to reduce leakage from Jedburgh however local spending is insufficient to support new convenience retail development.</p> | recommended. |
| Regeneration, Jedburgh | High Street | The contributor states that a clear indication must be given to future intentions regarding the High Street, Jedburgh. The contributor states there is a need to improve the street to | These comments are noted. Paragraph 5.43 within the MIR identifies all town centres as key potential projects for regeneration, this includes Jedburgh town | It is recommended that the preferred option is taken forward to the |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------|----------------|
| | | make it more attractive and visitor friendly. The contributor suggests one-way traffic, improved parking arrangements and investment in appropriate street furniture. (253) | centre. | Proposed Plan. |
|--|--|---|---------|----------------|

GREEN SPACES

PREFERRED OPTION:

Identify key open spaces within settlements and protect them from development.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

Continue the generic approach to the protection of open space through a general policy statement.

Question 14: Do you agree with the preferred option to identify and protect key open spaces? Do you agree with the alternative option to continue with a general approach towards open space? Or, do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Green Space | Green Space General | The contributors agree/support with the Preferred Option set out in the MIR and to identify and protect key green spaces. (99, 202, 226, 230, 287, 289, 290, 300, 309, 316, 327, 336, 339, 342, 349, 350, 353, 357, 368) Whilst the contributor agrees with the approach to identify key spaces for protection, they also consider that the Local Development Plan should also identify spaces which may be | Support noted. Agreement noted. It is noted that the contributors agree with the approach to identify key green spaces. It should also be noted that it is the intention of the Local | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|---|--|-------------------|
| | | <p>suitable for other uses, it should identify opportunities to create new spaces, and it should identify where deficiencies in provision may exist and what may be done to rectify these. (350)</p> | <p>Development Plan (LDP) to identify the Key Green Spaces within settlements that will be given the highest of protection. Where the need for new spaces is created by proposed development, this will be assessed through the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Green Space. It is intended that the LDP will also include a policy that will not only allow the greatest of protection to Key Green Spaces but the policy will also allow for protection of other green spaces within settlements not identified on proposals maps. Where proposals come forward on a green space, the proposal will be required to meet the stringent criteria set out within the policy.</p> | |
| | | <p>The contributor states that in taking forward it will be important to protect both formal and informal green spaces that are important for sport and that this should be a consideration in identifying key sites. The contributor notes and supports Appendix 5 where playing fields appear generally to have been identified as key sites. They state that although not familiar with every single playing field across the Scottish Borders the identified sites should match those considered within the Scottish Borders Sports Facilities and Pitches Strategy. (202)</p> | <p>Support noted. The intention is that the Local Development Plan will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. Other greens spaces not identified on proposals maps but within the Development Boundary will also receive protection through the Policy on Green Space.</p> | |
| | Green | The contributor supports the Alternative Option | It should be noted that that the Scottish | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | Space General | in that the Council should continue the generic approach to the protection of open space through a general policy statement. (172) | <p>Planning Policy (SPP) states that “<i>Open spaces which are identified in the open space audit and strategy as valued and functional, or which are capable of being brought into functional use to meet a need identified in the open space strategy, should be identified and protected in the development plan</i>”.</p> <p>In addition to the SPP, Planning Advice Note 65: Planning and Open Space (PAN 65) states that “<i>Development plans should safeguard important open spaces from development in the long term ...</i>”.</p> <p>Therefore it is recommended that the Local Development Plan identifies and protects key green spaces within settlements.</p> | that the Council agree to identify and protect key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | Green Space General | The contributor seeks no encroachment on green spaces. (94) | Noted. | No further action required. |
| | Green Space General | The contributors states that the Council’s approach to Green Space and Green networks will be detrimental to the economic, social and sustainability aims of SESPlan. (358, 359) | <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), Planning Advice Note 65: Planning and Open Space (PAN 65) states that “<i>Development plans should safeguard important open spaces from development in the long term and identify spaces that require significant improvement</i>”.</p> <p>In addition, PAN 65: Planning and Open Space states:</p> <p>“<i>Open spaces are important for our quality of life. They provide the setting for a wide range of social interactions and</i></p> | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>pursuits that support personal and community well-being. They allow individuals to interact with the natural environment and provide habitats for wildlife. They can also be important in defining the character and identity of settlements. ... Well-designed and managed spaces can raise the quality of business, retail and leisure developments, making them more attractive to potential investors, users and customers".</i></p> <p>Therefore, it is not considered that the Council's approach to Green Space and Green networks will be detrimental to the economic, social and sustainability aims of SESPlan, but rather it will support and enhance the aims of SESplan.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

General comments relating to Green Space

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------------|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Green Space | Eyemouth | The contributor states that the map requires clarifying in that it does not show the new school. (288) | This is an Ordinance Survey issue and outwith the control of the Council. Updates on the Ordinance Survey base maps will be undertaken in due course. | No further action required. |

GREEN NETWORKS

PREFERRED OPTION:

- a) **Identify and promote strategic green networks in Central and Western Borders**

- b) Identify and promote key green networks around the towns of Duns, Eyemouth, Hawick, Jedburgh, Kelso and Lauder
- c) Identify and protect former rail routes as important contributors to the green networks.

Question 15: Do you agree with the preferred option to identify and promote green networks? Do you agree with the alternative option to support environmental improvements generally? Or, do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------|------------------------|--|---|---|
| Green Networks | Green Networks General | <p>The contributors agree with the preferred option to identify and support green networks and as shown in Appendix B. (92, 99, 155, 172, 202, 226, 287, 288, 290, 296, 316, 327, 336, 342, 344, 349, 357, 368)</p> <p>The contributor supports the development of green networks, and notes that it would be worthwhile exploring whether there is scope to create cross boundary green networks. (135) In identifying such a network the contributor requests that regard is had to the Northumberland Strategic Green Infrastructure Network which is identified within the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document and Northumberland Green Infrastructure Strategy. The contributor also states that consideration should be given to the inclusion of a reference to cross-border working within neighbouring authorities in relation to the identification and creation of a Strategic Green Infrastructure Network. (344)</p> | <p>Support noted. However, following the Main Issues Report public consultation, it is considered that it would be acceptable to link the Proposed Western and the Proposed Central Strategic Green Networks to form a single Borders Strategic Green Network.</p> <p>Support noted and comments noted. Opportunities for cross boundary green network working can be explored and included within the Action Plan.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and support green networks and agree to include a single Borders Strategic Green Network within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>In addition it is recommended that the Council agree that opportunities for green networks including cross boundary green networks are considered and included in the Action Plan. It is also</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The contributor supports the generality of the Preferred Option, however suggest that the Plan should include specific mention of cycle routes between and into the towns in the context of both leisure use and green transport. (155)</p> <p>The contributor agrees with the preferred option to promote green networks. The contributor notes that the Main Issues report proposes to identify two strategic green networks, with separate green networks specifically related to some of the towns, and a further network based on the former railway routes. They state that rather than making these distinctions, they suggest it may be worth joining up these networks, on a consolidated linked basis, this would help promote active travel and recreation opportunities and help strengthen integrated</p> | <p>Support noted. It is noted within the Main Issues Report that the aim of the green networks are: <i>“to assist in supporting sustainable economic growth, tourism, recreation, the creation of an environment that promotes a healthier-living lifestyle, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, and have the potential to improve water quality, promote flood protection and reduce pollution”</i>. This therefore includes cycle routes for both leisure and green transport. However, it is considered that it is reasonable to make mention of cycle routes between and into towns in the context of both leisure use and green transport within the Plan.</p> <p>Support noted. It should be noted that para 5.63 of the Main Issues Report notes that although not identified within it, there are other local green networks through out the Scottish Borders. However, following further consideration on the Strategic Green Networks, it is now considered that a single Strategic Green Network would be appropriate. Essentially the proposed Borders Strategic Green Network would link the two proposed areas identified within the Main Issues Report – i.e. the Western Strategic Green Network and the</p> | <p>recommended that the Council agree to include reference to cycle routes within the introductory section of the new Policy on green networks within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>habitats networks and connectivity for species movement. (339)</p> <p>The contributors agree with the preferred option to identify and support green networks provided that the supporting policies and in particular Policy D2 and the opening wording of Policy EP3 Countryside Around Towns which are unreasonably and unrealistically drawn in that they are not consistent with each other and do not take account of existing settlements and building groups as they are on the ground. (104)</p> | <p>Central Strategic Green Network. Nevertheless, it is not considered appropriate to link all of those networks that are proposed – Strategic, Key and those linked to the former railways. This is because the networks identified, whilst linked to the Development Strategy as inline with Planning Advice Note 65, they are also made up of a number various components (with the exception of the former railways) and are not just related to active travel and recreation. Given the rich and diverse environment of the Scottish Borders it is considered more appropriate to identify green networks that compile a series of components and not just one or two such as active travel and recreation. The Technical Note on Green Networks provides further information.</p> <p>Support for the preferred option is noted. However, whilst it is intended that the new Local Development Plan will protect, promote and enhance a series of proposed green networks identified in the Plan, it is not envisaged that the new policy on Green Networks will in isolation prevent new development from taking place. Any development will obviously have to be assessed against a number of other policies depending on the circumstances of each proposal.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|---|---|---|
| Green Networks | Green Networks General | <p>The contributors strongly support sub option 'C' of the preferred option – “To identify and protect former rail routes as important contributors to green networks”. (108, 130)</p> <p>The contributor wishes to see the inclusion of the Peebles to Leadburn following the route of the Peebles Railway and Peebles to Broughton and Bigger following the Caledonian Railway. (289)</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>It is already intended that that these routes will be protected through the protection of the Former Railway Routes.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect former rail routes as important contributors to the green network within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
| Green Networks | Green Networks General | <p>In relation to the development of a policy on Green Networks, the contributor suggests that the key elements of the networks are described, with the key opportunities identified for each, based on the relevant stated aims of green networks given in para 5.60 <i>“...supporting sustainable economic growth, tourism, recreation, the creation of an environment that promotes a healthier-living lifestyle, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity”</i>. That said, the contributor states that it is recognised that the Council will have its own approach to the development of the policy. (327)</p> | <p>The Technical Note on Green Networks provides more detail on each of the Green Networks identified. It is considered that the key opportunities that exist within green networks could be identified within the Action Plan.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council consider identifying the key opportunities that exist within green networks within the Action Plan.</p> |
| Green Networks | Green Networks General | <p>In relation to para 5.67 of the Main Issues Report, the contributor states that it is unclear why improvements to the environmental quality of the region independent of the green network would prevent any of the issues listed. They state that every opportunity within or</p> | <p>It is intended that the promotion and enhancement of the series of green networks as those identified in the preferred option will assist in supporting sustainable economic growth, tourism, recreation, the creation of an environment</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and support green networks within the Proposed</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>outwith designated green networks should be taken to conserve and enhance the biodiversity interests of the region and to prevent damage to them through inappropriate development or lack of required management. The contributor also states that the development of disused railway lines for public use, such as walking, cycling or horse riding, should include a commitment to maintaining and enhancing existing biodiversity features and creating new ones along and adjacent to lines. (353)</p> | <p>that promotes a healthier-living lifestyle, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, and have the potential to improve water quality, promote flood protection and reduce pollution. By the Local Development Plan (LDP) identifying the series of green networks proposed within the areas of the Borders with the most population and in line with the Development Strategy this will allow for maximum benefits. The Technical Note on Green Networks provides more detail. In relation to the disused railways, the new LDP is intended to also include a policy that will aim to protect, promote and enhance green networks. As with all core paths the Council's ranger service can carry out appropriate maintenance and enhancement where appropriate.</p> | <p>Local Development Plan.</p> |
| <p>Green Networks</p> | <p>Green Networks General</p> | <p>The contributors state that the Council's approach to Green Space and Green networks will be detrimental to the economic, social and sustainability aims of SESPlan. The contributors also states that boundaries such as the Countryside Around Town are drawn too tight around settlements particularly in the Central Borders. (358, 359)</p> | <p>Not accepted. The Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) places a responsibility on local authorities to identify and promote green networks within Local Development Plans where this will add value to the provision, protection, enhancement, and connectivity of open space and habitats. In addition, the SESplan Proposed Plan states that it supports not only the creation of the Central Scotland Green Network but also the Green Network in the Scottish Borders to establish a strategic green network across the SESplan area. That</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and support green networks within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>document continues stating that Local Development Plans will identify opportunities to contribute to the development and extension of the Green Network and mechanisms through which they can be delivered.</p> <p>In addition, Planning Advice Note 65: Planning and Open Space states: <i>“Open spaces are important for our quality of life. They provide the setting for a wide range of social interactions and pursuits that support personal and community well-being. They allow individuals to interact with the natural environment and provide habitats for wildlife. They can also be important in defining the character and identity of settlements. ... Well-designed and managed spaces can raise the quality of business, retail and leisure developments, making them more attractive to potential investors, users and customers”.</i></p> <p>Therefore, it is not considered that the Council’s approach to Green Space and Green networks will be detrimental to the economic, social and sustainability aims of SESPlan, but rather it will support and enhance the aims of SESPlan.</p> | |
| Green Networks | Green Networks General | The contributor supports the Alternative option set out in the Main Issues Report to support environmental improvements generally. (364) | Comment noted however, the Scottish Planning Policy places a responsibility on local authorities to identify and promote green networks within Local Development | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and support green |

| | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | Plans where this will add value to the provision, protection, enhancement and connectivity of open space and habitats. In addition, Policy 11 of the Proposed Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) places a duty on Local Development Plans to identify opportunities to contribute to the development and extension of the Green Network. | networks within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Green Networks | Green Networks General | The contributor states that the issue of Green Networks set out in the Main Issues Report is too abstract and needs ostensive definition. (102) | <p>The Technical Note on Green Networks provides further detail on the proposed Green Networks within the Main Issues Report.</p> <p>Green networks consist of a network of green spaces and green corridors around settlements, linking open spaces within settlements to the wider countryside. They can assist in enhancing the biodiversity, quality of life, and sense of place of an area.</p> <p>The aim of the green networks that will be identified in the Local Development Plan, are to assist in supporting sustainable economic growth, tourism, recreation, the creation of an environment that promotes a healthier-living lifestyle, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, and have the potential to improve water quality, promote flood protection and reduce pollution.</p> | No further action required. |

General comments relating to Green Networks

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Green Networks | General Comments | The contributor states that former railway lines are very boring for walking but probably ok for cycling/wildlife corridors. (94) | Comment noted | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect former rail routes as important contributors to the green network within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Green Networks | General Comments | The Contributor states that the network of core paths and rights of way in the area is extensive and they urge that every effort is made to maintain these to a satisfactory standard by SBC funding and assistance when needed, in addition to the voluntary efforts of the North Tweeddale Paths Group. (240) | Whilst it is intended that the new Local Development Plan is intended to include a policy that will aim to protect, promote and enhance green networks; it should also be noted that the Council's ranger service can carry out appropriate maintenance and enhancement where appropriate. | It is recommended that the Council agree to include a policy on green networks within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Green Networks | General Comments | The contributor is fully supportive of the Council's proposals for the Countryside Around Town (CAT), the strategic and key green networks and the former rail routes. However, the contributor notes that there will be areas of countryside outwith the CAT and | Support noted. It is considered that the Proposed Development Plan will recognise outdoor sport and recreation interests. It should be noted that, in addition to the Council's policy on the Countryside Around Towns, the proposed policy on Green | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>the green networks that are also important for outdoor sport and recreation but which will not have the same policy protection and promotion. In addition, the contributor states that the green network approach places an emphasis on routes and linear recreation rather than on protecting and promoting important <i>sites</i> that might exist. They also note, for example, that only parts of Glentress and Innerleithen are included in the Western strategic green network, leaving parts of these nationally important recreation resources outwith green network protection and potentially, therefore, more susceptible to development pressures.</p> <p>The contributor highlights paragraph 149 of the Scottish Planning Policy builds on this advice stating that planning authorities should support, protect and enhance opportunities for sport and recreation in the countryside. The contributor states that to this end we consider it crucial that development plan policy fully recognises outdoor sport and recreation interests and the need to protect and provide for these interests through the development plan. (202)</p> | <p>Networks, the Council also have a series of other policies that will protect and promote the Scottish Borders environment and its countryside, as well tourist and recreational facilities such as Glentress.</p> <p>Furthermore, the aim of the green networks to be identified in the Proposed Plan are: <i>“to assist in supporting sustainable economic growth, tourism, recreation, the creation of an environment that promotes a healthier-living lifestyle, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, and have the potential to improve water quality, promote flood protection and reduce pollution”</i>.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the Scottish Borders is made up of many local green networks. However, due to the extent of the Borders and in line with Planning Advice Note 65, it is proposed to primarily consider identifying only those green networks that will contribute to the development framework. For that very reason the main focus will be on the Strategic Development Areas and the 11 main population centres/settlements within the Borders. It is also noted that almost all of the settlements identified within the Main Issues Report are located within the Strategic Development Areas.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

CLIMATE CHANGE

CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION

PREFERRED OPTIONS:

- a) Extend the protection of agricultural land to include protection of carbon rich soils such as peat
- b) Include a requirement to encourage the minimisation of water use within new development
- c) Continue to determine planning applications for wind turbines on a case by case basis, taking cognisance of the SPG on Wind Energy 2011 and any other material planning consideration.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

- a) Retain policy on protection of prime agricultural land
- b) Retain current policy position without specific reference to the minimisation of water use
- c) Consider that the Borders landscape is already at saturation point in terms of wind turbines and incorporate a policy that deals with them on a “by exception” basis.

Question 16: Do you agree with the preferred options to extend the protection of agricultural land to include the protection of carbon rich soils, the minimization of water usage in new development and the retention of the current policy approach on wind turbines? Or, do you have another alternative option?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------|---|--|--|---|
| Climate Change | Carbon Rich Soils (Peat) Q16 preferred option (a) | The contributor supports policy extension to include protection of carbon rich soils such as peat. (130, 135, 218, 288, 289, 290, 316, 327, 342, 353, 355, 357, 368) | Support noted. The extension of policy to protect carbon rich soils will be taken forward to the proposed plan. | Include policy to protect carbon rich soils in the Proposed Plan. |
| Climate Change | Carbon Rich Soils (Peat) | The contributor supports retention of current policy (do not include protection of carbon rich | The comment cannot be supported, as there is substantial Government agency | Include policy to protect carbon rich |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Q16 alternative option (a) | soils such as peat). (172, 210, 286, 336) | support for the protection of carbon rich soils. The extension of policy to protect carbon rich soils will be taken forward to the proposed plan. | soils in the Proposed Plan. |
| Climate Change | Water Minimisation Q16 preferred option (b) | The contributor supports the requirement to encourage minimisation of water use within new developments. (135, 138, 218, 288, 289, 290, 316, 327, 342, 357, 368) | Support noted. Develop policy context to include water minimisation in new development. | Include policy for water minimisation in the Proposed Plan. |
| Climate Change | Water Minimisation Q16 alternative option (b) | The contributor supports retention of current policy without specific reference to the minimisation of water use. (172, 336) | Water minimisation is a positive step to address climate change and will be taken forward. | Include policy for water minimisation in the Proposed Plan. |
| Renewable Energy | Preferred option to continue current policy of considering applications on a case by case basis | Support the preferred option to determine planning applications for wind turbines on a case by case basis, taking cognisance of the SPG on wind energy 2011 and any other material planning consideration. (268, 269, 270, 282, 283, 286, 289, 290, 300, 305, 306, 316, 327, 342) | <i>Support of the preferred option noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | <i>turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | Preferred option to continue current policy of considering applications on a case by case basis | Support the preferred option with a caveat that the weight to the SPG on wind energy should be carefully considered. (210) | <i>Support of the preferred option noted. The SPG on wind energy has been through a public consultation and it has been adopted by the Council. It is a material consideration to any planning application for wind turbines. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Renewable Energy | Preferred option to continue current policy of considering applications on a case by case basis | Oppose the preferred option to determine planning applications for wind turbines on a case by case basis, taking cognisance of the SPG on wind energy 2011 and any other material planning consideration. (184, 186, 243, 244, 299) | <i>Opposition to the alternative option noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | Alternative option policy on wind turbines to consider | Support the alternative option that the Scottish Borders is already at saturation point in terms of wind turbines and incorporate a policy the deals with them on a “by exception” basis. (106, 107, 117, 120, 124, 125, 126, 129, 133, | <i>Support of the alternative option noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | proposals on a “by exception” basis | 134, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151,152, 153, 154, 163, 164, 166, 169, 170, 172, 174, 176, 178, 181, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 197, 201, 204, 205, 208, 214, 217, 218, 220, 222, 232, 237, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 284, 288, 292, 293, 295, 323, 329, 336, 352, 364, 368) | <i>Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | Alternative option policy on wind turbines to consider proposals on a “by exception” basis | Oppose the alternative option that the Scottish Borders is already at saturation point in terms of wind turbines and incorporate a policy the deals with them on a “by exception” basis. (200, 210, 282, 283, 286, 343) | <i>Opposition to the alternative option noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p><i>the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | Alternative option policy – general comments | <p>The alternative option would be a negative and restrictive policy option and would not reflect the positive stance of SPP. A policy stance which states the Scottish Borders is at saturation point is an emotive one and is only subjective. Cumulative impacts can only be continued to be addressed on a case by case basis following the rigorous assessment as part of a LVIA. Any policy relating to renewable energy should remain positively worded. (282)</p> | <p><i>The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | <i>response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | Alternative option policy – general comments | The alternative option is a leading question as it would be readily seized upon by those opposing wind farms and would ignore the vast amount of work within the SPG. If such alternatives in the MIR were posed in an even handed manner, it would be equally fair to pose another alternative which would in fact be to allow a more relaxed position than that outlined in the current SPG. (283) | It is not considered the alternative option is misleading. It allows the opportunity for other options to be suggested. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | Alternative option policy – general comments | It is regrettable that the only alternative option suggested is a negative one stating that the Borders landscape is at saturation point for wind turbines. (339) | The alternative option asks the question as to whether or not there is a public opinion that the Borders landscape is at saturation point as a result of turbine approvals. It does not suggest this is the case, and offers the opportunity for other comments and options to be tabled. | No action required. |

SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT

PREFERRED OPTIONS:

- a) Include the Easter Langlee and other waste sites as designated sites within the Plan

- b) Refer to the need to provide adequate space for waste management in new developments, including the need for an SPG to provide further detail.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

None.

Question 17: Do you agree with the preferred option to include the Easter Langlee and other waste sites within the Plan and to include reference to the need for adequate space for waste facilities within the plan policy? Or, do you have other alternative options?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------|---|---|--|---|
| Climate Change | Waste sites Q17 preferred option (a) | The contributor supports the inclusion of Easter Langlee and other waste sites as designated sites within the plan. (135, 172, 288, 289, 316, 336, 357, 368) | Support noted. Sites will be referred to in the proposed plan and shown on the Proposals Map. | Refer to waste sites in the plan and show them on Proposals Map. |
| Climate Change | Waste Management in New Developments Q17 preferred option (b) | The contributor suggests that plan should refer to the need to provide adequate space for waste management in new developments and the need for SPG to provide detail. (135, 172, 288, 289, 316, 327, 336, 357, 368) | The need for adequate space for waste management in new development will be referred to in the proposed plan. It is proposed to provide supplementary planning guidance (SPG) on waste management in the future. | Include policy for waste management in new developments and provide SPG at future date. |

The following table summarises general comments relating to Climate Change:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|------------------------|
| Climate Change | Incineration | The contributor suggests that waste should be incinerated to generate power. (94) | Thermal waste treatment is already identified as a renewable energy opportunity, which will continue to be supported in the context of policies D4 | No change to the plan. |

| | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | Renewable Energy and INF7 Waste Management Facilities. | |
| Climate Change | Waste sites | The contributor suggests that Easter Langlee be safeguarded from incompatible development on adjacent land. Other waste sites should be identified in the plan. Site Waste Management Plans should be required for development sites. (357) | The plan will ensure that there are no incompatible uses around Easter Langlee whilst the site is operational. SWMPs are outside the remit of planning. It is intended to identify existing waste sites on the plan. | The plan will seek to prevent incompatible uses adjacent to Easter Langlee waste site and will identify other existing waste sites. |
| Climate Change | Waste sites | The contributor (Scottish Government) expects to see confirmation that proposed waste sites will meet the capacity required by Zero Waste Plan. (339) | The revised plan policy will reflect the Borders Area Waste Plan (BAWP), which accords with the Zero Waste Plan. | The plan will reflect the requirements of the BAWP. |
| Climate Change | Renewable Energy | The contributor asserts that climate change should be given higher priority and Council should show greater commitment to renewables. (95) | Policy context does support renewables and plan reflects the priority attached to climate change in Scottish Planning Policy and SESplan. | The plan will continue to support renewable energy where appropriate. |
| Climate Change | Climate Change assumptions | The contributor asserts that climate change assumptions and global warming 'notion' will be revised in the face of economic stresses. (102) | The plan will continue to reflect the priority given to climate change in Scottish Planning Policy and SESplan. | The plan will continue to include policies which help to tackle climate change. |
| Climate Change | District Heating | The contributor suggests that consideration should be given to having a policy for encouragement of district heating schemes. (360) | This is a renewable energy opportunity, which will continue to be supported in the context of policy D4 Renewable Energy. | The plan will continue to support district heating schemes where appropriate. |
| Climate Change | Greenhouse Gas emissions | The contributor asserts that an improved public transport network is essential to prevent private transport increasing greenhouse gas | The plan will continue to encourage and facilitate sustainable means of travel. | The plan will continue to support the |

| | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | from Transport | emissions. (353) | | provision of public transport and sustainable forms of travel. |
| Climate Change | Timber as Carbon Sink | The contributor asserts that timber is important as a carbon sink. (364) | Comment noted. | No change to the plan. |
| Climate Change | Impact on sport and recreation | The contributor (Sport Scotland) suggests that consideration be given to the impact of windfarms and hydro schemes on sport & recreation, including river-based sports. (202) | Renewable Energy policy D4 requires that there should be no unacceptable adverse impact on recreation interests or that these should be satisfactorily mitigated. A study into the benefits and impacts of wind energy in the Borders is currently underway and will help to determine the future policy approach to wind energy. | The plan will continue to ensure that consideration is given to the impact of renewable energy development on sport and recreation interests. |
| Climate Change | Peat Soils | The contributor supports the protection of carbon rich/peat soils, especially peat over 50cm in depth. Offsite compensation measures should be undertaken for lost peat. (353) The contributor suggests that carbon rich soils should be shown on a map. Refer to SEPA Soils Position Statement. (357) | Support noted. The extension of policy to protect carbon rich soils will be taken forward to the proposed plan. Consideration will be given to policy wording for protection of carbon rich soils, including depth of peat and mapping. | Include policy to protect carbon rich soils in the Proposed Plan. |
| Climate Change | Peat & Wind Turbines | The contributor asserts that peat should not be used as a reason to refuse wind turbines, as they themselves assist in carbon reduction. (210) | The extension of policy to protect carbon rich soils will be taken forward to the proposed plan. Consideration will be given to the wording of peat protection policy to enable losses to be balanced against other benefits (eg. renewable energy). | Include policy to protect carbon rich soils in the Proposed Plan. |
| Climate | Sustainable | The contributor supports MIR para. 2.14 | Support noted. | No change to the |

| | | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Change | Development | setting context for location of development, economic stability, placemaking and design. (130) | | principles set out in para 2.14. |
| Climate Change | Power points for electric vehicles | The contributor suggests that the Council should investigate the need for electric vehicle power points, due to the increasing use of this form of transport. (296) | Agree that the provision of power points for electric vehicles does need to be considered. The Council has sought a national approach for this issue to be adopted through its response to the Scottish Government on the National Planning Framework. | It is recommended that this issue is developed further through the Local Transport Strategy. |
| Renewable Energy | General | SBC has been at the forefront of renewable energy in terms of wind farms and already contributes more renewable energy on a per capita basis than most Scottish Council areas. (343) | Comments noted and agreed. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | Appreciate many of the better sites for turbines have been developed and great care must be taken to ensure future developments are done sensitively. Recognise that capacity for wind farms is not infinite and agree not all applications deserve to gain consent. (343) | Comments noted. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | Turbines are financially costly to the public ratepayer due to subsidies and compensation payments. (120, 178) | Comments noted. The Council undertook a study on the economic, landscape and community views on wind energy. This showed that there was potential economic advantage to the area from the wind turbine industry but that caution would need to be exercised to ensure that the impact on the environment was not adverse. | It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p><i>accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General | <p>Distribution of wind turbines in Scotland is not on an equitable basis. The Borders has more than enough and they will impact on the economy should it lose its beauty and relatively unspoiled location. (133)</p> | <p><i>Comments noted. The Council has undertaken a consultancy study into the economic, landscape and community view on wind turbines. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <i>will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | General | Reference to tabloid polls which suggest high numbers of the public against wind turbines. (133) | <i>Comments noted. The Council has undertaken a consultancy study into the economic, landscape and community view on wind turbines. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable,</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <i>including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | General | Generally support turbines but the scars which are their access roads should be minimised. (94) | Comments noted. Existing policy D4 on renewable energy seeks to ensure related works to turbine construction, including the formation of access roads, are constructed in an appropriate manner. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | The number of appeal decisions which have overturned refusals suggest existing policy on wind farms has failed. (146) | <i>Disagree. It is not considered that existing Council policy has failed. It is considered that the small number of overturned decisions were largely down to Reporter's decisions interpretation on parts of the policy where subjectivity is involved. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including</i> |

| | | | <i>inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>cumulative, impacts.</i> |
|------------------|---------|---|---|---|
| Renewable Energy | General | Whilst there is a strong case for supporting wind turbines they should only be part of a diverse portfolio of energy production. Increased building of turbines will decrease the availability of funds for alternative energy sources, thereby having a deleterious effect on Scotland's renewable energy aspirations in the long term. (148) | Comments noted. Existing Local Plan policy remains supportive of a range of renewable energy types. Funding of renewable energy types is out with the scope of planning control. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | SBC should resist the SNP's order to identify more land for wind turbines. This will totally destroy the already blighted landscape and the health and business of the Borders communities. (277) | <i>Local Plans should take due account of national guidance laid down by Scottish Government. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| | | | | unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts. |
| Renewable Energy | General | No further planning permissions should be given for wind driven power stations. Heavily subsidised companies submitting applications have no allegiance nor concerns for the wishes of the local population. (171) | <i>The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable | General | Concern generated electricity is not for the | It is acknowledged that the power | No action |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|--|---|
| Energy | | benefit of the Borders. (171) | generated from turbines will not all necessarily be for the full benefit and use of the particular local authority's administrative boundary. However, planning applications for wind turbines cannot be determined on the strength of the degree of electricity generated for the benefit of the Scottish Borders. | required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | Landscape is our main asset along with farming and what is left of the fishing fleet. (171) | Comments noted. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | The Council should take a strategic view to avoid saturation of our glorious landscape. Turbines should only be supported in appropriate sites. Wind is not the sole economic asset of the Scottish Borders. (184) | <i>The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | | unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts. |
| Renewable Energy | General | MIR should be more positive towards the potential that onshore wind energy development can be towards the national renewable energy targets. (286) | <i>SBC has been very supportive of wind energy within the Scottish Borders in the appropriate locations. It is considered the text does reflect the balance of supporting wind energy proposals and protecting the Scottish Borders landscapes. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable | General | It could be argued that the biggest issue is | <i>The MIR has received a large number of</i> | <i>It is</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|--|---|
| Energy | | <p>whether the Borders should continue to develop as a major centre for renewable (predominantly wind) energy generation or whether it should seek to retain and to grow the tourism industry it has. The two are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but there are carbon implications either way. The former may be the only way to generate significant new investment needed to tackle improved broadband, affordable housing, town centre enhancements, habitat improvements and flood mitigation. The MIR could stimulate debate as to how the Scottish Borders can benefit financially from income generated by turbines. (355)</p> | <p><i>responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council has commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General | <p>We (Scottish Government) are disappointed with the negative language within the MIR around renewables and in particular on shore wind energy. Authorities should recognise the positive benefits of turbines both to address climate change and for the local and Scottish economy. (339)</p> | <p><i>Disagree with comments. The MIR confirms the Council's support to renewable energy which is confirmed by the high number of approvals within the Scottish Borders for wind turbines. However, it would be completely naïve and incompetent of the Council to</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p><i>ignore the fact that there are very major issues raised from various sources regarding the cumulative impact of all approved and proposed turbines and reference to this must be made. It is considered this has been done in a balanced and an appropriate manner. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact (both positive and negative) and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General | The final plan and the SPG on wind energy should reflect the intentions of SPP in promoting renewable energy in appropriate locations, where cumulative impact issues can | <p><i>The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | be addressed. Some changes to the relevant text are accordingly suggested. (200) | <i>the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | General | The new plan should include a more balanced view of renewable energy, especially onshore wind and should make explicit links to national policies and targets. (200) | <i>It is considered the MIR did include a balanced view of renewable energy based on national policy and this will continue into the preparation of the proposed Local Development Plan. Quoting statistical national renewable energy targets has limited purpose as the targets regularly change and therefore text is soon out of date. The MIR has received a large number of</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General | <p>There appears to be an underlying assumption that wind farms conflict with tourism and are therefore potentially harmful. (200)</p> | <p><i>Disagree with the assumption made. It is not considered that the MIR gives this impression. As part of the preparation of the new LDP it is the Council's intention to carry out further work to investigate wind turbine issues, including a survey of public opinion on turbines and any possible tourist related issues. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|---|---|
| | | | <i>different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | General | It is considered that the MIR is lacking in its commitment to progress a spatial framework for renewable energy which is consistent with SPP and Scottish Govt renewable energy policy and advice. (346) | The Council has prepared a spatial framework for wind energy within the SPG in accordance with national guidance and Scottish Govt advice received during its consultation and preparation. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General | The LDP should be planned more positively for renewable energy development than the MIR suggests. (346) | It is considered that the MIR does give sufficient acknowledgement and weighting to renewable energy. | Renewable energy issues to be addressed in the preparation of the LDP. |
| Renewable Energy | General | The MIR should confirm the statistical national targets for renewable energy. (346) | The MIR is a high level document and has no remit to go into this level of detail. However, the MIR confirms the importance of renewable energy and the national thrust for supporting proposals where possible. A text reference to national figures for required renewable energy targets could be considered within the preparation of the LDP. However, quoting | Reference to statistical national targets for renewable energy to be considered in the preparation of the LDP. |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---|--|---|
| | | | statistical national renewable energy targets has limited purpose as the targets regularly change and therefore text is soon out of date. | |
| Renewable Energy | General | In respect of the approach to wind energy proposals, request that full account is given to the sensitivity of the landscape in neighbouring council areas, cumulative impact and any representation made in this regard by the relevant council. (135) | Comments noted. The SPG on Wind Energy takes cognisance of this and the Development Management process consults neighbouring authorities on applications on or in the vicinity of administrative boundaries. | No action required. Development Management to continue to consult neighbouring Council's where appropriate. |
| Renewable Energy | General | The LDP should recognise that Scotland Gas Networks has a statutory duty to maintain an efficient and economical pipeline system and may require development consent to be delivered under the terms of the Gas Act 1986. (346) | Comments noted. This will be considered within the preparation of the LDP, although existing policy supports the need for public infrastructure improvements and it may not be necessary to specifically make reference to this need. | Consider possible text reference to Scotland Gas Networks as part of new LDP. |
| Renewable Energy | General | Applications for turbines submitted by local farmers should be supported by SBC and the economic benefits should be maximised by planners, not minimised due to requesting smaller scale turbines. Considered more credence is given to objectors and farmer owned turbines will provide an invaluable income to secure many local jobs. (269) | <i>Whilst the economic benefits of turbines to farmers are acknowledged, such proposals must also be judged in respect of potential impact on the landscape. The economic benefits of turbines were addressed as part of the policy review which feeds into the LDP process. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <i>considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Renewable Energy | General | Wind turbine applications submitted by local developers should be determined by the full planning committee in all cases and not delegated. (270) | This proposal would be considered as part of the Development Management process as opposed to the Local Plan process. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Eskdalemuir | Remain unconvinced that development within the Eskdalemuir area will ever be possible, and believe this to be a significant additional constraint on the SPG map. (343) | The Council awaits further advice from the MOD on this matter. This may ultimately remove the current embargo on turbines within the buffer area of Eskdalemuir. | Await further advice from the MOD which will feed into renewable energy policy. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines | Turbines have a detrimental impact on tourism. (120, 129, 178, 184, 188, 189, 226, 249, 263) Consider the landscape is at saturation point and there must be designated areas for development and limits to the number of future applications and size that can be lodged by developers or local landowners. (262) | <i>Planning policy addresses the issues raised by the respondents, although any perceived impact of proposals on house prices is out with the remit of planning control.</i> <i>The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Turbines are devastating our wild life and house prices. (263)</p> <p>Turbines have a detrimental impact on landscape and cultural heritage. (124, 125, 126, 129)</p> | <p><i>the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | Proposals in the Hermitage Valley, one of the most beautiful and untouched areas of the Scottish Borders, are a concern from a private equity company only interested in profit for its stakeholders. (124, 125, 126) | Comments noted. Planning applications for specific sites will be judged via the Development Management process. Wider issues of cumulative impact and landscape capacity will be addressed as part of the policy review study which will feed into the LDP process. | Wider scale issues of landscape capacity will be presented as part of the report on the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | The by exception policy should be adopted in view of the number of applications which are being received (eg Birnieknowe, Dykerraw, Cummings Hill). (134, 186) | Comments noted. Planning applications for specific sites will be judged via the Development Management process. Issues of cumulative impact and landscape capacity will be addressed as part of the policy review which will feed into the LDP process. | Wider scale issues of landscape capacity will be presented as part of the report on the Proposed Local |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | Development Plan. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | Borders has done its bit for wind power and its valuable assets of landscape and wildlife must be protected. It is also important to put off inappropriate applications such as those at Whitton Loch, Yetholm Loch, Standhill and Ladykirk. (352) | Comments noted. Policy will continue to give protection to landscape and wildlife where appropriate. Planning applications for specific sites will be judged via the Development Management process. Issues of cumulative impact and landscape capacity will be addressed as part of the policy review which will feed into the LDP process. | Wider scale issues of landscape capacity will be presented as part of the report on the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | General and cumulative issues regarding proposals in Berwickshire at Drone Hill, Blackmains and Horn Burn. (192) | Comments noted. Planning applications for specific sites will be judged via the Development Management process. Issues of cumulative impact and landscape capacity will be addressed as part of the policy review which will feed into the LDP process. | Wider scale issues of landscape capacity will be presented as part of the report on the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | There are issues regarding the cumulative impact of approved turbines within Berwickshire. (146, 263) | <i>Comments noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | <p><i>policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals. It should also be noted that the Council has recently consulted on guidance for single and small groups of turbines in Berwickshire.</i></p> | <p><i>unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | As a hill walker it is daunting to walk through a wind farm in operation and in the Lammermuirs it has got to the point that from the east coast the length of the hills you can stand at one wind farm and see the next one in the distance. (329) | <p><i>Comments noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | <p><i>turbine development proposals. It should also be noted that the Council has recently consulted on guidance for single and small groups of turbines in Berwickshire.</i></p> | <p><i>capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General - Impacts of turbines on specific parts of the Scottish Borders | Objects strongly to all proposed wind farms in our beautiful area – we do not want Berwickshire spoiled. Not convinced that these are any help to our economy or environment. (361) | <p><i>Comments noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals. It should also be noted that the Council has recently consulted on guidance for single and small groups of turbines in Berwickshire.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative,</i></p> |

| | | | | impacts. |
|------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Renewable Energy | General – Proximity to residencies | The distance of turbines from residencies is an issue. (181, 232) | SPP gives guidance on distances between turbines and built up areas which is reflected within the SPG on wind energy. There is no specific national guidance to cases involving turbines and single residencies. Such issues are addressed on a case by case basis. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General – Domestic / individual turbines | Applications should be refused other than those for personal use on a domestic / individual scale. (242) | There is no statutory basis which can allow the consideration and determination of applications on these case types. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General - Economics issues | Land owners should be encouraged by SBC to erect turbines as the trickle down effect of revenue would greatly benefit the local economy. Small scale proposals for local benefit would be preferable to larger scale proposals where the majority of profit goes abroad. Small businesses desperately need work involved in building turbine bases, tracks, maintenance, etc. (268) | The Council does encourage communities to engage in investigating opportunities they could benefit from turbines. However, any resultant financial benefit to communities or individuals cannot be considered a material consideration within the processing of planning applications. The SPG on wind energy does make reference to both commercial and small scale turbine proposal types. | No action required. |
| Renewable Energy | General – single / medium scale turbines | Whilst much is said of the need to consider the location of wind farms, there is little reference to the location and siting of single medium scale turbines. These also have a cumulative impact which needs to be considered. (355) | <i>The Council is aware of cumulative issues of smaller scale turbines. There is a pilot study of this issue being carried out within Berwickshire where this is a particular concern. The template for this study may well be used for other parts of the Borders where this is also an issue. The MIR has received a large number of</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i></p> | <p><i>they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i></p> |
| Renewable Energy | General – Moratorium on wind turbines | <p>SBC should follow the examples of Aberdeenshire and Fife Councils in seeking a moratorium on wind farm applications given the vast number which are being submitted. The region is already a significant net exporter of wind energy and there is a danger of seeing its scenic assets being turned into “windfarm landscapes”. (264)</p> | <p>Both Aberdeenshire and Fife Councils’ proposed moratoriums on wind farms were dismissed by the Scottish Government. Whilst this Council is aware of concerns regarding the number of wind energy proposals being submitted with the Scottish Borders and the implications this has on staff resources, a moratorium would not be an appropriate action.</p> | <p>No action required.</p> |
| Renewable Energy | General - Tidal Energy | <p>Turbines and their installation destroy the landscape and impact on tourism. Tidal energy is more preferable, it is a constant and is invisible. (150, 226)</p> | <p>Comments noted. Offshore tidal wave applications are infrequent but the Council would be supportive in appropriate locations.</p> | <p>No action required.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Renewable Energy | General – Height restriction on turbines | No turbines over 6m in height should be accepted. (166) | <i>The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from this further work is anticipated before the end of 2012, and it is therefore proposed that the Council considers this issue as part of the overall content of the Proposed Local Development Plan in spring 2013. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
|------------------|--|--|---|---|

GENERAL POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

GENERAL POLICY ISSUES

PREFERRED OPTION:

To prepare the Proposed LDP on the basis of the recommendations set out in Appendix C.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION:

None.

Question 18: Do you agree with the preferred option to prepare the LDP on the basis of the recommendations in Appendix C? Or, do you have other alternative options?

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Question 18: Appendix C | Agreement with preferred option | The respondents agree with the preferred option. (172, 275, 288, 289, 290, 316, 327, 357, 336, 368) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Question 18: Appendix C | Opportunity for further comment | Would welcome the opportunity to comment on individual policies as they are amended. (368) In general we support the preferred option...We would however reserve final comment on this matter until the proposed drafting of those policies subject to change is issued for consultation. (252) | The policies will be subject to consultation when the Proposed Plan is put out for public consultation. | No further action required. |

APPENDICES

A. ZONING PROPOSALS

A1 EMPLOYMENT SITE OPTIONS

The sites within the following table were put forward within the Main Issues Report:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Central Strategic Development Area | MDARN001, Site west of Borders General Hospital, Darnick | <p>A number of contributors have submitted comments in support of the search area west of Borders General Hospital: Contributor (360) states that the area around the east of Tweedbank would appear to be optimum for employment land allocation in the Central Borders, and contributor (159) have no objections to the proposal.</p> <p>NHS appreciate that the Council consider the area for possible employment expansion. Expansion in activity within specialities such as Orthopaedics and Paediatric Care within BGH may influence and increase interest in the Broomilee site should this area be marketed for future development. NHS Borders has an early conceptual development plan of centralising more facilities within BGH campus which can be shared after being explored in greater detail. (348)</p> <p>Contributors have also submitted comments objecting to the inclusion of MDARN001. The</p> | <p><i>Comments noted. The Council commissioned a Market Assessment, Feasibility Study and Development Strategy for new business space within the Tweedbank / Broomilees / Huntlyburn area in order to maximise the development potential afforded by the Borders Railway. This assessed the future potential for business growth within the Central Borders and a demand forecast for the provision of appropriate business land and premises in light of that assessment. The Study found that it was not worthwhile progressing development at this site in the short term on the basis of a lack of identified demand, costs relative to other sites and landscape and visual issues which would require to be addressed. The site is, however, considered to have long term mixed use potential, incorporating business and industrial land. This would require assessment during the process of the next Local Development Plan.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that the circumstances had changed for</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>main issues raised are the sites planning history (327, 313, 314, 211, 131) and the likely adverse impacts on Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (327, 355, 364), and development of the site being contrary to Council policies on AGLV, NSA and CAT. (364, 331)</p> <p>Contributor (364) wants the site removed.</p> <p>More detailed comments on the impact on the landscape and character: Development would result in unsightly development straddling lane which is major approach to Scott's managed landscape associated with Abbotsford. (211, 132, 131) and SE end of search area covers NE edge of Abbotsford Gardens and Designed Landscape. (339) Contributors asserts the site is sloping (331), visually prominent (331), (327) and would require cut and fill solution for access. (331) Contributor (364) states that development would break into countryside and development would erode distinctiveness of Darnick.</p> | <p><i>development of the site as the promoted site identified in the MIR was a search area for a much smaller site than what had previously been included in the Local Plan. The site has support from NHS.</i></p> <p><i>The search area would need to be assessed in detail to locate any suitable development areas and identify how to minimise any impact on the surrounding landscape if development proposals were taken forward.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that this much smaller site is in a more discrete location than the previous site, and could be considered for development in the future. The Council is aware of the sensitive location and designations. Landscaping and screening would need to be carefully considered together with the site layout during the planning process to minimise any detrimental impacts on the landscape and views, if the site was taken forward.</i></p> <p><i>As the site is included in the</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | <p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No infrastructure in place (331) • SEPA recommend adding development requirement relating to waste water drainage to be connected to public sewer (357) <p>Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Tweedbank Industrial Estate and Broomilees search area is expanded or change uses of the Industrial Estate requirement for transport appraisal need to be revisited. (339) • If Broomilee site is taken forward transport appraisal may be required relating to trunk road junction. (339) <p>Comments on use and planning of site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No masterplan for use of site and BGH site (331) • BGH does not need further land to develop, if a need in future this can be dealt with through planning application (364) • Other less contentious options have been put forward (211) | <p>Countryside Around Town policy area further assessment of development proposals, in terms of design and setting, would be required.</p> <p>Infrastructure: If the site is taken forward in the future a requirement relating to waste water drainage as requested by SEPA would need to be set out.</p> <p>Transport: If the site is taken forward in the future and there is a requirement for a Transport Assessment the Council would work with Transport Scotland.</p> <p>The site is located in the Central Borders and is in close proximity to the proposed railway station in Tweedbank. NHS supports the site and a masterplan would be part of the planning process.</p> | |
| | MTWEE001 | The site has been supported for development, | The Council commissioned a Market | It is considered |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| | <p>Site east of railway terminal, Tweedbank and ATWEE001, Site east of railway, Tweedbank</p> | <p>although put forward for residential development instead of Mixed Use. (159)</p> <p>Contributors have commented on the mixed use site and have raised the following main issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is designated for temporary possession for purposes of construction of the Borders Rail link. The site will be available post construction (339) • Likely adverse impacts on the landscape character and scenic qualities of the Eildon and Leaderfoot NSA, particularly cumulative and in-combination impacts (327) • Site should be considered together with potential re-arrangement of existing industrial site at Tweedbank (364) <p>The development would require to connect to the public foul sewer. Network capacity (pumping station at Tweedbank) should be verified with Scottish Water (357)</p> | <p><i>Assessment, Feasibility Study and Development Strategy for new business space within the Tweedbank / Broomilees / Huntlyburn area in order to maximise the development potential afforded by the Borders Railway. This assessed the future potential for business growth within the Central Borders and a demand forecast for the provision of appropriate business land and premises in light of that assessment. It has been found that the area would be suitable for commercial mixed use development given its location close to an established industrial estate and the proposed railway station in Tweedbank. The site will be available for development post construction of the railway and railway station.</i></p> <p><i>The main concern raised by contributors is the potential impact on the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area which needs to be considered in the detailed planning of the site and the restructuring of the industrial estate. The NSA designation does not preclude development and the area is unusual in its mix of rural and urban development.</i></p> | <p><i>this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan for mixed use development.</i></p> |
|--|---|---|---|--|

| | | | <i>Comments on connection to public foul sewer can be considered at planning application stage.</i> | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Western Strategic Development Area | MPEEB004 Whitehaugh Employment, Peebles | <p>The contributor requests that a watercourse six metre buffer strip is added to the sites requirements. They also state that to ensure appropriate improvements are made to Scottish Water infrastructure to accommodate the development before it is occupied; they recommend that the connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer is specified as a developer requirement. (357)</p> <p>The contributor seeks an additional requirement for employment land and masterplan for Whitehaugh MPEEB004 that no development should take place before a second crossing is complete and that advance landscape screening should take place. (368)</p> <p>This site is being promoted for housing including affordable housing and the contributor does not wish to see the site allocated for any use which would sterilise it from being taken forward for residential development. The contributor is keen to assist the Council in realising the development potential of the area at Whitehaugh which is currently identified in the</p> | <p>These comments are noted and should a site at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, the suggested requirements could also be added.</p> <p>It should be noted that site MPEEB004 is part of the potential longer term mixed use site SPEEB005 as identified within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. A site requirement is already in place within the Plan requiring a new bridge over the River Tweed along with a further requirement for enhancement of existing woodland and provision of additional landscaping.</p> <p>Mixed use site MPEEB004 as identified within the Main Issues Report (MIR) is part of the potential longer term mixed use site SPEEB005 as identified within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. Whilst the MIR identified this site as a preferred option for employment, the site requirements stated that: <i>"A part of the site could be brought forward to meet a</i></p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council includes this site in the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>In the event that this site is allocated additional site requirements in relation to the requirement for a six metre buffer strip along the watercourse on site, as well as a further requirement regarding the need for connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer should also be included.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Plan for longer term. (333)</p> <p>The contributor objects to the site in that it is not located well to the settlement and has issues in relation to flood risk. (367)</p> | <p><i>need for employment land'</i>. Therefore it should be noted whilst all of site MPEEB004 was identified in the MIR, should employment land at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, it is not envisaged that the entire site would be allocated for employment.</p> <p>Site MPEEB004 is part of the potential longer term mixed use site SPEEB005 as identified within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. The identification of site SPEEB005 was considered by the Local Plan Amendment Examination Reporter and the Reporter in his conclusions stated: <i>"In terms of the balance of the town, the development of SPEEB005 would not relate to the existing built-up area as readily as sites SPEEB003 and SPEEB004. However, that part of SPEEB005 intended for built development would adjoin site TP7B, which is currently under development, with the B7062 providing an identifiable boundary to the north-east. In my opinion, this would represent a reasonable area of expansion when assessed in the context of the wider urban form of Peebles"</i>.</p> <p>In relation to the contributors comment regarding the issue of flood risk, it should be noted that the Scottish Environment</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | Protection Agency (SEPA) have not objected to the inclusion of the site in respect to flood risk. However, it should be noted that should site MPEEB004 come forward within the Proposed Local Development Plan a Flood Risk Assessment will be required. | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

The sites within the following table were submitted as new sites during the process of the consultation of the Main Issues Report, maps are included in Appendix A1:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Coldstream | BCOLD001 Lennel Mount North, Coldstream | - Amendments to criteria in Local Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Vehicular access from the A6112 and Hill View; improvements to the A6112/Coldstream Mains Farm road junction as required</i> A sense of arrival should be created at the entrance from the A6112; (310) | The conditions reflect an existing planning consent granted for a change of use from agricultural to employment land with provision of a new access road from the A6112. Any issues regarding this should be challenged through the Development Management process over the Local Development Plan process. | No further action required. |
| Eyemouth | MEYEM001 Gungreen Mixed Use, Eyemouth | Respondent states that mixed use development at Gungreen should be kept inside MEYEM001. Submits there should be allowance for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upscale housing; • commercial/tourism potential (Marine Interpretative Centre/Lobster Hatchery); • provision for sea water for the development of said commercial/tourism outlets and existing business (347) | The Mixed Use site MEYEM001 will remain in the LDP; the proposals for development listed would appear to be in line with appropriate mixed use development but would need to be subject to assessment under a planning application. | No further action. |
| Greenlaw | Replacement | The respondent states that the site is suitable | Council GIS data shows that the site is | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|---|
| | of Consolidated Local Plan site zEL23 (Extension to Duns Road Industrial Estate, Greenlaw) with alternative employment land BGREE004 (Land at South East, Greenlaw) | <p>because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is away from residences and the Conservation Area; • landowner supportive; • good access from A697; • tucked low in landscape; • protected from flooding by old railway (300, 301) | located within the 1:200 flood envelope. It should be noted that there is further mixed use provision in the proposed site MGREE001. | that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| Lamancha | BLAMA001 Whim Moss, Lamancha | The contributor seeks the allocation of site BLAMA001 for horticultural manufacturing purposes. They state the proposed development would represent a £8 million investment in the area which would assist in safeguarding existing jobs on peat mosses whilst creating a further 70 full time and 15 seasonal jobs. The contributor states the site is located adjacent an existing peat operation, and that locating the site here would maximise operational efficiency and minimise road haulage requirements. They also state that the site can be developed in a manner which is sympathetic to the appearance and character of the area. (187) | It should be noted that the Council have a supportive policy for this type of development in terms of Policy D1 'Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside'. Therefore, it is considered that this proposal can be considered against that policy as well as other appropriate policies through the Development Management Process should a planning application be submitted. Policy D1 aims to allow for appropriate employment generating development in the countryside whilst protecting the environment and ensuring that developments are appropriate to their | It is recommended that the Council can consider this proposal through the Development Management Process. |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | location. | |
| Peebles | BPEEB008 Land on the Edinburgh Road, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of a site (BPEEB008) for employment at Land on the Edinburgh Road (outwith the Boundary). They state that it is essential that the site benefits from a landscaped tree belt to minimise the visual impact which the new development would impose. (177) | <i>It is acknowledged that there is a shortage of employment land within the Peebles Area. However following a full assessment of site BPEEB008, the site has been found to be unacceptable for development. The majority of the site sits within an area of flood risk; it is also considered that development at this location would have a major impact on biodiversity. In addition the Economic Development Section of the Council are unable to support the allocation of the site. It should however be noted, that a part of the Longer Term Mixed Use site within Peebles, site SPEEB005 has been identified as having potential to come forward in the short term to accommodate business and industrial use. As a result of the above, it is considered inappropriate to allocate site BPEEB008 within the Proposed LDP.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP.</i> |
| Peebles | BPEEB009 Land to the East of Eshiels Yard, Eshiels, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of a site (BPEEB009) for employment at Land to the East of Eshiels Yard. They state that it is essential that the site benefits from a landscaped tree belt to minimise the visual impact which the new development would impose. (177) | <i>It is acknowledged that there is a shortage of employment land within the Peebles Area. However following a full assessment of site BPEEB009, the site has been found to be unsuitable for development. The site partly sits within an area of flood risk; it is also</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>considered that development at this location would have a major impact on biodiversity. In addition there is the potential for conflict between the proposed new use and existing neighbouring residents.</i></p> <p><i>It should however be noted, that a part of the Longer Term Mixed Use site within Peebles, site SPEEB005 has been identified as having potential to come forward in the short term to accommodate business and industrial use.</i></p> <p><i>As a result of the above, it is considered inappropriate to allocate site BPEEB009 within the Proposed LDP.</i></p> | <p><i>proposed LDP.</i></p> |
| Peebles | BPEEB010 South Park West, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of a site (BPEEB010) for employment at South Park West. They state that it is essential that the site benefits from a landscaped tree belt to minimise the visual impact which the new development would impose. (177) | <p>A reduced site (BPEEB003) at this location was considered by the Local Plan Amendment Examination Reporter. The Reporter concluded that:</p> <p><i>“I believe that that this area could generate a significant level of industrial/commercial traffic which, of necessity, would be required to pass along the residential approach roads to the east. Despite the reduced area of development, I share the concerns of the previous Reporter, ... about the impact on residential amenity. ... I conclude that in terms of access and traffic generation, the allocation of site BPEEB003 is not acceptable”.</i></p> | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Therefore given the recent Reporter decision for employment use at this location (be that decision on a smaller site than that brought forward through the Main Issues Report consultation), it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site for employment land within the Proposed Local Development Plan. | |
| Peebles | BPEEB011 East of Cavalry Park /Land North of B7062, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of a site (BPEEB011) for employment at East of Cavalry Park. They state that it is essential that the site benefits from a landscaped tree belt to minimise the visual impact which the new development would impose. (177) The contributors state that part of the land at Whitehaugh which is north of the B7062 and south of the River Tweed should be considered as an extension to Cavalry Park. (297, 333) | Development at this location has previously been considered by the Local Plan Amendment Examination Reporter. The Finalised Local Plan Amendment identified site SPEEB005 for longer term mixed use development. The Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) objected to the Finalised Plan and sought the following wording to be added: <i>“As this site is at a high risk of flooding a flood risk assessment is required to inform site layout, design and mitigation. No built development should take place on the functional floodplain. The flood risk area in the northern half of the site (north of the B7062) should be safeguarded as open space, for structured planting and landscaping purposes only”.</i> The Reporter in his conclusion stated that that: <i>“In considering this matter I am acutely aware of the opinion of the Scottish Environment Protection Agency in respect of flood risk. I attach great weight to the</i> | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>views of the Agency and, as I have indicated, I consider the suggested addition to the finalised local plan amendment should be included in the document to provide a warning to potential developers. I therefore conclude that the indicative open space designation should not be removed from this part of the longer-term mixed-use allocation of site SPEEB005'.</i></p> <p>As a result of the above, it is considered inappropriate to consider employment land or any type of built development at this location.</p> | |
| Peebles | MPEEB003 Hunters Park, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of site MPEEB003 for mixed use development. They state that floodrisk on this site is acknowledged however, it is considered that the current designation of the site as open space with structure planting is inappropriate. The contributor continues stating that the site is well contained by mature planting and could be further planted to provide additional screening. (235) | Response as above relating to site BPEEB011. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Peebles | MPEEB005 Glentress, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of site MPEEB005 for mixed use for possible tourism and recreation. The contributor states the provision of new facilities at Glentress Peel have resulted in the removal of temporary buildings and reallocation of car parking leaving brownfield sites which may be suitable for further development such as Aparthotel, | It is noted that the proposal is not sufficiently developed at this stage. However the Council have a supportive policy in terms of Policy D1 'Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside'. It is therefore considered that this proposal can be considered against Policy D1 along with other | It is recommended that the Council can consider this proposal through the Development Management Process. |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|---|--|--|
| | | commercial property, additional car parking and 50 cabins/lodges. The contributor notes that the National Planning Framework 2 seeks to raise the profile of recreational and tourism opportunities which woods and forestry present in terms in economic benefits as well as health and wellbeing. Furthermore Policy 11 of the proposed SESPlan recognises the importance of green networks and puts emphasis on Local Development Plans to identify a mechanism through which these opportunities can be delivered. (341) | appropriate policies through the Development Management Process should a planning application be submitted. Policy D1 recognises that some tourism related developments may not be able to be easily accommodated within settlements and may be satisfactorily located in certain countryside locations subject to compliance with environmental policies. | |
| Peebles | MPEEB006 Rosetta Road Mixed Use, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of site MPEEB006 on the Rosetta Holiday Park to allow for housing of different sizes and tenures including affordable to take place; as well as the holiday park and associated facilities. The contributor states that the allocation of this site would allow for investment to take place to upgrade the park attracting more visitors and expenditure to the wider Peebles area. The contributor states that they have undertaken an initial assessment on access, landscaping, topography, and utilities within the site and have concluded that this site along with proposed housing site APEEB044 has the potential to accommodate up to 200 units as well as additional accommodation facilities for the holiday park and improved facilities. (326) | <i>It is noted that this site is part of the Rosetta Caravan Park . Following a full assessment of site MPEEB006 it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site within the proposed LDP for mixed use including housing. Development at this location would result in at least some loss of the tourism asset onsite, in addition development on site would result in a negative impact on the built heritage and landscape assets onsite . It is also considered that development here would have a moderate impact on biodiversity. As a result of the above, it is considered inappropriate to allocate site MPEEB006 within the Proposed LDP.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| Peebles | SPEEB006 | The contributor seeks the identification of site | A reduced site at this location was | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | South West of Peebles, Peebles | SPEEB006 for Long term mixed use including housing and employment. The contributor's submission includes a Development Framework Plan. The contributor states that extensive new planting can be carried out to form the setting of the new development and that the site provides a distinct natural containment within the existing landscape; that the site could be accessed of Edderston Road and from South Parks; it would be an effective site; and that it compares favourably in relation to flood risk and physical location to the town when considering other sites identified within the town. (367) | considered by the Local Plan Amendment Reporter for housing, as well as for longer term development. The Reporter who did not support the allocation of the site as a result of roads issues stated within his conclusions: <i>"Traffic matters are also of concern and the difficulties of access via Caledonia Road and South Parks and the Tweed crossing are common to both sites"</i> in reference to sites APEEB016 and site APEEB015 (both sites of which are part of site SPEEB006), the Examination Reporter then added: <i>"I conclude that site APEEB016 should not be regarded as preferable to sites to the south-east of Peebles and should not be allocated for longer term development"</i> . | that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Newstead | MNEWS001, Back Road, Newstead | The site has been put forward for inclusion in the plan. The site is promoted as it has less development difficulty, less impact on agricultural units, less impact on landscape, equal access, and fits well in the landscape than other sites in the plan. The site can be used as example of zero carbon development. (331) | <i>Following a full site assessment it is considered that site MNEWS001 is not appropriate for allocation. The site was found to be unsuitable because of its relationship to an archaeological site and the form and setting of Newstead. In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas and within the Central Housing Market.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| West Linton | zEL18 | The contributor suggests that this site should | Site zEL18 is the only allocated | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Deanfoot Road, West Linton | be re-allocated to another use; since it has been allocated for employment for some time and despite interest from other parties, no employment development has taken place on the site. (226) | <p>Employment Use site in West Linton within the Consolidated Local Plan, and therefore its loss as such would not be recommended.</p> <p>Furthermore, this site has been recently considered for housing during the Local Plan Amendment Examination. The Examination Reporter concluded:</p> <p><i>“Although site zEL18 is on the periphery of West Linton, it is relatively accessible and I believe it is suited to the employment land use allocation that has been applied in the adopted local plan. ... The site offers the only employment land in the village and I share the opinion of the council that this is a further important consideration. ... The current employment land allocation should remain and a housing land designation should not be applied”.</i></p> | that the Council agree to retain this site as an allocated employment site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|--|

A2 HOUSING SITE OPTIONS

The sites within the following table were put forward within the Main Issues Report:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues | Recommendation |
|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | Raised | |
| Berwickshire Housing Market Area | ABIRG003 Land East of Birgham, Birgham | The respondent considers ABIRG003 should be an allocated alternative site in the LDP. The Respondent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorses principles (<i>site requirements</i>) put forward in the MIR; • Believes the proposal is commensurate to character of the village (275) | <p><i>Support for the alternative site is noted.</i></p> <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets. However, only a limited number of units will be supported, so as to respect the character and layout of the village.</i></p> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| | ABIRG003, Land East of Birgham, Birgham | The respondent states that within the SEA the site is identified as acceptable. The following points are noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the land is prime quality agricultural land | <i>This representation is written in the context of promotion of another alternative site also located outwith the three Strategic Development Areas as</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>against AEDDL002, (Eddleston)</p> <p>(assessment of housing sites outwith Core Development Areas)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there would be moderate wider biodiversity impacts (227) <p>The respondent states that a Scottish Water growth project will be required for foul drainage before this development can progress. (357)</p> | <p>put forward in the SESplan Proposed Plan.</p> <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets. However, only a limited number of units will be supported, so as to respect the character and layout of the village.</i></p> <p>Scottish Water have commenced work on the growth project, they envisage the water works being operational next year.</p> | <p>Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>If the site is carried forward foul drainage should not be an issue given Scottish Water's work. No further action required.</p> |
| ADUNS023 | | The respondent supports part of the site | Support for part of the proposed site is | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| | <p>South of Earlsmeadow (Phase 1), Duns</p> | <p>subject to land policy ADUNS023 (land immediately adjacent to high school) for housing allocation. It is submitted this part of the site would be an excellent 'infill' opportunity. (137)</p> <p>SEPA state that ADUNS023 does not contain reference to need for a Flood Risk Assessment and that the site may be at flood risk from the small watercourse that appears to be culverted beneath the site. Although they feel the site is acceptable, they further state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend developer requirement to undertake a FRA and a commitment that no development would take place within the function flood plain, or within an area of any known flood risk is attached • Recommend contacting Tweed Forum to check if this site is identified on the wetland inventory and Council wetland maps. <p>Duns STW currently at capacity so a growth project to upgrade would be required before the development could progress (357)</p> | <p>noted. In the interests of the longer-term strategic development of Duns it was considered appropriate to include additional land adjacent to that beside the high school in the proposal.</p> <p>The site requirements in the MIR state that "Investigation of ground conditions should be carried out on the southern part of the site and that the findings should be addressed with appropriate mitigation".</p> <p>The development of site ADUNS023, if included in the proposed LDP, will be carried out in consultation with Scottish Water and SEPA.</p> | <p>that the Council agrees that the site should be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP.</p> <p>If the site is included in the proposed plan further investigation of flood risk, including a flood risk assessment, should be included in the site requirements.</p> |
| | <p>MGREE001 South of Edinburgh Road, Greenlaw</p> | <p>The respondent states that surface water from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage involving the use of water resilient construction measures. (357)</p> | <p>SEPA have been requested to re-affirm the need for water resilient construction measures.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should be proposed for inclusion in the</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | proposed LDP. |
| | <p>MGREE001 South of Edinburgh Road, Greenlaw against AEDDL002, North of Bellfield, Eddleston (assessment of housing sites outwith Core Development Areas)</p> | <p>The respondent states that within the SEA, the site is identified as acceptable for mixed use with a capacity of 6 units. The following points are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land is prime quality agricultural land; • there is limited access to public transport, employment and services (227) | <p>This representation is written in the context of promotion of another alternative site also located outwith the three Strategic Development Areas as put forward in the SESplan Proposed Plan. It should be noted that if MGREE001 was carried forward it would increase the availability of employment land options in Greenlaw.</p> <p>The SESplan Proposed Plan is now at Examination and this will consider the issue of future housing land requirement across the SESplan area. Because the LDP requires to conform to the SESplan Strategic Development Plan, the finalisation of the housing supply within the proposed LDP should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination. This is anticipated in spring of 2013. It is therefore proposed that the finalisation of the housing land supply within the Local Development Plan should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination, and be subject of the report to Council on the overall content of the Proposed LDP in spring 2013.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree that this site should be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
| | <p>AHUTT002 Land south of Hutton Church,</p> | <p>The respondents state a number of objections, which are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing estate out of place/ out of scale | <p>It was considered in the preparation of the Main Issues Report that the proposed site would offer an opportunity for a small scale housing scheme and the</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--------|---|--|---|
| | Hutton | <p>and would mar village character/result in an imbalanced community (160, 127, 113, 161, 96, 128, 223, 219, 207)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • would mean an extension of an ancient village boundary. It is outwith the 2011 Settlement Plan. Traditionally village has been two parts (127, 221, 231) • no need for housing in Hutton as property tends to remain on the market for a long time (161, 114, 221, 113, 231, 294) • a more gradual approach (to housing development) would be preferable (160, 114) • should revert back to original housing site in Hutton at Rosebank (109, 127, 291) • proposed site locally regarded as a protected view...Hutton has 3 listed buildings ...the proposed designation makes a step towards protecting the view – but only from one aspect. All other aspects would be lost (127, 128, 291, 231) • Hutton Church has housing on three sides...its presence would be spoilt should it become enclosed by a housing scheme to the south. For these reasons I feel that the earlier designated site for housing was | <p>introduction of an attractive village green/amenity area which could be considered an appealing feature within the centre of the village. The village green would be located immediately in front of the church and therefore would help conserve its listed setting.</p> <p>For these reasons it was considered worthwhile proposing the site within the MIR to seek public opinion.</p> <p>It is acknowledged there has been strong local objection to the site although it is contended that the pluvial flooding issues in the field could be mitigated in a straightforward manner.</p> <p>Given the economic climate a site of this size may not be deliverable and it is considered that the Proposed Plan should stick with the existing allocated housing site in the village (BHU2B)</p> <p>The site assessment process has been clarified in writing to Hutton and Paxton Community Council. There has not been ongoing discussion with the landowner.</p> | proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
|--|--------|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>the better choice (109, 114, 127, 128, 224, 221, 207, 257, 231)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of greenspace (161, 97, 96, 127, 221, 231, 228, 294) • scale of proposed village green and amenity area falls woefully short of the real needs of a community such as Hutton (160, 127) • any inclusion of AHUTT002 should be as protected greenspace (113) • there is a tree preservation order in place on the Oak tree in the corner beside the church (219, 228) • field is subject to flooding (161, 160, 100, 114, 127, 128, 224, 219, 231) • single track access road is subject to flooding (127) • field contains a cesspit and sewage pipes feed into this (161) • sewage infrastructure is at capacity (114, 127, 113) • assessment from runoff and overland flow recommended | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6m buffer recommended from water feature on site • enhancement of habitat potential from restoration of small water course to west of the site (removal of culvert) • clarification from Scottish Water on whether site can be connected to public foul sewer. Hutton has two sewerage systems, one being a septic tank which would require to be upgraded if the development went ahead (357) • Hutton does not have any schools, shops or pubs. It has a very limited bus service. Difficult for people to live there unless they have personal transport (161, 97, 100, 114, 127, 128, 224, 219, 113, 231, 294) • development would adversely affect quality of life (97, 161, 128, 113, 207) • ...housing development on this site and on this scale, would generate significantly higher levels of traffic movement through the village. Adding to heavy lorries and cars from Hutton Barns and the plant hire depot (160, 224, 207) • had the Community Council known of this proposal at the time of the July 2011 meeting in Duns, attending members would have been in a more informed | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>position...As it is, we now appear to be behind the process instead of working in parallel with it (160, 113, 127)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we were surprised when we learned there had been discussion between the owner of AHUTT002 and the Council as far back as 2010. (113) <p>Regrettable that the owner of the land currently designated for housing – BHU2B – but now removed from the latest Local Plan, was neither informed nor consulted about this change...this particular area of designated land has not at any time caused controversy in Hutton and it is noted that the number of houses suggested in that site are almost identical to AHUTT002. (160)</p> | | |
| | AREST001 Auction Mart, Reston | <p>SEPA state that potential development could increase flood risk elsewhere. In addition they add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRA required in case an alternative scheme comes forward; • 6m buffer from water feature required; • Opportunity should be taken to enhance watercourse as a feature of the development. Any engineering work (culverting) should be prohibited; • Growth project would be required at Reston STW to enable development; • WWTW upgrade. (357) | <p><i>The site has a planning permission subject to legal agreement (no consent has been released) and as a part of the process granting this permission the respondent's comments including those in relation to flood risk were addressed and satisfied.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree that the site should be put forward for a mixed use allocation, noting that this will allow the current application to proceed. The allocation will be MREST001.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Historic Scotland state that redevelopment of this site should include the repair and future maintenance/use of the B listed Auction Mart Building and that any alteration/demolition should be in line with advice in the SHEP (339)</p> <p>The respondent states that re-development opportunities should be re-drawn in this 10 acres to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • business work-space centre; • unlimited parking for proposed Rail stop and Park and Ride; • use of the auction mart ring as a community building; • James Hutton statue; • genealogy and ancestral research tourism; renewable energy for housing developed (solar, community turbine, biomass). (363) | <p>There is ongoing discussion with the relevant parties about a suitable re-use for the Auction Mart Building. The issue will be decided upon the determination of the planning application.</p> <p>Suggestion noted.</p> | <p>No further action.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Council agree that the site should be put forward for a mixed use allocation, noting that this will allow the current application to proceed. The allocation will be MREST001</p> |
| | ASWIN001 Land adjacent to Swinton Primary School, Swinton | <p>The respondents support the principle for development at ASWIN001 but believe it would be appropriate to specifically provide that (i) development at (Consolidated Local Plan) allocated site BSW2B, which is deliverable and for which preparations for development have begun, should be completed before ASWIN001 can be commenced. (300, 308)</p> | <p>Support for site ASWIN001 noted. Site ASWIN001 offers the opportunity for a mixed use development with a community land use facility integral to any development and an indicative housing figure of 25no units. The site can also allow for future expansion of the school if required. It is consequently considered this should be put forward in the proposed Plan for mixed use.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree that site should be put forward for a mixed use allocation, with a community land use facility integral to any development. The</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>The respondents state that consideration should be given to safeguarding the site for a new village hall within ASWIN001. (300, 308) The respondents support identification of alternative sites for advancement...notably in relation to site ASWIN001. They state that Swinton has a high proportion of second homes which have resulted in demand for</p> | <p>Site BSW2B has been allocated for 25no housing units for some time but has not been developed. It is questionable how effective the site may be and the removal of the allocation could be considered as part of the new LDP. Site ASWIN001 offers better opportunities for the village. Site BSW2B remains within the village's development boundary and therefore could be developed under infill policy irrespective of whether it is formally allocated for housing or not. The removal of the formal allocation of site BSW2B can be considered as part of the proposed LDP process.</p> <p>Whether or not site BSW2B is formally allocated or not, there are no justifiable planning grounds for ensuring it is developed before site ASWIN001 as the respondent suggests.</p> <p>Comments noted. Support for site ASWIN001 noted. Site ASWIN001 offers the opportunity for a mixed use development with a community land use facility integral to any development and an indicative housing figure of 25no units. It can also allow for future expansion of the school if required.</p> | <p>removal of the formal allocation for housing on site BSW2B can be considered as part of the proposed LDP process. The allocation will be MSWIN002</p> <p>It is recommended that the Council agree that site ASWIN001 should be put forward for a mixed use allocation, with a community land use</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>housing for local people which is currently not being met...exacerbated through allocation of BSW2B site, which has been allocated since 1986 and remains undeveloped. (276)</p> <p>The respondents state that should the Council decide not to increase housing provision within Berwickshire towns...consider that BSW2B should be removed on the basis of its proven ineffectiveness and site ASWIN001 allocated for a similar amount of housing (25 units). (276)</p> | <p>It is consequently considered this should be put forward in the proposed Plan for mixed use.</p> <p>Support for site ASWIN001 noted. Site ASWIN001 offers the opportunity for a mixed use development with a community land use facility integral to any development and an indicative housing figure of 25no units. It can also allow for future expansion of the school if required. It is consequently considered this should be put forward in the proposed Plan for mixed use.</p> <p>Site BSW2B has been allocated for 25no housing units for some time but has not been developed. It is questionable how effective the site may be and the removal of the allocation could be considered as part of the new LDP. Site ASWIN001 offers better opportunities for the village. Site BSW2B remains within the village's development boundary and therefore could be developed under infill policy irrespective of whether it is formally allocated for housing or not. The removal</p> | <p>facility integral to any development. The allocation will be MSWIN002</p> <p>It is recommended that the Council agree that site ASWIN001 (The allocation will be MSWIN002) should be put forward for a mixed use allocation, with a community land use facility integral to any development. The removal of the formal allocation for housing on of site BSW2B can be considered as part of the proposed LDP process.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>The respondents recommend that the connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer is specified as a developer requirement and that a WWTW upgrade may be required. (357)</p> <p>The respondents state that within the SEA, the site is identified as acceptable with a capacity of 25 units. The following points are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is prime quality agricultural land • There is limited access to employment • Sewerage capacity is limited (227) | <p>of the formal allocation of site BSW2B can be considered as part of the proposed LDP process.</p> <p>Scottish water have advised that allocation of the site is ok and as a result a site requirement is not necessary</p> <p>This representation is written in the context of promotion of another alternative site also located outwith the three Strategic Development Areas.</p> <p>Site ASWIN001 offers the opportunity for a mixed use development with a community land use facility integral to any development and an indicative housing figure of 25no units. It can also allow for future expansion of the school if required. It is consequently considered this should be put forward in the proposed Plan for mixed use.</p> | <p>A site requirement on this issue is not required.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Council agree that site ASWIN001 (The allocation will be MSWIN002) should be put forward for a mixed use allocation, with a community land use facility integral to any development.</p> |
| | SBWESR001 Development Boundary Amendment, Westruther | No comments received. | Noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree to include this development boundary amendment in the Proposed Local |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Central Housing Market Area | ABONC003 Land opposite Memorial Hall, Bonchester Bridge | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that waste water treatment issues and water resilience measures be considered for this housing site. (357) | Include reference to the requirement for resilience measures and other aspects of the water environment in site information and any subsequent development briefs. Site requirements will be applied through policy framework to permit development only if any identified risk can be adequately mitigated. As the Local Development Plan (LDP) is required to conform to the SESplan Strategic Development Plan, the finalisation of the housing supply within the Proposed LDP should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination, which is anticipated in Spring 2013. Confirmation or otherwise of the allocation of these sites will then be included in the report to Council on the overall content of the Proposed LDP. | Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are made aware of water issues and requirements. The final decision in relation to the allocation of these sites should be presented as part of the report on the Proposed Local Development Plan in Spring 2013 |
| | AGALA027 Extension of Birks Avenue, Galashiels | The contributor supporting this site wants to see it upgraded to a preferred site in the plan. The site can accommodate 20-24 units and can be commenced promptly. (177) A number of contributors has objected to the site and the main issues are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not contained within natural boundaries (331, 211) • Negative effect on views out of Eildon and Leaderfoot NSA (211) • Prominent development (238) | Support from land owner noted. The site is steep and visible, so development would be limited to the lower parts and creation of woodland would be required on the steeper parts of the site to create an acceptable site. Layout and design would need to be very carefully considered to minimise | It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate gradient (238) • Development of the site is contrary to CAT policy, where it has the highest landscape value (331) • New development needs to be in keeping with development at Birks View (121) <p>Contributors asserts there are access and road safety/roads issues (195, 158, 121, 182, 267, 248, 238)</p> <p>Contributor (158) doesn't consider the site suitable for affordable housing as outwith walking distance from schools, shops etc. (158)</p> <p>Comments from SEPA are: Include site requirement for water resilient construction measures as the site is located adjacent to the functional flood plain or in area of known flood risk. There are co-location issues with SEPA regulated site. (357)</p> <p>Other comments: Development will create noise. (158) Development might worsen issues with subsidence in the Birks View development (267, 248)</p> | <p><i>any effects on the views into the site and the surrounding hills. Although the site would need to be sensitively developed it is seen as a natural expansion of Galashiels.</i></p> <p><i>The Council is aware of the issues relating to connecting to other roads and limits in the local road network, and only a development of around 20 units would be supported.</i></p> <p><i>The site is located on the edge of Galashiels and it is considered to be within reasonable distance of schools and services to be appropriate for affordable housing.</i></p> <p><i>Site requirement included. Co-location issues with the filter station to the south west of the site would need to be investigated as part of any planning application.</i></p> <p><i>Other comments: More detailed issues would be considered at the planning application stage.</i></p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Contributor (121) considers there to be a lack of demand for housing in the area. | <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets.</i></p> | |
| | AGALA029, Netherbarns, Galashiels | <p>The site at Netherbarns has gained support from contributors stating that:</p> <p>Contributor (334) asserts that Historic Scotland has confirmed that they are not opposed to appropriate residential development and welcome current landscape informed approach. It is asserted that site is developable, free of constraints and the developer is fully committed to sensitive development of the site.</p> <p>Contributor (339) is pleased to see reduced capacity and that the site should be brought forward via a Masterplan and also that access from local road network is welcomed</p> | <p><i>It should be noted that the circumstances have changed for development of the Netherbarns site as Historic Scotland has withdrawn their previous objection, and that there is some support for development of the site through a masterplanning process.</i></p> <p><i>The issues raised during the consultation have been dealt with previously during the plan making process. No new issues have been raised by contributors.</i></p> <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land</i></p> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>and in accordance with SPP.</p> <p>A number of contributors state that there is scope for limited development in policy/woodland to restore edge of Galashiels (364, 131, 211).</p> <p>The development would give an opportunity to mitigate the impact of Netherbank on views from Abbotsford and other places (364)</p> <p>A large number of contributors have raised concerns mainly about the planning history relating to its sensitive location within the landscape (327, 364, 256, 172, 131, 132, 116, 211, 314, 313, 91).</p> <p>There have also been a number of comments on the need to protect views from Abbotsford House and Abbotsford Designed Landscape. (364, 256, 172, 116), the potential impacts on Abbotsford House (238, 172, 211, 91) and potential impacts on Abbotsford Gardens and Designed Landscapes (238, 172, 211).</p> <p>Two contributors see the site as inappropriate for development (355, 364) and the site should not be allocated unless exceptionally tight restrictions/design parameters are set out. (364) A further contributor states that if the site is taken forward, clear guidelines for its development</p> | <p><i>requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets.</i></p> <p><i>The Tweed is at a lower level than the site in question with the only exception being the extreme southern corner which shows the 1 in 200 year flood envelope of the Tweed just encroaching across the road. There is also quite an extensive floodplain on the right bank of the Tweed. It is therefore considered that there should be no issue of flooding from the River for the vast majority of the site and in order to ensure that this is the case the developable area of the site should extend no further south than the line of the old railway. This area is shown as proposed structure planting/landscaping on the settlement</i></p> | |
|--|---|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>must be set out in the plan in relation to physical and natural qualities and characteristics of the site and surrounding landscape, specifically NSA. Development must also address potential impacts on River Tweed SSSI and SAC (327). Comments have also been put forward that further consultation with Abbotsfords Trustees is required to reach an acceptable solution for development of the site (256).</p> <p>Contributors have also raised a number of more detailed issues as; impact of lighting (364, 256, 116), noise (256), screening (256), (172), access and traffic safety (340, 91, 339) impact on environmental qualities and ecology (355, 238, 91), location within the AGLV (238), moderate gradient (238), loss of heritage (340), negative impact on tourism (116) and negative impact on local residents. (91).</p> <p>There are also concerns about scale and character (132) and capacity of the site (334, 364).</p> <p>Two contributors (116, 313) are concerned that the site is promoted because of pressure from Waverley project and Edinburgh Region.</p> <p>Contributor (364) and (211) does not see the</p> | <p><i>plan. SEPA have requested a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out but this seems unnecessary given the issues highlighted.</i></p> | |
|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>site suitable for consideration as a school site.</p> <p>SEPA recommends inclusion of requirement for Flood Risk Assessment is included and no development to take place on flood plain or area of flood risk. (357)</p> | | |
| | SBGAT001, Gattonside | <p>One contributor has raised a number of issues relating to the change in development boundary at Gattonside, including; TPO in the perimeter of the site, site included in AGLV and NSA, moderate biodiversity impacts and limited capacity in water supply and sewerage. (238)</p> <p>Other issues raised are to extend Conservation Area to include Castle Field and the adjoining small fields to the west as green space (211) and SEPA recommends adding development requirement relating to waste water drainage to be connected to public sewer. (357)</p> | <p>The site requirements include reference to Tree Protection Order and other environmental issues are included in the SEA and considered in the assessment process. Further site requirement relating to waste water drainage can be added if the site is taken forward in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Potential protection of land for green space does not require the conservation area boundary to be amended.</p> | <p>It is recommended that this settlement boundary change is taken forward in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>It is recommended that a requirement relating to waste water drainage is included.</p> |
| | AHAWI023 Burnfoot (Phase 1) Hawick | <p>The contributor is opposed to the allocation of this site due to loss of productive farmland and reduction in size of dairy farm, together with adverse impacts on the environment. (212, 213, 315)</p> <p>The contributor (SEPA) has requested that waste water treatment issues and water resilience measures be considered for these</p> | <p>Site currently identified within the Consolidated LP as a long term housing site (SHAWI003).</p> <p>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | two housing sites. (357) | <p><i>Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available within the Central Strategic Development Area for development during this plan period. Furthermore, it is considered unlikely that there would be market delivery, in view of the number of other housing allocations within the settlement.</i></p> | |
| | AKELS021 Nethershot (Phase 1), Kelso | <p>The contributor acknowledges that the site is identified as acceptable within the SEA and notes the site is prime agricultural land and careful integration with the existing settlement would be required. The contributor also notes the site's relationship with the racecourse would require to be addressed. (238)</p> <p>The contributor states standard SUDs are sufficient on this site and there is no requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. The contributor states clarification should be sought from Scottish Water regarding capacity at Kelso STW. (357)</p> | <p><i>Comments noted. The landowner is promoting the site who has a relationship with the racecourse.</i></p> <p><i>Comments noted. Scottish Water are consulted throughout the development plan process to ensure development can be accommodated prior to inclusion in the MIR.</i></p> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The contributor acknowledges that AKELS022 is identified as acceptable within the SEA and notes that there are pipelines running through the site and an archaeological evaluation will be required as there is a medieval hospital in the area. (238)</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</p> <p>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets.</p> | |
| | <p>AKELS021 Nethershot (Phase 1), Kelso</p> | <p>The contributor does not support the identification of AKELS021 – Nethershot Phase 1 as an alternative housing site. The contributor states the site is used in association with Kelso Racecourse and for the circus, it is also home to red-listed bird species. The contributor also states the site is currently undeliverable and AKELS022 should be developed in preference to AKELS021. (300, 302, 304)</p> | <p>Comments noted. The landowner is promoting the site who has a relationship with the racecourse.</p> <p>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | <p>The contributor raises concerns regarding the development of AKELS021 in relation to existing properties being overlooked and the loss of privacy and amenity value. The contributor requests the site requirements of AKELS021 to include screening between existing properties and those proposed. (216)</p> | <p><i>allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets.</i></p> <p><i>Comments noted. The design and landscaping proposals of the site will be detailed at the planning application stage.</i></p> | |
| | <p>AKELS022 Hendersyde (Phase 1), Kelso</p> | <p>The contributor identifies key points which need to be taken into consideration before AKELS022 is developed. These include wastewater management, boundary treatments and the location of a gas main running through the site. (112)</p> <p>The contributor states standard SUDs are sufficient on this site and there is no requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. The contributor states clarification should be sought from Scottish Water regarding capacity at Kelso STW. (357)</p> <p>The contributor states the site is adjacent to the north eastern edge/boundary of the Hendersyde GDL. The contributor states an allocation at this location would mean the</p> | <p>Comments noted. Where appropriate relevant site considerations will be included within the site requirements of each site.</p> <p>Comments noted. Scottish Water are consulted throughout the development plan process to ensure development can be accommodated prior to inclusion in the MIR.</p> <p>Comments noted. Should the site be included within the Proposed Plan then potential mitigation measures will be included within the site requirements for</p> | <p>The general approach proposed is to update site requirements where appropriate.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>north end/north lodge of the GDL would be encircled. The contributor suggests potential mitigation measures including a green buffer between the housing development and the north western edge of the GDL boundary. (339)</p> <p>The contributor requests to be consulted on any development framework produced by the Council for the site. (339)</p> | <p>this site.</p> <p>It is noted that the contributor requests to be consulted on any development framework produced by the Council for the site.</p> | |
| | AKELS022 Hendersyde (Phase 1), Kelso | <p>The contributor considers the site AKELS022 to be less favourable site than AKELS023 in terms of services, site aspect, landscape and access. The contributor also states AKELS022 has issues to address in relation to connectivity with the town, access and a gas pipeline. (332)</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</p> <p>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
| | AKELS022 Hendersyde (Phase 1), Kelso | <p>The contributor supports the allocation of AKELS022 and has submitted a Masterplan to show the site can be delivered in two phases. The contributor states the site could</p> | <p>Support noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>be brought forward and is deliverable during the period 2009-2019. (311)</p> <p>The contributor supports the allocation of AKELS022 and states the site should be developed in preference to AKELS021. The contributor states that the site is free of constraints and is under option to a national house building company and is deliverable in the short term. The contributor also states that by developing the site it will provide housing choices in the Central Housing Market Area and bring economic benefits to the Borders. The contributor also supports the development of the adjoining land to the north east, AKELS010. (300, 302, 304)</p> | <p><i>to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered this site is appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan to help meet the above housing targets.</i></p> | <p><i>Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |
| Northern Housing Market Area | MCARD006 North of Horsbrugh Bridge, Cardrona | <p>The contributors support the identification of site MCARD006. (273, 364)</p> <p>The site is well situated and it would be good to have at least some employment opportunities near to this established residential area. (364)</p> <p>The site already has planning permission for a garden centre, nursery, and four craft units on the east of the site. In relation to the site requirements set out in the Main Issues Report and specifically that regarding the need for a Flood Risk Assessment, Engineers have considered the proposed housing part of the site on the west part of the site and confirm that the site would not flood in a 1 in 200 year event and that a</p> | <p>Support noted. It is noted that the site already has planning permission. However, it should be noted also that the Scottish Environment Protection Agency recommends that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required (see comment from contributor 357 below).</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan and include an additional site requirement regarding the need for connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>drainage and flood assessment would accompany any application. (273)</p> <p>Contributor agrees that a Flood Risk Assessment is required. They also state that to ensure appropriate improvements are made to Scottish Water infrastructure to accommodate the development before it is occupied; they recommend that the connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer is specified as a developer requirement. (357)</p> <p>The contributors object to the identification of site MCARD006 as a Preferred site. Whilst the site falls within the West Strategic Development Area it is physically remote from centres of population and does not lend itself well to forming part of a sustainable settlement pattern. The site has serious constraints relating to pipeline safeguarding zones, flood risk, location adjacent to an SAC, no access to sewage facilities and potentially moderate biodiversity impacts. (227, 297, 333)</p> | <p>These comments are noted. Furthermore should a site at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, the suggested requirement should also be added.</p> <p>The site sits within development boundary and can therefore already come forward at present for development. Cardrona has a limited range of services and facilities. However the settlement sits off the A72 and is located less than 10 mins drive time from Innerleithen and 10 mins drive time from Peebles. The site is not located within any of the pipeline consultation zones and therefore the sites development is not constrained by this issue.</p> <p>Whilst there is an element of flood risk on a portion of the site, a flood risk assessment will be required to inform its development. The site assessment for the site indicates that the site's proximity to the River Tweed SAC nor issues of</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | biodiversity are not constraints to prevent its development. Whilst access to sewage facilities may currently be an issue, upgrades can overcome that issue. | |
| | MCARD007 South of Horsbrugh Bridge, Cardrona | <p>The contributors support the identification of site MCARD007. (273, 364)</p> <p>The site is well situated and it would be good to have at least some employment opportunities near to this established residential area. (364)</p> <p>However, contributor 273 states that this site should be allocated for 10 units rather than 5 units. The site has detailed planning consent for a mixed use development of 10 residential dwellings, a pub/restaurant, and an extension to the village shop/coffee shop. Each of the site requirements set out in the Main Issues Report relating to this site has already been taken into account during the planning application process. (273)</p> <p>The site situated on the south side of the River Tweed and incorporates the Standing Stone Scheduled Ancient Monument. It is noted that the site requirements note this as a constraint however, we consider that the potential impact of development on the monument comprises three elements; the impact on the standing stone itself, the impact on the immediate surroundings; and the impact on views to and from the standing stone along the valley which form the setting</p> | <p>Support noted and comments noted.</p> <p>The site sits within development boundary and can therefore already come forward at present for development. In addition a recent planning application has been approved for the site's development. Comments noted.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan (subject to further discussion with SEPA) and include an additional site requirement regarding the need for connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>of the monument. The contributor is aware of previous consents on the site, and believes that some development could be accommodated; any development would have to be designed to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the site and setting of the monument. In the event of this allocation being brought forward into the Proposed Plan, we would wish to be consulted on any development framework from the Council. (339)</p> <p>The contributor seeks that the site MCARD007 is removed from the Plan due to flood risk. They also state that to ensure appropriate improvements are made to Scottish Water infrastructure to accommodate the development before it is occupied; they recommend that the connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer is specified as a developer requirement. (357)</p> <p>The contributors object to the identification of site MCARD007 as a Preferred site. Whilst the site falls within the West Strategic Development Area it is physically remote from centres of population and does not lend itself well to forming part of a sustainable settlement pattern. The site has serious constraints relating to pipeline safeguarding zones, scheduled ancient monument and</p> | <p>The site sits within the development boundary and can therefore already come forward at present for development. In addition a recent planning application has been approved for the site's development. Should a site at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, the suggested requirement could also be added.</p> <p>The site sits within development boundary and can therefore already come forward at present for development. In addition a recent planning application has been approved for the site's development. Cardrona has a limited range of services and facilities. However the settlement sits off the A72 and is located less than 10 mins drive time from Innerleithen and 10</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | related archaeological interests, flood risk, mature trees, location adjacent to an SAC, no access to sewage facilities and potentially moderate biodiversity impacts. (227, 297, 333) | mins drive time from Peebles. The site's proximity to the pipeline is not a constraint to its development as it is not located within the inner zone. It is accepted that there is a scheduled ancient monument on the site however; the layout of the site can be designed to take account of it. Whilst there is an element of flood risk on a portion of site, a flood risk assessment will be required to inform its development. The site assessment for the site indicates that the site's proximity to the River Tweed SAC nor issues of biodiversity are not constraints to its development. Whilst access to sewage facilities may currently be an issue, upgrades can overcome that issue. | |
| | AEDDL002 North of Bellfield, Eddleston | The contributor supports the identification of site AEDDL002 within the Plan. They note that SESPlan places a requirement for 50 units outwith the Strategic Development Areas for the period 2019-2024 but that the MIR does not identify a Preferred option to meet that requirement only Alternatives. The contributor states that the site is deemed as a Acceptable within the Strategic Environment Assessment and benefits from a number of positive aspects including that it is not suffer from flood risk, benefits from good access to transport, employment and services, it has a minor impact on biodiversity and there are no cultural heritage constraints. Furthermore | <i>Support noted. It should be noted with regard to the identification of only 'Alternative' sites outwith the Strategic Development Areas, a housing technical note has been produced as a background paper of the Main Issues Report (MIR). This technical note updates the housing land supply from the 2010 data which was used to calculate the housing requirement within the Strategic Development Plan. The technical note details the number of additional units contributing to the land supply through approved planning applications since</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>they state that there are no constraints to the deliverability of this site and there is a willing landowner, and can contribute to the housing land requirement. (227)</p> <p>The contributor states that they have no concerns with extra housing per se as many benefits such as positive effect on the school and the potential of reintroduction of a village shop. They also states that low density would be preferred and affordable housing should be included in addition to a childrens play area. However, the contributor states it would be preferable if road access would be via the turn off to the north near Scots Pine Café and that the 30MPH zone would need to be extended. The contributor states that there are concerns with potential effects on the drainage around the site which is prone to flooding. (362)</p> <p>The Contributor states that the requirements for the site should include that water resilient construction measures are employed in the development of the site. (357)</p> <p>The contributors state that whilst site AEDDL002 is only identified as an Alternative option the contributors object to its</p> | <p>31st March 2010. The Area outwith Strategic Development Area included an additional 78 units which contribute towards the 50 unit requirement. It is as a result of this over supply of 28 units that the MIR does not require identify any preferred sites.</p> <p>Comments noted. Issues regarding vehicular access, possible extension of the 30MPH zone, as well the potential for an addition of a play area would be dealt with through the planning application process should the site be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Accepted. The suggested site requirement can be added.</p> <p>Eddleston sits outwith any of the Strategic Development Areas as set out within SESPlan. The site</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>identification as a housing option. They state that the site sits outwith the Western Strategic Development Area and that the extant Structure Plan confirms in relation to Peebles that the focus for most new development will be to the east of the town. (297, 333)</p> | <p><i>assessment for the site confirms that it is an appropriate site for development.</i></p> <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing</i></p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | market areas. | |
| | <p>APEEB021 Housing south of South Park, Peebles</p> | <p>The contributors supports the identification of the Preferred site APEEB021 within the MIR and seeks its allocation within the Local Development Plan, however the contributor disagrees with the extent of the landscaping identified within the Plan. The contributor also states that the site is deliverable. (229, 367)</p> <p>The contributor does not object to the identification of this site (APEEB021) within the Plan however, they consider that the small watercourse along the eastern edge of the site should be safeguarded and the opportunity taken for its enhancement. They also request that a watercourse six metre buffer strip is added to the sites requirements. They also state that to ensure appropriate improvements are made to Scottish Water infrastructure to accommodate the development before it is occupied; they recommend that the connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer is specified as a developer requirement. (357)</p> <p>The contributors object to the inclusion of site APEEB021 for housing. A site at this location for employment has already been</p> | <p>Support noted. The site was fully assessed prior to the inclusion in the Main Issues Report (MIR) and in respect to the landscaping identified within the MIR, this is what is considered necessary to screen, enclose, and provide a setting for the site should the site come forward within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>These comments are noted. The suggested requirements can also be added.</p> <p>The site was fully assessed prior to the Main Issues Report (MIR), in respect to issues regarding roads, the Councils</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>excluded in the Local Plan following investigation by the Reporter mainly due to roads issues. The contributors consider that as a housing site the issues with regards to the roads still remain. Furthermore, they state that development at this location will result in additional development pressure in the future in the surrounding fields; that the site may not be deliverable and therefore may not be effective as it requires a second Tweed crossing, and without the second crossing there would be unacceptable impacts on the existing transport network. (227, 289, 297, 333, 368)</p> | <p><i>Roads Planning section can support the allocation of this site for housing. Whilst this site has been identified as a preferred short term site for housing within the Main Issues Report, the south east of Peebles has been identified within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011 as the preferred area for future longer term development.</i></p> <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were</i></p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | <p><i>'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> | |
| | <p>APEEB041 Violet Bank II, Peebles</p> | <p>The contributors support the allocation of site APEEB041 for housing. They state that the site should be identified as a Preferred option. The contributors state that this site and the neighbouring already allocated site TP200 should be allocated as one site thus sharing and improving layouts and access. The site should not include the area covered by flood risk and preferably with an extra safety margin to take account of increasing extreme weather conditions due to global warming. A flood risk assessment has already been carried out for the site. The contributor states that they consider that a new vehicular link between Rosetta Road and the A703 over the Eddleston Water is not required; furthermore many of the site requirements for this site have already been addressed through work already completed on site TP200; this site provides the same</p> | <p><i>Support noted. It should be noted that the site boundary to the site has been amended since the Main Issues Report was out for public consultation. In addition it is not intended that development will take place in areas at risk of flooding. A flood risk assessment will be required to inform the development of the site. In respect to the issue regarding the site requirement set out in the Main Issues Report regarding the need for a new vehicular link between Rosetta Road and the A703 over the Eddleston Water, it is the view of the Councils' Roads Planning section that this is necessary so as to improve local connectivity on both sides of the water and to relieve congestion on Rosetta</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>qualities and appropriateness as the adjacent allocated housing site TP200. (289, 337, 368)</p> <p>Whilst site APEEB041 is only identified as an Alternative option the contributors object to its identification as a housing option. They state its inclusion in the Local Development Plan would run counter to the extant Structure Plan development strategy; the development strategy which is continued in the proposed SESPlan confirms most new development will be to the east of Peebles; there are serious traffic difficulties in the town just south which would be worsened, and extra traffic on the small road to the site north is equally undesirable making this part of Peebles unsuitable for further development. Furthermore they state that the site experiences serious constraints relating to the requirement for a new transport linkage between the Eddleston Water and the A703, along with third party constraints, and would lead to moderate biodiversity impacts and a lack of access to sewerage facilities. (227, 297, 333, 364)</p> <p>The contributor recommends that site APEEB041 is removed from the Plan due to flood risk. They also state that to ensure appropriate improvements are made to Scottish Water infrastructure to</p> | <p>Road.</p> <p><i>It should be noted that the site has been fully assessed and it is considered that the site is an acceptable site which could be come forward through the Local Development Plan Process. In respect to comments in relation to the Structure Plan references that most new development would take place to the east of Peebles, the SESPlan Proposed Plan does not restrict development to the east of the town. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that there are issues relating to the roads infrastructure within the vicinity, the Councils' Road Planning section has stated that these can be overcome. It should be noted that should the site come forward within the Proposed Local Development Plan, it is not intended that the entire site would be developed. A flood risk assessment has already been carried out for the site by the applicant of the neighbouring site TP200. Also, it should be noted that should a site at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, the</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>accommodate the development before it is occupied; they recommend that the connection of waste water (foul) drainage to the public sewer is specified as a developer requirement. (357)</p> | <p><i>suggested site requirement could also be added.</i></p> <p><i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630</i></p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <i>housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

The sites within the following table were submitted as new sites/boundary changes during the process of the consultation of the Main Issues Report, maps are included in Appendix A1:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Birgham | ABIRG004 Tweed Haugh, Birgham | The respondent proposes a housing allocation at Tweed Haugh in the centre of Birgham: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comprises an in-fill development site; • is well positioned within the core of the village; • flat and regular shaped; • adjoins modern housing developments to the west; • benefits from access points to A698 (320) | The site was rejected in the Local Plan Amendment Inquiry where the Reporter agreed with the Council's assessment that the site proposed site would generate considerable vehicular traffic which would not be sustainable and that it was of a scale that was incongruous with the scale of the existing village. Although the boundary of the site is marginally different to what it was previously. The principle issues remain relevant and the site cannot be supported for inclusion in the proposed LDP. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| Blainslie | ANETH001 Nether Blainslie South | The contributor seeks the allocation of site ANETH001 for housing. They state the site can be easily accessed and forms an effective housing site which can be delivered during the plan period. (318) | This site has been considered previously by the Council and has been discounted. Through the site assessment process, the site was found to be 'unacceptable' in that Roads Planning are unable to support the allocation of this site; the site has limited access to public transport; is substantial in size and appears disconnected from the rest of the settlement. Furthermore, the site contributes to the setting of the | It is recommended that the Council agree that this site is not allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | settlement. | |
| Bowden | ABOWD005 Bothenden House, ABOWD006, South of Cross, ABOWD007, South of Morven, Bowden. | Contributor (234) submitted three housing sites in Bowden. The contributor asserts that there is capacity at Newtown St Boswells PS and Earlston HS for the growth proposed and that the sites are effective and would provide choice. It is also asserted that allocation of the sites would allow contribution to proposed green space. The sites proposed are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABOWD005 15-20 units • ABOWD006 4-6 very high quality houses • ABOWD007 10 high-quality houses | <i>Following full site assessments it is considered that sites ABOWD005, ABOWD006 and ABOWD007 are not appropriate for allocation. The character and setting of Bowden makes the settlement very sensitive to development. Furthermore, it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available within the Central Strategic Development Area for development during this plan period.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate these sites within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| Broughton | ABROU002 South West of Dreva Road & SBBRO002 Settlement Boundary, Broughton | The contributor seeks the allocation of site ABROU002 South West of Dreva Road as an alternative to the allocated site TB200 at Broughton. Furthermore, the contributor seeks that the anomaly in the Development Boundary is rectified in the Local Development Plan, in that the full extent of the Elmsfield site which has planning permission be included. The contributor contends that the Scottish Borders Local Plan Reporters when considering the site TB200 and the land subject to this submission relied largely on unsubstantiated claims made by other | It is acknowledged that a site with an extant planning permission from the early 1960's sits outwith the Development Boundary of Broughton. However, the removal of the site from the Development Boundary was at the request of the Local Plan Inquiry Reporter who considered the objections into the Finalised Local Plan 2005. The Reporter stated: <i>"I conclude from the prolonged absence of development on this site that it is not effective, and I am not convinced by the Council's submissions that there is good reason to expect the situation to change. Deletion of the site from the local plan</i> | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site nor include the site within the Development Boundary for Broughton within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>parties that flooding prevented this site from coming forward. This then resulted in the Inquiry reporter moving the allocation to the opposite side of Dreva Road i.e. TB200. The contributor includes in their submission a flood risk assessment, a drainage assessment, an ecological walkover survey, a topographical survey and an access survey which they state confirm that there are no constraints to this site coming forward for development. The Access Survey proposes that the site would come forward with up to 35 units. (325)</p> | <p><i>would not take away any right to develop in accordance with an extant planning permission, if one exists".</i> The Reporter therefore recommended that the site should not be allocated within the Plan and that the site should not be included within the Development Boundary.</p> | |
| Broughton | TB200 Dreva Road, Broughton | <p>The contributor seeks the removal of site TB200 from the plan. The contributor contends that this site was only recommended for inclusion in the Plan as a result of unsubstantiated claims made by other parties that flooding prevented site ABROU002 from coming forward. (325)</p> | <p>Site TB200 is an allocated housing site within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. The site was recommended for allocation by the Local Plan Inquiry Reporter who considered the objections into the Finalised Local Plan 2005. Within his Report, the Inquiry Reporter stated: <i>"This leaves site TB5 [an enlarged site], which I find to be generally acceptable, the only significant doubt being the issue of road access. However, for the reasons already explained, and taking account of the probable failure of the Elmsfield site to generate additional traffic on the Dreva Road, I conclude that, on balance, and taking account of the unsuitability of the other additional sites proposed for</i></p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to retain this allocation within the Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | <i>development, the site to the southeast of Springwell Brae could be accepted for a limited development of up to 10 houses, on the lower half of the field, giving a density of about 5 units/ha".</i> | |
| Chirnside | SCHIR003 Long-term housing land, land to south east of settlement, Chirnside | The respondents state that Chirnside does not have an area for long-term housing and they put forward a proposal to safeguard at least part of the site in question for this purpose. Also to include an element of open space possibly for use by the school (300, 309) | It is considered that longer-term housing development for Chirnside should be dealt with in later plans because the settlement has experienced a relatively high level of recent housing development and the mixed use site MCHIR001 remains undeveloped and will cater for future demand for a considerable time. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| Cockburnspath | ACOPA003 Kinegar Quarry, Cockburnspath | The respondent proposes redevelopment of Kinegar Quarry to provide a lochan and 224 housing units; the first phase would form 48 houses. (165) | A very similar site was rejected by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry for the Finalised Local Plan (site code BCO100). The Reporter considered that the site was remote from the southern boundary of the settlement and was separated from it by a deep gully of Cockburnspath Burn which marks a clearly defined edge to the settlement. The Reporter also found that there was no basis or justification for a development isolated in the countryside, well away from Cockburnspath and in a location which would not be sustainable and so would not be in accord with national or development plan policies. It is considered that the Reporter's arguments are still relevant in assessment of the proposal at ACOPA003. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|---|
| Coldstream | zR018, Lees Farm Mill Consolidated Local Plan Redevelopment Site, Coldstream | Respondent states that the site has the opportunity for redevelopment to a number of possible alternative uses. Could include a housing element, individually or as part of a mixed use development. (252) | The site is already allocated in the Consolidated Local Plan as a redevelopment site, for a number of possible uses, and this will remain in the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council agree to retain this allocation within the Plan. |
| Crailing | ACRAI003 Crailing Toll Extension, Crailing | The contributor seeks the allocation of Crailing Toll Extension (ACRAI003) for housing. The eastern part of the site is allocated within the current Consolidated Plan and remains undeveloped. This larger site has been put forward to provide a stronger design framework for the eastern extension of the village. The contributor has submitted an indicative design framework for the site incorporating 10-15 housing units. (239, 1 of 3) | Comments noted. The western part of this site is allocated in the Consolidated Local Plan as ACRAI001 with an indicative capacity of 5 units. The remainder of the site has been fully assessed and it is considered that the site is 'doubtful' as increasing the site size would impact the character of the village. In addition, It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available within the Central Borders Strategic Development Area. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Crailing | SBCRA001, Crailing | The contributor seeks an amendment to the Development Boundary for Crailing. This amendment would include a plot to provide a small infill opportunity with scope for a single house. (239, 1 of 3) | Comments noted. There is no planning history on this site which would only accommodate a single house. It is not the purpose of the Local Development Plan to amend development boundaries to incorporate single plots for development. Such proposals should be dealt with through the Development Management process. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to amend the development boundary within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|--|
| Dolphinton | ADOLP003 South of Sandy Hill, Dolphinton | The contributor seeks the allocation of site ADOLP003 for housing with the site capacity of 5 units. They state that the site is part of the former station yard and its development would tidy the area. (226) | <i>Following a full site assessment it is considered that site ADOLP003 is not appropriate for allocation. The site is located within a settlement that experiences a lack of services and facilities. In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas and within the Northern Housing Market.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| Earlston | SEARL006 Georgefield, Earlston | The contributor would like to re-iterate their support for a longer term site at Georgefield, Earlston which is allocated in the Consolidated Local Plan. Recognition should also be given to the opportunity to bring forward land identified for later phases earlier than currently envisaged due to the need to maintain a five year land supply. (358, 359) | Support noted. This site is an existing allocation within the Consolidated Local Plan. The site is identified as an area for potential longer term mixed use development. | The general approach proposed is to carry forward all existing undeveloped allocations within the Consolidated Local Plan. |
| Ednam | AEDNA001 Cliftonhill Farm, Ednam | The contributor seeks the allocation of EDNA001 for housing with an indicative capacity of 15-20 units. (165) | Comments noted. This site has previously been assessed as part of the Local Plan Amendment. The site was deemed acceptable for development however it was considered there were more suitable sites to meet the housing requirement in the Central Borders HMA. The MIR was based upon the SESplan Proposed Plan housing requirement. The | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | SESplan Proposed Plan is now at Examination and this will consider the issue of future housing land requirement across the SESplan area. Because the Local Development Plan requires to conform to the SESplan Strategic Development Plan, the finalisation of the housing supply within the Proposed Local Development should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination. This is anticipated in spring of 2013. It is therefore proposed that the finalisation of the housing land supply within the Local Development Plan should await the outcome of the SESplan Examination, and be subject of the report to Council on the overall content of the Proposed Local Development Plan in spring 2013. | |
| Ettrick | AETTR002 Hopehouse East, Ettrick AETTR003 Hopehouse West, Ettrick AETTR004 Hopehouse North East, Ettrick | The contributor asserts that allocated housing sites in Ettrick are wrongly justified by the presence of local facilities - which in practice are very limited or reduced. (203) | The issue was previously considered at Consolidated Local Plan stage. It was concluded that the allocated sites should remain within the plan and a similar stance should be taken in the proposed plan. | It is recommended that the Council agree to retain this allocation within the plan. |
| Ettrickbridge | AETTB005 Land SE of Kirkhope Cemetery, | The contributor proposes the allocation of a site (AETTB005) between Kirkhope Cemetery and Jean's Burn in Ettrickbridge to help meet an identified | The allocation of the southern part of this site was previously considered at Consolidated Local Plan stage. It was concluded that the site should not be | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|--|
| | Ettrickbridge | need for affordable housing. (105) | allocated for housing. A similar stance should be taken in the proposed plan. | within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Gattonside | AGATT011 North of Montgomerie Terrace, Gattonside | The site has been submitted as an effective site and natural extension to the village. (272) | This site has previously been assessed in the Local Plan process and is unacceptable as its elevated and prominent nature would have a detrimental impact on the sensitivity of the character and setting of the settlement and the National Scenic Area. The site is constrained in the Landscape Character Assessment. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Gattonside | AGATT014 Gateside Meadow, Gattonside | The site has been submitted for inclusion in the plan, and it has been included previously in the Local Plan process. The contributor asserts that the current land supply relies too much on expansion of NSB and the promoted site can be back-up if St Aiden site fails to deliver (358, 359) . It should be noted that the further information, including maps, submitted had discrepancies from the initial submission. | <i>Following a full site assessment it is considered that site AGATT014 is not appropriate for allocation. The site was found to be unacceptable due to access issues, the visual prominence of the site and potential impact upon the National Scenic Area. In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas and within the Central Housing Market. There is currently a large housing site allocated at St Aiden's for 40 units and given the sensitive setting and character of the village it is important that overdevelopment does not take place.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| | Housing Land Supply – Promoted | The site has been submitted for inclusion in the plan, and it has been included previously in the Local Plan | <i>Following a full site assessment it is considered that site SGATT001 is not appropriate for allocation. The site was</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|
| | Longer term Housing Site SGATT001, Gattonside Mains, Gattonside | <p>process. The contributor asserts that the current land supply relies too much on expansion of NSB and the promoted site can be back-up if St Aiden site fails to deliver (358, 359).</p> <p>It should be noted that the further information, including maps, submitted had discrepancies from the initial submission.</p> | <p><i>found to be unacceptable due to visual prominence and potential impact upon the National Scenic Area. In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas and within the Central Housing Market. There is currently a large housing site allocated at St Aiden's for 40 units and given the sensitive setting and character of the village it is important that overdevelopment does not take place.</i></p> | <p><i>agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |
| Gavinton | AGAVI002 Land at Langton Glebe, Gavinton | <p>The respondent puts forward the 3ha site for 20 housing units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three existing access points from: The Glebe and South Street • outwith settlement boundary • adjoins Conservation Area • built development to north, open space to the south (319) | <p>Gavinton is a small village with a fairly substantial housing allocation to the west as proposed by a Scottish Government Reporter. It is considered the scale of this site is adequate to satisfy demand for a considerable period of time and there is no need to consider any other sites within the village at this point of time.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP.</p> |
| | AGAVI003 Crimson Hill Site (part) to replace Consolidated Local Plan site BGA1, West Gavinton - both Gavinton | <p>The respondent proposes inclusion of a housing allocation on part of Crimson Hill site, known as BGA4B within Final Draft Local Plan, to replace the allocated site BGA1, West Gavinton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe BGA1 is on a significant gradient sloping east to west and north to south. Anticipate that pumping would be required to facilitate a connection to the mains waste water treatment pumping | <p>Gavinton is a small village with a fairly substantial housing allocation to the west as proposed by a Scottish Government Reporter. It is considered the scale of this site is adequate to satisfy demand for a considerable period of time and there is no need to consider any other sites within the village at this point of time.</p> <p>For a similar site a Reporter for the Scottish Government dismissed development in this area to the north of the Village in the</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>station to the east of the village;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe development of BGA1 would be very prominent whereas at AGAVI003 it would be better screened, have minimal effect on the amenity and character of the village and represent a more logical direction for future expansion (356) | preparation of the Adopted Local Plan 2008. | |
| Glen Estate | SBGLE001 Settlement Boundary, Glen Estate | <p>The contributor seeks the identification of the Glen Estate as a settlement within the Local Development Plan. The contributor considers that identification of the Glen Estate as a settlement would provide the Estate, the Council and wider interest groups with the confidence necessary to enable future land use change; this will allow the regeneration of the Estate by bringing up to 20 new residential units in addition to office space. Furthermore the contributor states that the repositioning of the existing farm operations will boost the business with new state of the art facilities, and improvements to the estates roads and other infrastructure would also enhance opportunities for public access. (298)</p> | <p>A settlement boundary at this location has been considered previously by the Council and has been discounted as it is not considered appropriate to identify a boundary at this location. The proposed boundary appears sporadic and illogical in that a significant proportion of the boundary takes in a long strip of land along the roadside and for much part does not follow any boundaries on the ground. Any proposed new development here can already be assessed against the Development in the Countryside Policies. The Proposed Boundary takes in a large concentration of listed building and is located within a Historic Garden and Designed Landscape that is included within the Inventory. There are also a number of archaeology points within the area. Furthermore, Roads Planning are unable to support a settlement boundary at this location as it would not be in the best interests of sustainable transport.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree not to designate a settlement boundary at Glen Estate within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
| Greenlaw | Change of use | The respondent states that their client | <i>There is no need for another allocation</i> | <i>It is</i> |

| | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|---|
| | of Consolidated Local Plan site zEL23 at Greenlaw, from employment to residential | (the landowner of zEL23) has asked them to assert that the land will not be released for employment. They believe the site is better suited to housing because it is infill in a part of Greenlaw that has become increasingly residential in character (300, 306) | <i>for housing in Greenlaw. However, the site does offer an opportunity for mixed use development and it could be allocated as such, although it is imperative that the site contains an employment element as part of this. It should be noted that there is further mixed use provision in the proposed site MGREE001.</i> <i>It has been considered that reallocation of the site as a mixed use site is appropriate as the opportunity for complimentary development uses provides for a perceived demand in Greenlaw.</i> | <i>recommended that the Council agree that the site should be reallocated as a mixed use site.</i> |
| Greenlaw | SGREE003, Consolidated Local Plan longer term housing site to change use to Mixed Use (MGREE002) – both Greenlaw | The respondent states that the land should be formally allocated for development in the LDP for housing and also possible employment. The respondent believes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development helps to achieve government policy with regards to provision of a generous land supply, flexibility of supply of housing type and constant 5 year supply, when combined with (Consolidated Local Plan housing sites) Marchmont Road; • No access restrictions; • Infrastructure such as vehicular/cycle/pedestrian access, | There is no need for a further housing allocation in Greenlaw given the provision already allocated that will be carried forward into the proposed LDP. The Council is proposing 2 mixed use sites (at zEL23 and MGREE001) for allocation that will meet a known need for employment land in Greenlaw. However, in future Local Development Plans the longer-term housing site SGREE003 has the potential for review. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP other than as land identified for longer-term housing. |

| | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|--|
| | | mains drainage and public utilities infrastructure will be provided in association with the development of the affordable housing site AGREE004 (233) | | |
| Greenlaw | SBGRE002 Revision to include land north of Greenlaw Mill Farm, Greenlaw | The respondent would like the settlement boundary revised to reflect a hatched line that was put forward in the Scottish Borders Local Plan Consultative Draft- Second Stage Consultation (August 2005) (119) | The area in question was only ever in draft form in this document and it has never been part of an adopted plan. The area was used to demarcate the possibility of protecting greenfield land to the south of Greenlaw. It was not a settlement boundary change. The proposal does not follow any natural boundaries to the south and is not considered an appropriate extension to the Greenlaw development boundary. It is considered that there is ample housing land already allocated in Greenlaw. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the proposed settlement boundary revision should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| | SBGRE001 Revision to south east of Wester Row, Greenlaw | The respondent proposes to extend the settlement boundary to include the site between Rose Dene and Rumbleton Burn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous application refused because it was thought the site flooded. Have undertaken a hydrological survey and this indicates no flooding risk – endorses local knowledge Building on the site will require the | Council GIS data shows that the site is within the 200 year flood envelope. It is also considered that there is already a generous supply of housing land within Greenlaw and that the site extends outwith the natural boundary of Greenlaw. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the proposed settlement boundary revision should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|--|
| | | dwelling to be elevated to allow drainage to the sewer (119) | | |
| Hawick | BHAWI001 North West Burnfoot, Hawick BHAWI002 Gala Law North, Hawick MHAWI001 Gala Law, Hawick | The contributor is opposed to the allocation of this site due to loss of productive farmland and reduction in size of dairy farm, together with adverse impacts on the environment. (212, 213, 315) | This issue was previously considered at Consolidated Local Plan stage. It was concluded that the allocated sites should remain within the plan and a similar stance should be taken in the proposed plan | It is recommended that the Council agree to retain this allocation within the Plan. |
| Jedburgh | AJEDB013 Oakieknowe, Jedburgh | The contributor requests that the site at Oakieknowe (AJEDB013) be reallocated as a housing site. The contributor also suggests part of the site be considered for education use eg: the replacement of Parkside Primary School. (253) The contributor suggests as the site is no longer allocated for housing it would be a suitable site for a Primary School. (365) | Comments noted. It should be noted this site was previously allocated within the Roxburgh Local Plan (1995) but was removed from the plan. The site has been considered again previously for a housing allocation. However, due to issues with site access, sloping of the site and the proximity of the industrial estate the site has not been reallocated. The Education and Lifelong Learning department indicate that the school roll has dropped recently and that Parkside Primary School is operating around 70% occupancy. E&LL are planning to take forward a project to review the whole school estate to determine where investment priorities should lie into the future. The needs of Parkside will be taken into account in this process. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|--|
| Kelso | SKELS003, Nethershot West, Kelso | The contributor seeks the safeguarding of SKELS003 for longer term housing development. (332) | Comments noted. Due to the proposed allocation of the housing site, AKELS021 and the new High School site, DKELS001. The site boundary of SKELS003 has been amended to reflect these proposed allocations. The site has been recoded as SKELS004 and is identified for longer term housing within the Local Development Plan. | It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate site SKELS003 due to a site boundary changes but to identify site SKELS004 for Longer Term Housing within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Kelso | AKELS010 Cotterlee, Kelso | The contributors would like the land adjoining the north-east of AKELS022 (previously assessed under site code AKELS010) to be allocated or protected for the future expansion of Kelso in preference to AKELS021. (300, 302, 304) | Comments noted. The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. As a result the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas. Following a full site assessment of AKELS010 it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate site AKELS010 but to continue to identify site SKELS005 for Longer Term Housing within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p><i>available within the Central Strategic Development Area for development during this plan period.</i></p> <p><i>AKELS010 falls within site SKELS002 which continues to be identified as a longer term housing site. As a result of allocating AKELS022 the boundary of SKELS002 has been amended and recoded to SKELS005.</i></p> | |
| Kelso | AKELS023 Nethershot East, Kelso | <p>The contributor seeks the allocation of AKELS023 as a housing site in the LDP. The site is at the same location as AKELS021 although it has a larger site area extending further to the north-east. The contributor states it should be considered as a preferred site as opposed to its current status as an alternative site. The contributor states AKELS023 is more suitable and less obtrusive in planning and design terms than AKELS022. The site is also more favourable in terms of services, site aspect, landscape and access. The contributor considers the proposed Phase 1 area at Nethershot can be facilitated within the existing housing land allocation. (332)</p> | <p><i>Comments noted. A large proportion of this site has been identified within the Local Development Plan as a housing site as AKELS021. The site has not been allocated due to unlikely market delivery. Part of the site has also been identified by the Council for a new High School, DKELS001.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |
| Lanton | ALANT002 Land on east | <p>The contributor proposes a new housing site on east side of Lanton</p> | <p>The allocation of this site was previously considered at Consolidated Local Plan</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|
| | side of Lanton village | village (ALANT002). (239) | stage. It was concluded that the site should not be allocated for housing. A similar stance should be taken in the proposed plan. | agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Langshaw | AGALA028 Langshaw, Galashiels | A site has been put forward in Langshaw, north of Galashiels. The contributor sees the site as being effective and a natural extension to Langshaw. (318) | Development of the site would be development in the countryside and any such proposals would be assessed against policy D2 Housing in the Countryside. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan because of its location in the countryside, detached from Galashiels. |
| Lennel | SBLEN001 Identification as a settlement, Lennel | The respondent states that Lennel should be identified as a settlement, including settlement boundary and that Land NW of Lennel should be identified as a preferred housing site (1.7ha), to provide a modest target towards 50 units outwith SDAs (to meet SESplan housing targets). (310) | A very similar site to the land north west of Lennel has been considered and rejected by the independent Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Local Plan Amendment Inquiry respectively. Reasons for this rejection such as being visible in the open countryside and being remote from Coldstream are relevant to this proposal. It is considered there are sufficient housing land options within established settlements in the Berwickshire Housing Market Area without the need to allocate any new | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | settlement boundaries in the countryside. | |
| Leitholm | ALEIT002, North East Quadrant, Leitholm | <p>The respondent proposes an alternative or additional site to that allocated in the Consolidated Local Plan, to the north east of the quadrant in the village;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has 2 access roads; • close to facilities; no views to the north side of the village as relative to the south side (101) | <p>A similar site was put forward for the Local Plan Amendment and it was considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site extended beyond the natural boundaries of the village on the northern side; • there are no natural boundaries to the site on the northern and eastern sides; • the scale and location of the site would be out of character with the village and its linear form <p>It is considered that these arguments remain valid in relation to this proposal. In addition, Leitholm already has a site allocated in the Consolidated Local Plan and this is adequate to meet local need.</p> | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| | BLE2B, Consolidated Local Plan site & non-inclusion of ALEIT001 (proposed extension to BLE2B) – both Leitholm | The respondents object to the “exclusion” of Site Reference BLE2B. (180) | <p>The site in question is not proposed to be excluded; it will be carried forward into the proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The respondent proposed an extension to the site, ALEIT001, however it was considered this should not be a formal housing proposal in the MIR because the site could be developed as housing, under Policy G7 Infill Development, due to it being within the settlement boundary. Therefore it was considered more suitable sites for proposal could be found</p> | No further action. |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | elsewhere. | |
| Melrose | AMELR010, Waverley Road, Melrose | The contributor is promoting inclusion of site AMELR010 in the settlement boundary. The contributor recognises the CAT area and that the site is adjacent to settlement boundary and built up area and would not significantly affect the open space between Melrose and Darnick. (317) | The site is an important part of the land separating Melrose and Darnick and is protected in policy EP3 Countryside Around Town. Allocation of the site would be contrary to policy. | It is not recommended to take this site forward to contribute to the strategic housing requirement. |
| Midlem | SBMID001 Land on north edge of Midlem village | The contributor proposes a change to the settlement boundary at north edge of Midlem (SBMID001). (206) | No change. Proposed settlement boundary does not follow any distinct physical or natural features and is not a logical extension of the settlement. A change to the plan is inappropriate. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the proposed settlement boundary revision should not be proposed for inclusion in the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Newstead | Housing Land Supply – Promoted Site ANEWS004, Land east of Newstead, Newstead | The site has been submitted for inclusion in the plan as the site can contribute to housing land requirement and is in proximity to proposed railway station in Tweedbank. The contributor asserts the site offers opportunity for sensitive development, and there are no insurmountable constraints for development, the site is effective and the landowner is willing to develop. Assessment of the site is included in | <i>Following a full site assessment it is considered that site ANEWS004 is not appropriate for allocation. The site is located on the eastern edge of the settlement on an area of land which is considered to form part of the character and setting of the village which should be protected. In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas and within</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | representation. (238) | <i>the Northern Housing Market.</i> | |
| Nisbet | ANISB002 | The contributor seeks the allocation of East Nisbet (ANISB002) for housing. It is acknowledged the site is outwith the settlement boundary but the contributor suggests the site would form a high quality infill site. The contributor has submitted an indicative design framework for the site incorporating 4-6 housing units. (239) 2 of 3 | <i>Comments noted. This site has previously been assessed as part of a larger site put forward at the MIR Expressions of Interest stage. The outcome of the assessment was 'doubtful' as the settlement has recently had a considerable housing development built within it in relation to its size.</i> <i>Following a full site assessment it is considered that site ANISB002 should not be included within the Local Development Plan. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available within the Central Borders Strategic Development Area.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| Peebles | APEEB003 Whitehaugh II, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of site APEEB003 for housing. The contributor states that they have undertaken several studies including landscape and visual assessment, assessment of flood risk, ecological, archaeological, utilities, and consideration of transport and access issues. These have all confirmed that the site is suitable for development. A conceptual master plan has been prepared showing how the site might integrate with the current housing | Site APEEB003 is part of the potential longer term mixed use site SPEEB005 as identified within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. Therefore, it is intended that should this site come forward in the future it will be as a mixed use site and not just for housing in isolation. It should be noted that the Local Plan Amendment Examination Reporter in his conclusions on considering site SPEEB005 stated: <i>"I do not consider that site SPEEB005 should be designed in isolation but should adopt the coherent and holistic approach</i> | It is recommended that the Council agree to continue to identify longer term mixed use site SPEEB005 within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>development to the west and the existing eastern settlement edge. The contributor contends that site has many advantages including that it is well located to existing residential development, assist in maintaining a continual 5 year housing land supply, is close to local community facilities, good access to public transport, good vehicular and pedestrian access, and good fit with the landscape. The site could accommodate approximately 290 units. (333)</p> | <p><i>advocated in the finalised local plan amendment. Such an approach would be better suited to achieving an appropriate local road network and creating a neighbourhood character as suggested in the Development and Landscape Capacity Study. Notwithstanding the strategic context, I do not accept that site SPEEB005 should be allocated for housing in the local plan amendment</i>".</p> <p>Furthermore it should also be noted that whilst the Main Issues Report identified site MPEEB004 as a preferred option for employment, the site requirements stated that: <i>"A part of the site could be brought forward to meet a need for employment land"</i>. Therefore it should be noted that should the site MPEEB004 be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, it is not envisaged that the entire site would be allocated for employment.</p> | |
| | <p>APEEB032 Venlaw, Peebles</p> | <p>The contributor seeks the allocation of site APEEB032 for housing. They state that the site is capable of accommodating 36 units and would be additional to the Local Plan and the alternative options proposed in the Main Issues Report. They state that the site lies within the existing settlement of Peebles and therefore would be integral to the existing urban infrastructure; a range of house sizes</p> | <p>A site at this location was considered by the Local Plan Amendment Examination Reporter, who in his conclusions stated that:</p> <p><i>"I agree also that the slopes provide enclosure and that this is important to the setting of Peebles. Despite the opinion of the previous Reporter, this sense of enclosure would be lost, at least to some extent, should development take place at Venlaw. The landscape setting of the area</i></p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | and plots could be accommodated within this visually contained site, and its setting enhanced with further landscaping. The contributor continues stating that the site is located to the north of Peebles and therefore not subject to the constraint of the need for a second vehicle crossing over the River Tweed. (351) | <i>is also identified as being of high sensitivity. Overall, I share the opinion of Scottish Natural Heritage and agree that the development of site APEEB001 would damage landscape character to an unacceptable degree".</i> He further added: <i>"irrespective of the strategic housing target, that the site is not suitable for housing".</i> Therefore due to landscape reasons, it is not considered appropriate that this site be considered for inclusion in the Proposed Local Development Plan. | |
| | APEEB040 South West of Whitehaugh, Peebles | The contributor identifies a new site proposal APEEB040 to be allocated in the short term within the Local Development Plan. They contend that development at this location would be entirely consistent with the extant Structure Plan development strategy and the adopted Local Plan; several studies have been undertaken which confirm the suitability of the site for development and this is also confirmed in the Council's SEA Appraisal for the Local Plan Amendment that <i>"the site is an acceptable site for development"</i> . A Master Plan has also been developed for the site. The contributor states that the site has many advantages: well located to existing housing development; development of the site | <i>It should be noted that a potential longer term housing site has already been identified at this location within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. In reference to site SPEEB003, and in addition to the requirement for a new bridge, the Plan states:</i> <i>"A vehicular link will be required between the end of Glen Road and Kingsmeadows Road via the Whitehaugh land. The upgrading of Glen Road to Forest View will be required". Therefore the requirement for a vehicular link to Glen Road has already been established through the Development Plan Process.</i> <i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate site APEEB040 but to continue to identify site SPEEB003 for Longer Term Housing within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>will assist the Council in maintaining its continuous 5 year supply of effective land; many local community facilities are within walking distance; vehicular and pedestrian access can be provided directly from Kingsmeadows road via the Whitehaugh land to the north; pedestrian access on to Glen Road can be achieved, and the contributor states that if it can be demonstrated that a vehicular link to Glen Road is required they will seek to facilitate this. They also states that the site is an effective site when considered against the criteria contained within Planning Advice Note 2/2010: Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits. (297)</p> | <p>requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024. The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</p> | |
| | <p>APEEB042 South Parks, Peebles</p> | <p>The contributor seeks the allocation of site APEEB042 South Parks for housing, it is intended that the existing business onsite will be re-located to an alternative site within the local area. It</p> | <p>Not accepted. It should be noted that this site takes in the allocated Employment site South Park – zEL204 and part of Employment land safeguarding site zEL46 within the</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree to retain employment allocations</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | is considered that this location is no longer appropriate for employment. They state that the identification of site APEEB021 indicates that the Council recognise the opportunity for housing to be located in this area of town. Sites within the settlement boundary that or brownfield or part brownfield as with this site should be considered as superior to greenfield sites located outwith the settlement boundary. (199) | Consolidated Local Plan 2011. This proposed housing site is therefore currently protected by Local Plan Policy ED1 Employment Land. Therefore the loss of employment land and good quality business premises would be against Council policy. In addition it should be noted that the 2012 Monitoring Report acknowledges a shortage of employment land at Peebles and states that the Local Development Plan should identify more employment land within Peebles, or at least within the vicinity of Peebles. | zEL204 and zEL46 as currently allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | APEEB043 Tantah, Edderston Road, Peebles | The contributor seeks the allocation of site APEEB043 Tantah for housing. They state that some landscaping has already taken place on site and has been maintained since 2002 which will lessen the impact. Furthermore, the access lane into the site and neighbouring garden is in the same ownership and can be widened if necessary to accommodate access. (177) | <i>It should be noted that this site is already located within the Development Boundary of Peebles. Therefore, the potential for development to occur on the site can be assessed through the Development Management Process and is therefore not dependent on the Development Plan Process.</i> <i>Following a full site assessment, it is considered that site APEEB043 is not appropriate for allocation within the proposed Local Development Plan. Whilst the Council's Roads Planning Section have not objected to the allocation of the site, they have stated that significant road upgrades would be required in taking the site forward. As</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | <p><i>noted above the site does already sit within the Development Boundary of the settlement therefore, the site is not dependent on allocation for it to be developed.</i></p> <p><i>In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available within the Western Strategic Development Area.</i></p> | |
| | <p>APEEB044 Rosetta Road, Peebles</p> | <p>The contributor seeks the allocation of site APEEB044 on the Rosetta Holiday Park to allow for housing of different sizes and tenures including affordable to take place. The contributor states that the allocation of this site would allow for investment to take place to upgrade the park attracting more visitors and expenditure to the wider Peebles area. The contributor states that they have undertaken an initial assessment on access, landscaping, topography, and utilities within the site and have concluded that this site along with proposed Mixed Use site MPEEB006 has the potential to accommodate up to 200 units as well as additional accommodation facilities for the holiday park and improved facilities. (326)</p> | <p><i>It is noted that this site is part of the Rosetta Caravan Park.</i></p> <p><i>Following a full assessment of site APEEB044 it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site within the proposed LDP. Development at this location would result in a loss of the tourism asset onsite, in addition development here would have a negative impact on the built heritage and landscape assets onsite; have a moderate/major impact on biodiversity, there is also the risk that development at this location would detract from the currently attractive approach into the settlement from the north, and the allocation of this site can not be supported by the Council's Economic Development Section. Furthermore it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available within the Western Strategic Development Area.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <i>As a result of the above, it is considered inappropriate to allocate site APEEB044 within the Proposed LDP.</i> | |
| Peebles | SPEEB003 South West of Whitehaugh, Peebles | The contributor objects to the inclusion of this site SPEEB003 within the Plan in that a site to the south west of Peebles is better located for housing. (367) | Site SPEEB003 is identified within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. The inclusion of the site was considered by the Local Plan Amendment Examination Reporter who also considered land to the south west of Peebles. The Reporter concluded: <i>“I consider the finalised local plan amendment provides a good basis for assessing related land use matters should it ultimately be decided to progress with the development of the longer term allocations. Importantly, a masterplan is required and, as indicated in the Peebles settlement statement, this is to ensure a coherent and holistic approach”.</i> | It is recommended that the Council agree to retain this potential longer term housing site within the Plan. |
| Romannobridge | Housing site – Land south east of Fairview, Romannobridge | The contributor seeks housing on a plot of land currently located within the development boundary for Romannobridge. An application was submitted for the site (approximately 0.25ha) for the development of two units which was refused. (226) | The site is already located within the development boundary and the proposal is for two houses. This can be considered under normal development management procedures. It should be noted that the Local Development Plan process only considers housing sites that are capable of accommodating 5 units or more. Therefore it is not appropriate for this site to be considered as part of the Development Plan Process. | It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Stow | ASTOW027 Stagehall, Stow | The contributor seeks the allocation of site ASTOW027 for housing for 16 units. The contributor states that the | This site has been considered previously by the Council and has been discounted as a result of being constrained within the | It is recommended that the Council agree that this site |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | <p>site is substantially degraded having previously been used as the site compound for the neighbouring housing site ESO10B. They continue that development of this site would also allow the opportunity to improve the edge of the settlement at this location. Furthermore they state that there is no likelihood of this site being tidied, remediated, or returned to agricultural use. The contributor states that access can be attained through the neighbouring Wedale View as well as a new access of the minor road to the west of the site. The submission includes a Transport Statement which states that the proposed development will not substantially increase traffic flows. (274)</p> | <p>Development and Landscape Capacity study. Furthermore, Roads Planning are unable to support the allocation of this site.</p> | <p>is not allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
| West Linton | AWEST010 Deanfoot Road, West Linton | <p>The contributor seeks the allocation of site AWEST010 for housing. The contributor states that the Robinsland sites at West Linton were allocated sometime ago and as yet have not been development. The contributor states that they are a local company with which do not hold a significant land bank so development of this site could be commenced promptly and become an effective supply of housing, furthermore West Linton has seen little in the way of housing completions since</p> | <p>It should be noted that there is currently active developer interest in the Robinsland housing sites with the submission of a recent planning application 12/01035/FUL. An enlarged site (AWEST011) at this location has been previously considered as part of the Local Plan Amendment Examination. The Examination Reporter concluded: <i>"I believe that the open nature of the site would exacerbate the poor relationship that any new development at this location would have with the village and agree with</i></p> | <p>It is recommended that the Council agree not to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | the millennium. (177) | <i>the council that a sense of detachment would result. ... I concur with the council's assessment that development in this area would be unacceptable and I therefore conclude that the development boundary in this location should not be changed from that shown in the West Linton settlement plan".</i> | |
| | AWEST015 East of Dryburn Brae, West Linton | The contributor seeks the allocation of site AWEST015. The contributor states that this site should be allocated to provide choice, competition, realistic land supply and a means of achieving a critical mass of population at West Linton. Furthermore the contributor states that if necessary part of the site could be kept over for an allotment if there was community demand for one. (345) | <i>Following a full assessment of site AWEST015 it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site within the proposed LDP. The settlement of West Linton has experienced significant development in the past and currently has a number of sites already allocated within the Plan. It is therefore considered that the settlement does not require any additional allocations at this time. In addition development at this location would result a moderate impact on biodiversity and the Roads Planning section of the Council are unable to support the allocation of this site. Furthermore it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas.</i> <i>The Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) sets a housing land requirement for the whole of the SESplan area for the period up to 2024.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | <p><i>The figures are based on the Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (HNDA) undertaken in the preparation of SESplan. For the Scottish Borders the HNDA set the scale of housing land requirement over the period 2009 to 2024 at 8740 housing units. For the period 2012 to 2024 this would be equivalent to 6950 housing units. At 2012 the Council's annual Housing Land Audit identified a total established housing land supply of 9540 housing units. It was considered that 6660 of those housing sites were 'effective' or 'potentially effective' with the remaining 2880 being constrained principally by market or infrastructure considerations at that point in time. Therefore, the Proposed Local Development Plan requires to ensure that there will continue to be a generous supply of housing land over the plan period and a further 630 housing units are proposed to be allocated across the Borders housing market areas.</i></p> <p><i>As a result of the above, it is considered inappropriate to allocate site AWEST015 within the Proposed LDP.</i></p> | |
| Yarrowford | AYARR009 Yarrowford south, Yarrowford | The site is promoted for residential development. The contributor states that the majority of the site is elevated well above area prone to flooding. (157) | <p><i>The site is not considered to have a capacity of 5 or more units and has not therefore been considered as a housing site in the LDP. The area has however</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to include</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <i>been assessed and it is considered that it is suitable for inclusion in the Settlement Boundary.</i> | <i>the area in the settlement boundary within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

A3 TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES; PRIME RETAIL FRONTAGES

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Retail | Prime Retail Frontage - Selkirk | Prime Retail Frontage for Selkirk should be extended to include West Port. (342, 290) Contributor (342) is also concerned over loss of protection in Selkirk, local groups working to encourage and initiate improvement in Selkirk. | The prime retail frontage for Selkirk is proposed to be included in the LDP to protect the town centre. Inclusion of West Port was considered but would have created a too large area of the town centre with unnecessary strong protection. | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to take forward the Core Activity Area (previously known as Prime Retail Frontage) for Selkirk as proposed within the Main Issues Report.</i> |
| Retail | Prime Retail Frontage - | Contributor (289) objects to the removal of prime retail frontage on the south side east | In Peebles the south side of the east end of Eastgate was excluded as it differs from | <i>It is recommended</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---------------------------|--|--|
| | Peebles | end of Eastgate, Peebles. | the traditional town centre in character and also the use as post office/sorting office and bus station. | <i>that the Council agree to take forward the Core Activity Area (previously known as Prime Retail Frontage) for Peebles as proposed within the Main Issues Report.</i> |
|--|---------|---------------------------|--|--|

A4 KEY REGENERATION SITES

The sites within the following table were put forward within the Main Issues Report:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Berwickshire Housing Market Area | RDUNS003 Disused Chicken Hatchery, Clockmill, Duns | The respondent's state that the proposed site is located on the functional flood plain or in an area of known flood risk, as such: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitivity of use should be considered as some sites may not be suitable for more sensitive uses • Recommend FRA • Burn bordering the site on the south and west edges should be protected and enhanced in any redevelopment (357) | <i>The site was assessed for flood risk using the strategic 1:200 data and it was not found to be at risk. However, if the site is included in the LDP, it is possible for the site requirements to be amended to reflect any updated information as appropriate. SEPA have been requested to confirm their stance on this.</i> <i>SEPA have confirmed their stance that a Flood Risk Assessment is required and this has been included in prospective site requirements. It is</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <i>considered that the site is an appropriate redevelopment option to be included in the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> | |
| | REYEM002 Former High School Extension, Eyemouth | No comments received. | | |
| | REYEM003 Gasholder Station, Eyemouth | Respondent states there may be contamination issues and that remediation of land likely to be required before redevelopment (357) | The site underwent a site assessment process and no contamination issues were identified. | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| | REYEM004 Eyemouth Mill, Eyemouth | The respondents state that the proposed site is located on the functional flood plain or in an area of known flood risk, as such: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitivity of use should be considered as some sites may not be suitable for more sensitive uses; • Recommend FRA; • Located very close to banks of a watercourse. Redevelopment should be setback an appropriate distance (357) | <i>The site has been redeveloped to form a private dwelling and as a result it is not necessary to allocate it in the Proposed Local Development Plan</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | |
| Central Housing Market Area | REARL001, Halcombe Fields, Earlston | The contributor requires a Flood Risk Assessment for this site. The contributor states the sensitivity of use should be considered as part of any new development as some sites may not be suitable for more sensitive land uses eg: residential. Redevelopment opportunities for less sensitive land uses such as employment industrial or greening initiatives should also be considered more favourably for these sites. If such a requirement cannot be made the contributor may object to the regeneration of these sites at the proposed plan stage. (357) | These comments are noted and should a site at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, the suggested requirements will be included in the site requirements. | It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site REARL001 for redevelopment within the Proposed Local Development Plan. The necessary site requirements will be included in the site requirements. |
| | RGALA002 Vacant buildings at Kirk Brae, Galashiels | Support for the regeneration of this site (285) There is support for redevelopment of the site although there might be some parking and road safety issues. (90) SEPA has requested a requirement for water resilient construction measures as the site is located adjacent to the functional flood plain or in area of known flood risk. (357) | Support noted. SEPA have been requested to re-affirm the need for water resilient construction measures. Issues such as parking and road safety will be dealt with at planning application stage. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | RGALA003 Old refuse tip, Galashiels | Support for the regeneration of this site. (285) SEPA has raised that there may be co-location issues with a SEPA regulated site and that a Flood Risk Assessment should be | Support noted. Because of co-location issues highlighted by SEPA, low-risk use excluding housing will be promoted on the site. If the site is taken forward in the Proposed Plan | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | required. Less sensitive land uses should be considered more favourably. (357) | requirement for Flood Risk Assessment should be included. | the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements relating to development of low-risk use and flood risk assessment should be included. |
| | RGALA004 Bylands, Galashiels | <p>Support for the regeneration of this site. (285)</p> <p>One contributor has raised issues with this redevelopment site which he would like to see undeveloped. Issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to loss of privacy of neighbouring properties, the development on the site would need to be in keeping with the surrounding area and protect the residential amenity with a planting scheme (321) • Requirement for water resilient construction measures should be included in the site requirements as the site is located adjacent to the functional flood plain or in area of known flood risk (357) | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>SEPA have been requested to re-affirm the need for water resilient construction measures.</p> <p>Issues raised relating to loss of privacy and protection of residential amenity will be dealt with at planning application stage.</p> | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | RHAWI010 | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that | SEPA have been requested to re-affirm | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Cottage Hospital, Hawick | flood risk assessments and water resilience measures be considered for this regeneration site. (357) | the need for water resilient construction measures. | that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are made aware of flood and water issues and requirements. |
| | RHAWI011 Factory, Fairhurst Drive, Hawick | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that flood risk assessments and water resilience measures be considered for these regeneration sites. (357) | SEPA have been requested to re-affirm the need for water resilient construction measures. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | developers are made aware of flood and water issues and requirements. |
| | RHAWI012 St Margaret's & Wilton South Church, Hawick | <p>The contributor (SEPA) has requested that flood risk assessments and water resilience measures be considered for these regeneration sites. (357)</p> <p>The contributor (Scottish Government) suggests that access to site should be from the local road network (as opposed to the A7 trunk road). (339)</p> | <p>Include reference to requirement for flood risk assessments, resilience measures and other aspects of the water environment in site information and any subsequent development briefs. Site requirements will be applied through policy framework to permit development only if any identified risk can be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Include reference to access requirements in site information and any subsequent development briefs.</p> | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are made aware of flood, water and access issues and requirements. |
| | RHAWI013 Former Council Houses, Eastfield Road, Hawick | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that flood risk assessments and water resilience measures be considered for these regeneration sites. (357) | <p>Include reference to requirement for flood risk assessments, resilience measures and other aspects of the water environment in site information and any subsequent development briefs. Site requirements will be applied through policy framework to permit development only if any identified risk can be</p> | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | adequately mitigated. | Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are made aware of flood and water issues and requirements. |
| | RHAWI014 Land on Mansfield Road, Hawick | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that flood risk assessments and water resilience measures be considered for these regeneration sites. (357) | Include reference to requirement for flood risk assessments, resilience measures and other aspects of the water environment in site information and any subsequent development briefs. Site requirements will be applied through policy framework to permit development only if any identified risk can be adequately mitigated. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are made aware of flood and water issues and requirements. |
| | RHAWI015 Land east of | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that flood risk assessments and water resilience | Include reference to requirement for flood risk assessments, resilience measures | It is recommended that the Council |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | Community Hospital, Hawick | measures be considered for these regeneration sites. (357) | and other aspects of the water environment in site information and any subsequent development briefs. Site requirements will be applied through policy framework to permit development only if any identified risk can be adequately mitigated. | agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are made aware of flood and water issues and requirements. |
| | RHAWI016 Former N Peal Factory, Carnavon Street, Hawick | The contributor (SEPA) has requested that flood risk assessments and water resilience measures be considered for these regeneration sites. (357) | Include reference to requirement for flood risk assessments, resilience measures and other aspects of the water environment in site information and any subsequent development briefs. Site requirements will be applied through policy framework to permit development only if any identified risk can be adequately mitigated. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirements will be applied to ensure that potential developers are |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | made aware of flood and water issues and requirements. |
| | RJEDB002, Riverside Mill, Jedburgh | The contributor requires Flood Risk Assessment and Water resilient measures for this site. The contributor states the sensitivity of use should be considered as part of any new development as some sites may not be suitable for more sensitive land uses eg: residential. Redevelopment opportunities for less sensitive land uses such as employment industrial or greening initiatives should also be considered more favourably for these sites. If such a requirement cannot be made the contributor may object to the regeneration of these sites at the proposed plan stage. (357) | These comments are noted and should a site at this location be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan, the suggested requirements will be included in the site requirements. | It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site RJEDB002 for redevelopment within the Proposed Local Development Plan. The necessary site requirements will be included in the site requirements. |
| | RSELK003 Land at Kilncroft/Mill Street, Selkirk | The Mill Burn is shown to be culverted adjacent to the site. Investigation of a potential culvert beneath the site should be considered. (357) | If the site is taken forward in the Proposed Plan a site requirement relating to investigation of a potential culvert beneath the site should be included. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. Site requirement for investigation of potential culvert should be |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | included. |
| | RSELK004, Souter Court, Selkirk | SEPA has requested a requirement for water resilient construction measures to be included in the site requirements as the site is located adjacent to the functional flood plain or in area of known flood risk and also, due to steep topography surrounding the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. (357) | It is suspected that SEPA has looked at the wrong location when assessing the site. SEPA have been requested to re-affirm their stance on this. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Northern Housing Market Area | RINNE001 Former Gas Works, Innerleithen | The contributor states that site RINNE001 is located on the functional flood plain or in an area of known flood risk. Therefore they state that the sensitivity of use should be considered as part of any new development as some sites may not be suitable for more sensitive land uses e.g. residential. The contributor continues, stating that to ensure that any new development is designed to minimise and where possible mitigate flood risk they recommend that flood risk assessments are required to inform the regeneration of the sites. If such a requirement cannot be made they state that they may object to the regeneration of these sites at the proposed plan stage. (357) | Comments noted. However, should this site be identified as a Regeneration site within the Proposed Local Development Plan, site requirements can be added in relation to the contributor's comments. | It is recommended that the Council agree that the site can be taken forward for redevelopment in the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

The sites within the following table were submitted as new sites during the process of the consultation of the Main Issues Report, maps are included in Appendix A1:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|---|---|---|---|
| Coldstream | RCOLD001 Duns Road, Coldstream <i>Same site as proposed key greenspace GSCOLD003</i> | The respondent states that the tennis courts should be identified as a redevelopment opportunity, with potential for tennis courts to be incorporated. Submission states that the tennis club's lease is up and client understands they are seeking to relocate to an alternative location. (310) | The Council is aware that there are issues over the future of the tennis club and there are concerns from existing members regarding this. In view of the potential pressure on this site it is considered the tennis courts should be safeguarded as open space in the proposed LDP. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect Lennel Tennis Club/RCOLD001/GSCOLD003 as a key green space within the Proposed Plan. |
| Eyemouth | REYEM005, The Old Whale Hotel & Harbour Road/ Manse Road, Church Street area, Eyemouth | The contributor would like to see the inclusion of the Old Whale Hotel, Burgon's Yard, DR Collin and the FMA and FMA car park within Appendix A4 Key Regeneration Areas. (347) | The MIR identifies the Harbour Road/ Manse Road, Church Street area and it is the intention to include this within the settlement plan. | Note the inclusion of the key regeneration opportunities identified in paragraph 5.43 of the MIR. |
| Galashiels | Commercial Redevelopment, Galashiels Central | Contributor supports the removal of the commercial redevelopment allocation at ASDA as the redevelopment has taken place. Area should return to white land in the plan. (236) | A review of the development of commercial redevelopment sites in Galashiels would inform what sites need to be included in the Proposed Plan. | It is recommended that any fully developed sites are excluded from the Proposed Plan. |
| Polwarth | RPOLW001, Land behind Old Village Hall, Polwarth | The respondent proposes redevelopment of the old settlement at Polwarth, behind the village hall, for residential purposes. It is stated that the site would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make good use of previously developed land | The site put forward is located in Polwarth which does not have a settlement boundary. The LDP does not allocate sites outwith a settlement boundary. APOWL002 has been rejected by | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |

| | | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase no. and choice of sites in Borders • be deliverable, as evidenced by recent completion of housing units nearby (300, 306) | <p>the Reporter at the Local Plan Amendment Inquiry. Reasons for rejection such as completion of existing planning permissions will result in saturation point, isolated community with no services and the archaeological value of the site are still relevant.</p> <p>Any proposed redevelopment/new build of the site could be tested under the current Housing in the Countryside policy and the Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside policy within the Consolidated Local Plan. It is therefore not considered that the site can justify a regeneration allocation.</p> <p>It is considered there are sufficient housing land options within established settlements in the Berwickshire Housing Market Area without the need to allocate any new settlement boundaries in the countryside.</p> | |
| Selkirk | RSELK005 Heather Mill, Selkirk | The site has been submitted for inclusion in the plan for mixed use redevelopment. The contributor asserts that flood risk issues will be addressed, subject to funding, within | <i>Following a full site assessment of RSELK005 and a review of the Riverside Area of Selkirk it is considered that RSELK005 is appropriate for use as a local</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to allocate this site as a Local Business and Industrial Land allocation which would</i> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | <p>the LDP period. After the flooding constraint is lifted the current employment safeguarding can be redeveloped for a wider range of mixed uses. SPP promotes redevelopment, mixed use and review of sites not coming forward for intended use. The representation includes assessment of the site. (335)</p> | <p><i>safeguarded Business and Industrial Land allocation. This Local designation means that alternative uses are likely to be supported. This is due to the current mix of uses, connection to the town and residential areas and recreational areas. The move towards mixed use sites are promoted in SPP. RSELK005 forms part of a larger area known as BSELK003.</i></p> <p><i>Any development of this site would be dependant on completion of the Flooding Scheme planned for Selkirk.</i></p> | <p><i>enable mixed use development.</i></p> |
| | <p>RSELK006 Whitfield Mill, Selkirk</p> | <p>The site has been submitted for inclusion in the plan for mixed use redevelopment. Flood risk issues will be addressed, subject to funding, within the LDP period. After the flooding constraint is lifted the current employment safeguarding can be redeveloped for a wider range of mixed uses. SPP promotes redevelopment, mixed use and review of sites not coming forward for intended use. The representation includes assessment of the site. (335)</p> | <p><i>Following a full site assessment of RSELK006 and a review of the Riverside Area of Selkirk it is considered that RSELK006 is not appropriate for mixed use allocation. The site is located within an area which is predominantly within employment use and is detached in terms of connectivity from the town. The area is considered to be appropriate as District Business and Industrial Land under zEL11 and BSELK001.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan as a mixed use site.</i></p> |

A5 KEY GREEN SPACES

The sites within the following table were put forward within the Main Issues Report:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------|------------------------|---|--|---|
| Green Space | GSCHIR001 Chirnside | <p>The contributor supports the inclusion of GSCHIR001. The contributor states that they are very keen to support Chirnside Football Clubs plans to develop and improve, whilst at the same time they remind the Council of the potential for future residential development to the north of the village and the need for an access to such a development in the vicinity of the football ground. (198)</p> <p>The contributors consider that it is not appropriate for the Council to protect the existing football field (GSCHIR001) in its current location. The contributors state that the area is subject to a mixed use allocation in the existing Local Plan (MCCHIR001). The contributors continue, in order to achieve the best layout for a mixed use development at Chirnside it may be appropriate to re-site the football field on an equivalent green space in a more appropriate location. The contributors state that areas under consideration by the landowner include land to the east of the allocated site or land adjacent to the school. (300, 309)</p> | <p>Support and comments noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that the football pitch at Chirnside which was identified as a potential Key Green Space for inclusion in the Local Development Plan (LDP) is not part of the allocated Mixed Use site. Furthermore the above submission of the Community Council supports the identification of this Key Green Space within the LDP.</p> | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSCHIR001 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSEDDL001 | The contributor supports the inclusion of | Support noted. | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | & GSEDDL002 Eddleston | GSEDDL001 and GSEDDL002. (362) | | that the Council agree to identify and protect GSEDDL001 and GSEDDL002 as key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSLAUD001 Lauder | The contributors state in reference to GSLAUD001, that the whole of park should be included. (111, 364) | Following the recent planning approval for a new health centre adjacent to the park on a reduced foot print (planning application reference 11/01690/FUL), it is considered appropriate that the area of the park protected as a key green space can be enlarged. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect revised site GSLAUD001 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSMELR001 Melrose | The contributor states that in reference to GSMELR001, the northern corner should also be included. (364) | It is considered that this alteration maybe acceptable. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect revised site GSMELR001 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| | GS MELR004 Melrose | The contributor states that in reference to GS MELR004, they are not sure how National Trust for Scotland Abbey Gardens can be included. (364) | Comment noted. Following further consideration it is suggested that Abbey Gardens could be removed from GS MELR004. However, it is recommended that the adjacent recreational ground is identified and protected as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect revised site GS MELR004 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GS PEEB011 Peebles | The contributor supports the identification of GS PEEB011 as a Key Green Space. (230) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GS PEEB011 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GS PEEB005 Peebles | The contributor states that in reference to GS PEEB005, they wish to see the space extended to include a derelict piece of land which is currently in a poor state and badly littered. (289) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. Other greens spaces not identified on proposals maps but are within the Development Boundary will still receive a degree of protection through the Policy on Green Space. It is considered that the suggested extension is a separate entity from the site already identified. Furthermore its | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GS PEEB005 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | inclusion within the Local Development Plan is not guarantee that the space will be enhanced. | |
| | GSPEEB007 Peebles | The contributor states that in reference to GSPEEB007, parts of the Cuddy Green which should be included have been omitted. (289) | The space was identified within the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Green Space and includes the areas of green accessible to the public. It is not considered appropriate to identify the private areas of land in this instance. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSPEEB007 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSPEEB001; GSPEEB002; GSPEEB003; GSPEEB004; GSPEEB005; GSPEEB006; GSPEEB007; GSPEEB010; GSPEEB008; GSPEEB009 & GSPEEB011 Peebles | The contributor supports the identification of sites GSPEEB001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007 and GSPEEB010 although they are major public spaces they are unlikely to come under development pressure. In addition the contributor states that sites GSPEEB008, GSPEEB009 and GSPEEB011 could come under development pressure and they welcome their inclusion. (368) | Support noted and comment noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSPEEB001, GSPEEB002, GSPEEB003, GSPEEB004, GSPEEB005, GSPEEB006, GSPEEB007, GSPEEB008, GSPEEB009, GSPEEB010 & GSPEEB011 as key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-------|
| | | | | Plan. |
|--|--|--|--|-------|

The sites within the following table were submitted as new sites during the process of the consultation of the Main Issues Report, maps are included in Appendix A1:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Green Space | Clovenfords | The contributor seeks the identification of the football pitch outwith the Development Boundary. (196) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan (LDP) will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. In relation to the football pitch, it is located outwith the Development Boundary and therefore is unlikely to be subject to development pressure. | It is recommended that this site is not included within the Plan. |
| | GSCLOV001 Clovenfords | The contributor seeks that all of the grassy areas between the playground and the roundabout be designated as green space as this is the only green space in the village. (196) | It suggested that given the recent development of the school within Clovenfords and the new landscaping that has taken place within that vicinity, the new village green including the play park provides an important focus in the centre of the settlement. It is therefore considered that inclusion of the new village green as a key green space within the Local Development Plan would be appropriate. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect revised site GSCLOV001 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSCOPA004 Cockburnspath | The contributor seeks the identification of the football field. This area is used for local entertainments such as Gala and the flower show as well as greatly used by the primary school. (115) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. Other greens spaces not identified on proposals maps but are within the Development Boundary will still | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSCOPA004 as a key green space |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>receive protection through the Policy on Green Space.</p> <p>In respect to the football field it is considered that it may be appropriate to identify it as a key green space within the settlement.</p> | <p>within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
| | GSDUNS001 Duns | <p>The contributor seeks the extension of site GSDUNS001 to the west to provide additional amenity space to make up for the loss of these playing fields close to the town, and to increase public enjoyment of the present parkland and link to the school. This should be landscaped by the developer to the Council's design. (225)</p> | <p><i>It should be noted that the playing fields are not lost but are being relocated at the site of the former High School, Duns. The land to the west will be subject to a Master Plan and the same issues raised would feed into that. However, much of the land to the immediate west is a wetland area which must be safeguarded and would offer limited opportunities for open space use. There is a requirement within the consolidated Local Plan to have a foot link running through the area linking the town to the New High School and this has been completed, including the provision of a board walk through the wetland area. It is therefore not considered appropriate to extend this green space.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure the supply and protection of amenity space in Duns, and to safeguard the use of the land at the former High School for the relocation of the playing fields, it would also be appropriate to formally allocate two</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Council agree to continue to identify and protect GSDUNS001 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan and to agree to identify GSDUNS002 and GSDUNS003 within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i></p> |

| | | | <i>areas of greenspace: GSDUNS002 and GSDUNS003.</i> | |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| | GSEYEM005 Eyemouth | The contributor seeks the inclusion of the playing field/park corner of the Coldingham Road and Northburn Road opposite Acredale. (288) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. It is noted that enhancement of this space has been recently undertaken and therefore its contribution to the locality has significantly increased, for that reason it is considered that it may be appropriate to identify this area as a key green space. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSEYEM005 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSEYEM004 Eyemouth | The contributor seeks the inclusion of Border Forest Planting site at back of Queens Road. (288) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. Given the position of the planting area and the contribution it has to the setting of the town at that location it is considered that it may be appropriate to identify this area as a key green space. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSEYEM004 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSEYEM002 Eyemouth | The contributor seeks the inclusion of the trees at the back of Victoria Road. (288) | It is already intended to include a site along Victoria Road for inclusion in the Local Development Plan. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSEYEM002 as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Eyemouth | The contributor considers that the old gas works site (REYEM003) does not need to be a development opportunity as this is a key site into our town and could be better used as a green space. (288) | The site already sits within the Development Boundary of Eyemouth and therefore a proposal could come forward at anytime. The Main Issues Report identifies this site as a Regeneration Opportunity. It should be noted that identification as a Regeneration Opportunity would not preclude an element of green space. | It is recommended that the Council continues to identify the Regeneration site REYEM003 Gas Holder Station within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | Eyemouth | The contributor seeks inclusion of top corner at Killiedraghts/Barefoots and Pocklawslap. The contributor also seeks the inclusion of the old Eyemouth high school playing fields for possible use as an Events Park. (347) | The area suggested is part of an allocated housing site within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify the site as a key green space. The former high school site is an allocated redevelopment site within the existing Consolidated Local Plan and has also been subject to a planning Brief therefore, it is not considered appropriate to identify it as a key green space. | It is recommended that the Council does not identify the Housing site BEY1 Barefoots or redevelopment site REYEM001 Former Eyemouth High School site as key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSGATT002 Gattonside | The contributor states that the Green Triangle Common at the top of The Loan is already recognised as Site ID no. 435 in Scottish Borders Council's Green Space Strategy, as being of high value and a certificate of Lawful Use as Amenity Green Space has been issued. Furthermore the contributor states | It is noted that the Green Space Audit that was undertaken as part of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Green Space identifies the area as of High Quality and High Value. Although it is acknowledged that the space could do with some enhancement, it is recognised | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSGATT002 as a key green space within the |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | that the Triangle is currently in a sorry mess and a permanent way needs to be found of returning it to the form and character that made it such a valued place. (211) | that the space remains to be considered as high value to the community. | Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | Gordon | The Contributors seek the identification of a piece of ground opposite 12 and 13 Sunnybraes, Gordon as a Key Green Space within the LDP. (168, 169, 173, 175) | The piece of ground is subject to a recent planning approval – 11/00533/FUL. Furthermore, the Council are aware that the applicant of that planning application already has right of access over this piece of ground, therefore it is not appropriate to identify it as a key green space. In addition it would be inappropriate for the Council to support the loss of an individual's right of access over this piece of ground by identifying it within the Local Development Plan as a protected Key Green Space. | It is recommended that the Council does not identify the suggested site as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSHAWI014 & GSHAWI015, Hawick | The contributor states that out of the seven allotments sites in Hawick, there are two not identified in the Main Issues Report – Kirk Wynd and Weensland Allotments. (99) | It is the intention of the Local Development Plan to identify all allotment sites therefore it is considered acceptable that these two sites could also be included within the Local Development Plan. | It is recommended that the Council agree to identify and protect GSHAWI014 (Kirk Wynd) and GSHAWI015 (Weensland) as key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | GSPEEB012 Peebles | The contributor seeks the inclusion of various other sites for identification in the plan. (289) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan (LDP) will identify the | It is recommended that the Council |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>most important green spaces within settlements. Other greens spaces not identified on proposals maps but within the Development Boundary will still receive protection through the Policy on Green Space.</p> <p>Of the sites suggested by the contributor, some sit outwith the Development Boundary, others are not considered to be sufficiently significant to be identified within the LDP.</p> <p>It should be noted that all of the former railway lines will also be protected as part of the Green Networks.</p> <p>It is the intention of the LDP to identify allotments on proposals maps, therefore it is accepted that the Burgh Hall Allotments should be included as GSPEEB012.</p> <p>In respect of the Violet Bank field (zSS203) it is considered allocation as a school site is no longer required. Nevertheless, the site is used as a playing field for the school and this is intended to continue. Whilst it is not considered necessary for the playing field to be identified as a key green space within the LDP, they will still receive protection as green space through the green space policy. Furthermore, it should be noted that the playing field is also in the</p> | <p>agree to identify and protect GSPEEB012 Burgh Hall Allotments as a key green space and to remove the School site allocation from site zSS203 Violet Bank and for that site to be protected as green space through the Green Space Policy within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|--|
| | | | ownership of the Council and benefits from the protection that that affords. | |
| | Peebles | The contributor seeks the inclusion of other sites – triangle green on Edderston Road; wooded areas at the end of Edderston Road to Craigerne Land; open spaces in housing estates bounded by Victoria Park, Kingsmeadows Road and Glen Road. (368) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan (LDP) will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. Other greens spaces not identified on proposals maps but are within the Development Boundary will still receive protection through the Policy on Green Space. Of the sites suggested by the contributor, it is considered that they are not sufficiently significant to be identified within the LDP. | It is recommended that the Council does not identify the suggested sites as key green spaces within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | Selkirk | The contributor seeks the identification of Selkirk Hill as it is a prominent natural feature of the town and a prime open space, which is enjoyed by the local community and visitors alike. (342) | The intention is that the Local Development Plan (LDP) will identify the most important green spaces within settlements. Selkirk Hills currently sits outwith the Development Boundary. It should be noted though, that Selkirk and the Selkirk Hills fall within the proposed Central Strategic Green Network identified within the Main Issues Report. It is intended that the new LDP will however contain a policy that will aim to protect, promote and enhance green networks within the Scottish Borders. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify Selkirk Hill within the LDP as a key green space. | It is recommended that the Council does not identify the suggested site as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| | Selkirk | The contributor notes the importance of managed and natural open spaces in | Comments noted. | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|--|--|
| | | stimulating tourism opportunities, for example the current redevelopments at Abbotsford and The Haining - but these must also be supported by an adequate and sensitively integrated infrastructure. (342) | | |
| | Selkirk | The contributor states that they are aware of the need to improve the quality and scope of the facilities contained at Pringle Park so that this key area of green space is suitably equipped and managed to serve the Selkirk Community for the foreseeable future. (342) | Comment noted. | No further action required. |
| | Tweedbank | The contributor seeks the addition of Killie Holes, Tweedbank as there are plans for allotments and a community orchard. (364) | Whilst it is noted that the community have aspirations for this area, their plans are in a very early stage. Currently the space is designated as Natural Green Space within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Green Space and therefore already receives protection. Furthermore, it should be noted that greens spaces not identified on proposals maps but are within the Development Boundary will still receive protection through the new Policy on Green Space. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify Killie Holes within the Local Development Plan. | It is recommended that the Council does not identify the suggested site as a key green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |

A6 OTHER SITES SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION DURING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS OF THE MAIN ISSUES REPORT

The following tables shows sites submitted for consideration during the consultation process of the Main Issues Report, maps are included in Appendix A1:

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|---|---|--|---|
| Ayton | MAYT001 Land Adjacent Peelwalls House, Ayton | <p>The respondent states that the site should be included in the Local Development Plan (LDP) as either housing, regeneration or redevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal for 12 private residential live/work houses; • 2 ha in size, accessed from B6355 via newly made access junction; • Site already has 5, 2 bed housing units partly constructed, including roundels designed to serve 36 proposed residential units (322) | <p>The site has a complicated planning history linked to the former use of Peelwalls House (sited adjacently). This has left the site with 5 partially-complete retirement/care dwellings and related access. However their usage and any further development associated with the original planning application cannot take place as the approval was in conjunction with a nursing home at Peelwalls which has ceased to operate.</p> <p>Any proposed redevelopment/new build of the site could be tested under the current Housing in the Countryside policy and the Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside policy within the Consolidated Local Plan. It is therefore not considered that the site can justify a regeneration allocation, but there may be opportunity to develop the site via a tourism related development.</p> <p>It is considered there are sufficient housing land options within established settlements in the Berwickshire Housing Market Area without the need to allocate any new settlement boundaries in the countryside.</p> | It is recommended that the Council agrees that the site should not be proposed for inclusion in the proposed LDP. |
| Lennel | FCOLD002, | The respondent proposes an alternative | <i>In consultation with other Council</i> | <i>It is</i> |

| | | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Cemetery expansion, Coldstream | cemetery expansion site south of the existing cemetery, opposed to the Consolidated Local Plan site directly to the north, on the other side of the A6112 (FCOLD001). (310) | departments it was concluded that the site would have severe constraints (landslip, biodiversity impact, roads access) which mean it is not a suitable alternative to the allocated cemetery expansion site (FCOLD001) | recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. |
| Peebles | New Bridge Crossing Peebles | The contributor states that there is a compelling case for a second bridge in Peebles and suggests that the option to the east of Cavalry Park (option 6 from the Peebles Transport Study) is the most appropriate. (179) | It should be noted that the Consolidated Local Plan 2011 already makes reference to the requirement for a second bridge for Peebles. A report was submitted to the Environment and Infrastructure Committee on 8th November 2012, where it was agreed that bridge options B3, B7 and B8 provided the best balance in terms of meeting the stated objectives of the study and should be explored in more detail. It was proposed that further consultation work with the local community be undertaken along with additional design work to help explore these recommended options in more detail, with a view to finalising a preferred route option. | It is recommended that the Council await the outcome of further consultation with the community along with additional design work before making a decision on a preferred route option. |
| Reston | BR6, Consolidated Local Plan | The respondent is concerned at reference to future new primary school being located on CLP longer term sites | In 2001 there was permission granted for a house. | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|--------|--|--|---|--|
| | housing site change of use to education safeguarding, Reston | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land adjacent to existing primary school has been allocated for housing since 1994 and yet to be subject to a successful planning application; • Site is logical for primary school expansion (103) | The Council's Education and Lifelong Learning department state that although the site has been considered for its potential for either an extended or new primary school there are significant issues with either of these options. An extension does not provide a suitable solution due to the nature of the site and the existing Victorian buildings, plus the location outside the main village settlement is considered unsuitable for the long term development of Reston. | |
| Retail | Retail - GSELK002, Dunsdalehaugh, Selkirk | <p>The site is promoted as a Retail Development Opportunity as part of a larger Commercial Centre and specific retail allocation for the vacant part of the site. Previous Council assessment shows the site as 'acceptable'.</p> <p>Future flood mitigation measures will address flooding issue on site and part of the site has a live planning permission for retail.</p> <p>SPP advice that Development Plans should provide clear guidance on what will or will not be permitted and where. SPP also promotes Commercial Centres.</p> <p>Site assessment is included in the representation. (215)</p> | <p><i>The site is located within the settlement boundary and the area is predominantly retail use.</i></p> <p><i>The Council promotes focus on retail within town centre and it is therefore not supporting allocation of this edge of town site.</i></p> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to not allocate this site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</i> |
| Other | Bowden Toll, Bowden | The area at Bowden Toll is highly visible on the landscape and unworthy the approach to | This is not a matter for the Local Development Plan. Allocation of the | No further consideration will |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | Conservation Village. It needs to be tidied and prevent future despoliation. (211) | <p>area would be unsuitable as it is located in the countryside.</p> <p>The area has been subject to a recent enforcement case and the Council's Enforcement Officer is satisfied that the site is currently in an acceptable condition.</p> | be given to this matter. |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|

B GREEN NETWORKS

No comments/submissions received.

C POLICY REVIEW / STANDARDS REVIEW / SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------|---|---|---|--|
| General | Policy G1 - Quality Standards for New Development | The contributor would like Placemaking and Design to be referred to as central to policy G1. (364) | Reference will be made in relation to Placemaking and Design as part of the LDP policy justification. | It is recommended that the policy justification for G1 Quality Standards for New Development within the Proposed Local Development Plan will make reference to Placemaking and Design. |

| | | | | |
|---------|---|--|---|--|
| General | Policy G1 - Quality Standards for New Development | The contributor supports the preferred option. The contributor supports the consideration of future Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to Waste Management issues relating to construction in particular. (327) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G1 - Quality Standards for New Development | The contributor encourages the Council to include a criterion in policy G1 to outline the need to take outdoor sport and recreation interests into account in assessing all relevant development proposals. (202) | Policy BE6 Protection of Open Space is the primary policy in relation to the protection of outdoor sports facilities and amenity opens spaces. This is supported by policy Inf12 Public Infrastructure and Local Service Provision which encourages the retention and improvements to public infrastructure and local services. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G2 – Contaminated Land | The contributor supports the preferred option. The contributor welcomes the wording change proposed to reflect that the contributor only wishes to be consulted by developers where there are potential impacts on sites designated for their natural heritage value. (327) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G2 – Contaminated Land | The contributor notes that SNH may in the future adjust their policy regarding consultations. (342) | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G3 – Hazardous Developments | The contributor agrees with the recommendations relating to policy G3. (342) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |

| | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|---|--|--|
| General | Policy G4 - Flooding | Wording should acknowledge work carried out and approved for Selkirk area. (342) | Policy G4 Flooding does not mention specific settlements in the policy text. Reference to flooding work in Selkirk is included in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The introductory text to the policy can be updated to include settlements at risk and an update on flooding projects. | It is proposed to make no changes to policy G4 Flooding in terms of including references to flooding works in specific settlements, but to update the introductory text to include settlements at risk of flooding and an update on flooding projects. |
| General | Policy G4 - Flooding | Minimise flood risk by identifying current 'waste land' to be wetlands. (94) | The Council is in line with Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 looking to identify areas where natural flood management can be promoted. | It is proposed to, as part of the policy review process, promote natural flood management and start the process of identifying search areas or safeguarded areas for natural flood risk management. The introductory text to the policy should be updated to include |

| | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | commitment to an SPG where detailed work on locating areas for natural flood management is included. |
| General | Policy G4 - Flooding | SEPA welcome the approach in Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and specifically identification of potential search areas for natural flood management. SEPA encourage safeguarding the identified areas as part of the spatial strategy in the LDP. (357) | Support noted. The introductory text to the policy should be updated to include commitment to an SPG where detailed work on locating areas for natural flood management is included. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment needs to be updated as part of the LDP process to include updates on current projects and new information. | It is proposed to, as part of the policy review process, promote natural flood management and start the process of identifying search areas or safeguarded areas for natural flood risk management. The introductory text to the policy should be updated to include commitment to an SPG where detailed work on locating areas for natural flood management is included. |
| General | Policy G4 - Flooding | SEPA wants to assess all sites included in the Proposed Plan | Noted. SEPA is one of the key agencies which the Council works | No further action required. |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | (including previously allocated sites) in relation to flood risk and water quality. (357) | with in the LDP process. SEPA will continue to provide the Council with information on policies and individual sites. | |
| General | Policy G4 - Flooding | The contributor suggests the policy should acknowledge the work already carried out for the Selkirk area and approved by the Council which is now awaiting final funding arrangement and implementation. (342) | Agreed. An update is to be provided in the policy justification. | It is proposed to provide an update on major Flood Scheme proposals in the policy justification of policy G4 Flooding. |
| General | Policy G5 – Developer Contributions | The contributor would like policy G5 to include contributions towards broadband and mobile phone infrastructure provision. (364) | Reference is to be made to broadband and mobile communications infrastructure provision within point 7. | It is recommended that reference is to be made to broadband and mobile communications infrastructure provision within point 7 of policy G5 Developer Contributions. |
| General | Policy G5 – Developer Contributions | The contributor would like Policy G5 to include developer contributions towards the NHS. (289) | Policy G5 Developer Contributions already makes reference to communal and community facilities. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G5 – Developer Contributions | The contributor supports the preferred option. The contributor supports the inclusion of improvements to the water environment in line with River Basin Planning objectives. (327) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|---|--|
| General | Policy G6 – Developer Contributions related to Railway Reinstatement | The contributor notes the recommendations. (342) | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G7 – Infill Development | The contributor notes the recommendations. (342) | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G8 – Development Outwith Development Boundaries | The contributor would like it to be made clear that development outwith development boundaries is not acceptable even if it is affordable housing. The contributor would like the policy wording to be amended to clarify that development outwith development boundaries will only be considered in exceptional circumstance and other criteria must be met. (364) | Policy G8 provides necessary flexibility particularly in relation to the encouragement of affordable housing across the Borders. It should be noted that there are specific criteria to be met in relation to any proposed development outwith a settlement boundary. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| General | Policy G8 – Development Outwith Development Boundaries | The contributor supports the proposed policy review and supports policy G8. (275, 276) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Built Environment | Policy BE1 - Listed Buildings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted (342) • Change to encourage renewable energy and energy conservation within conservation areas and on listed buildings and also permit use of modern materials especially windows and doors (289) | The Council's support for renewable energy will be carried forward to the LDP. Policy BE1 does not specifically encourage renewable energy and energy conservation as special consideration is needed for | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>buildings in a conservation area and in listed buildings. The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Replacement Windows promotes renovation of existing windows, draught-proofing and in some cases slim profile double-glazing to conserve energy.</p> <p>The SPG will be updated as appropriate to include national guidance on micro-renewables in listed buildings.</p> | |
| Built Environment | Policy BE2 - Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted and Agreed (342) <p>Policy review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Scotland is content with the proposal to combine policy on archaeology but it will be important to distinguish between how policy is applied to the protection of national and local level of designations. This is (a) scheduled monuments which is preserved in situ in its existing state and within appropriate setting, and (b) non-scheduled archaeology which is to be preserved in situ wherever feasible (339) • HS welcomes cognisance of Battlefields is also proposed for the proposed plan. HS encourage | <p>Noted.</p> <p>There will be changes to the policy in terms of creating one overarching policy including reference to sites of national, regional and local importance and with battlefields as a separate category. The division between the different levels will address Historic Scotland's concerns relating to how the policy will apply to different levels of protection.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained.</p> <p>There will be changes in terms of creating one overarching policy including reference to sites of national, regional and local importance and with battlefields as a separate category.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>SBC to reflect the landscape aspects of battlefields as well as their heritage value in any new policy (339)</p> <p>General comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MIR includes very little on yet unsurveyed archaeological landscapes which is a major concern as they are vulnerable to rampant development. This applies in particular to Liddesdale and upper Teviotdale. This urgently requires to be addressed (93) | <p>Development in the countryside should not create a threat to unsurveyed archaeology as there is a requirement for developers to report any findings to the Council. If the Council's Archaeologist is concerned about the impact of a development he can request a watching brief.</p> | |
| Built Environment | Policy BE3 - Gardens and Designed Landscapes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted (342) SNH support amendment of the policy to remove reference to consultation with SNH, since Historic Scotland is now the sire consultee for planning applications which might affect a site in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes (327) | <p>Agreed. The policy needs to be reworded to reflect the changes in consultees for planning applications that might affect a site in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes.</p> | <p>It is recommended this policy will be substantially retained. Although the policy needs to be reworded to clarify that Historic Scotland is the only consultee for planning applications which might affect a site in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Built Environment | Policy BE4 - Conservation Areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted (342) • Change to encourage renewable energy and energy conservation within conservation areas and on listed buildings and also permit use of modern materials especially windows and doors. (289) | Noted. The Council's support for renewable energy will be carried forward to the LDP. Policy BE1 does not specifically encourage renewable energy and energy conservation as special consideration is needed for buildings in a conservation area and in listed buildings. The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Replacement Windows promotes renovation of existing windows, draught-proofing and in some cases slim profile double-glazing to conserve energy. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Built Environment | Policy BE5 - Advertisements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted, but individual and isolated advertisements placed in rural areas should be strictly controlled and limited (342) • Transport Scotland is in the process of preparing a policy on advertising adjacent to trunk roads (339) | <p>Noted. Consolidating policy D3 and BE5 would give clearer advice relating to advertisement in the countryside and within the settlements. The policy would set out restrictions to protect character, amenity and safety of an area.</p> <p>Policies will be reviewed as part of the LDP process and as the policy from Transport Scotland is not in place at the moment it will be considered in the next plan review.</p> | It is recommended that the policy is consolidated with D3 Advertisement in the Countryside. |
| Built Environment | Policy BE6 – Protection of Open Space | The contributor supports the intention that green space in general will continue to be covered by policy. | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Council agree to include a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>(327)</p> <p>The contributor is supportive of the general policy position referred to in Structure Plan Policies C4, C5 and C6 where playing fields are considered separately from Open Space. The contributor states that the wording of policy BE6 however does not reflect this separation, which they would recommend in order to ensure the sporting function of each site is considered in line with the Scottish Planning Policy. They state that currently a proposal to develop a playing field is considered under three criteria, two of which make reference to making judgements on the effect of the loss of open space on social, environmental and economic considerations or applying weight to the need for the development. The contributor continues stating that the playing field strategy will provide the necessary analysis to consider the implications of the development of a playing field.</p> <p>The contributor further states that although the justification for Policy BE6 states that sportscotland will be consulted on specific applications which effect playing fields it is</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that the Structure Plan dealt with different types of open space separately, the current local plan policy BE6 refers to all types of open spaces including playing fields and this is confirmed within the policy justification. Although, it is intended to amend the policy text inline with the identification of key open spaces within development boundaries, it is considered that the new policy will still be inline with Scottish Planning Policy and will offer sufficient policy protection to playing fields. In addition, it should be noted that it is not necessary for local planning policy to duplicate national policy.</p> | <p>policy on green space within the Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | considered that a specific policy position on playing fields as a separate entity would be stronger and clearer to any prospective applicant. Furthermore they state that the existing policy also makes no reference to the need to consider the findings of a playing field strategy, which the Scottish Borders now have in place. The contributor therefore recommends the wording of any policy for the protection of playing fields should incorporate the wording of paragraph 156 of the Scottish Planning Policy. (202) | | |
| Built Environment | Policy BE7 - Care Homes | Noted. (342) | Noted. | It is recommended to change the policy to encourage use of town centre facilities. |
| Built Environment | Policy BE8 - Caravan and Camping Sites | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted (342) • Policy BE8 should be retained in its current form. The contributor proposes to include a consideration of policy clarification in relation to the protection of existing non-residential sites from development and on occupancy conditions (317) • Supports the aim of protecting existing non-residential caravan | Support noted. The tourism sector is important to the Scottish Borders economy and policy BE8 aim to safeguard caravan and camping sites from other development such as housing. It is important to safeguard caravan and camping sites from other development as a part in promoting tourism within the Borders. | <p>It is recommended the policy is substantially retained.</p> <p>It is proposed to add a list of existing caravan and camping sites to ensure their protection.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>sites from inappropriate re-development. No need to include policy clarification in relation to occupancy conditions. To set criteria for occupancy conditions in the LDP would be unduly prescriptive. Such issues can be dealt with under the caravan sites licensing regime. (317)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor wants Rosetta Holiday Park to be included when the policy text is updated (326) • Make sure all existing pitches are full and existing caravan parks are at capacity before allowing expansion (347) | <p>It is proposed to include a list of existing sites to ensure their protection and that they are only used for other development in exceptional circumstances.</p> | |
| Built Environment | Policy BE9 - Education Safeguarding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowepark Primary School requires replacement. The Community Council is aware of potential locations and urges a feasibility study to be undertaken and welcome direct involvement discussing any possible alternatives that emerge. Future use of present school site should be considered and included in the finalised document (342) • Include Peebles High School and additional primary provision in Peebles (289) | <p>Support noted. The Council will consider future school provision in Selkirk, Galashiels, and other towns as required, during the period of the Local Development Plan. Land for primary and secondary schools can be allocated under policy H3.</p> | <p>It is recommended the policy is substantially retained.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contributor would like to see more education facilities in more remote parts of the area. Hubs with links to Universities such as in the Highlands and Islands (288) | <p>Policy BE9 safeguards land for education facilities of strategic importance. The policy currently safeguards land for Heriot Watt University's Scottish Borders Campus in Galashiels. Safeguarding of further land would be considered if there was interest for developing education centres in the Scottish Borders.</p> | |
| Built Environment | Policy BE12 - Further Housing Land Safeguarding | Noted. (342) | Noted. | It is recommended that no changes are made to policy BE12. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE1 - International Nature Conservation Sites | The respondent agrees with the preferred option. (287) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE1 - International Nature Conservation Sites | The respondent agrees that the differing legal basis of international, national and local nature conservation sites, means that it would be better to keep these policies separate. (327) | Comments noted and agreed. | It is recommended that the Council agree to distinguish between policies on nature conservation. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE2 - National Nature Conservation Sites | The respondent agrees with the preferred option. (287) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE2 - National Nature Conservation Sites | The respondent agrees that the differing legal basis of international, national and local nature conservation | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | sites, means that it would be better to keep these policies separate. (327) | | retained. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE3 - Local Biodiversity | The respondent agrees. In particular they support work being done through policy NE3 to promote local biodiversity sites, and urge that resource be found to make sure that these continue to be identified, surveyed, and expertly appraised. (287) | Noted. The Council will endeavour to continue to monitor local biodiversity sites and new sites where appropriate. | No further action required. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE3 - Local Biodiversity | The respondent agrees that the differing legal basis of international, national and local nature conservation sites means that it would be better to keep these policies separate. (327) | <i>Noted and agreed.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council agree to distinguish between policies on nature conservation.</i> |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE4 - Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows | The respondent agrees with the preferred option. (287) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE5 - Development Affecting the Water Environment | The respondent agrees with the preferred option. (287) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE5 - Development Affecting the Water Environment | We support the retention of these policies, and the suggested amendments to their wording. (327) | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE6 - River Engineering Works | Agree with preferred option, but note the opportunities afforded by | Noted. The Council continues to support all renewable energy | It is recommended that the policy is |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | renewable energy projects. (342) | types, although further work is being done on wind energy as part of the LDP Review. | substantially retained. |
| Natural Environment | Policy NE6 - River Engineering Works | We support the retention of these policies, and the suggested amendments to their wording. (327) | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP1 - National Scenic Areas | The respondents agree with the preferred option. (287, 342) | Support noted. | No further action required. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP1 - National Scenic Areas | The respondents assert that there may be potential to set out this hierarchy (of landscape designations) within a single landscape policy approach but clarity would need to be given on the likely wording and differentiation that would apply to National Scenic Areas, Special Landscape Areas and areas outwith such designations. We would be happy to discuss this approach with the Council. (327) | It is considered that in the interests of simplicity and clarity it is preferred to keep the policies separate | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP1 - National Scenic Areas | The respondents support proposal to widen policy consideration to landscape and visual impacts rather than just "landscape impacts" (327) | Comments noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP2 - Areas of Great Landscape Value | The respondents agree with the preferred option. (287, 347) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP2 - Areas of Great Landscape | The respondents assert that there may be potential to set out this | It is considered that in the interests of simplicity and clarity it is | It is recommended that the policy is |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Value | hierarchy (of landscape designations) within a single landscape policy approach but clarity would need to be given on the likely wording and differentiation that would apply to National Scenic Areas, Special Landscape Areas and areas outwith such designations. We would be happy to discuss this approach with the Council. (327) | preferred to keep the policies separate | substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP3 - Countryside Around Towns | The respondents offer support for confirmation of the relationship between the CAT policy and broad policy framework for rural development in the Housing in the Countryside policy as proposed for policy EP3 (276, 275) | It is agreed the LDP will confirm the relationship between the CAT policy and the Housing in the Countryside Policy | It is recommended that the Council support the proposal to expand the CAT policy considerations to allow development appropriate under policy D2 Housing in the Countryside. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP3 - Countryside Around Towns | The respondents agree with the preferred option. (287, 347) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP3 - Countryside Around Towns | The respondent would like to stress the importance to the people of Darnick and Melrose of the present policy...with respect to the fields between the two villages ...trust that this area will be specifically mentioned in your final | The LDP will continue to support the safeguarding of the land between Darnick and Melrose. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | document, as it is in the present Local Plan. (92) | | |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP3 - Countryside Around Towns | <p>The respondent asserts that the policy should be revised to permit proposals for development where it is appropriate to a countryside setting.</p> <p>The respondent asserts the wording in criterion 1 providing that there be an essential requirement for a rural location should be deleted.</p> <p>The respondent asserts the stringent restrictions on development in the countryside should be relaxed in order to promote sustainable economic development which can promote tourism and enhance enjoyment of the countryside. (317)</p> | The CAT is an adopted SPG but we are aware it is a policy that needs to be monitored. The CAT policy will be reviewed as part of the LDP process. | It is recommended that the Council support the proposal to expand the CAT policy considerations to allow development appropriate under policy D2 Housing in the Countryside. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP3 - Countryside Around Towns | The respondent asserts that the restriction in criterion 2 which permits changes of use only to existing traditional buildings of character should be lifted...if there is an existing building in the countryside which could be used for another use appropriate to a countryside location, then such redevelopment should be permitted, notwithstanding that the building is not an existing traditional building of character. (317) | The CAT is an adopted SPG but we are aware it is a policy that needs to be monitored. The CAT policy will be reviewed as part of the LDP process. | It is recommended that the Council support the proposal to expand the CAT policy considerations to allow development appropriate under policy D2 Housing in the Countryside. |
| Environmental | Policy EP3 - | The respondent believes “the opening | The CAT is an adopted SPG but | It is recommended |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| Protection | Countryside Around Towns | <p>words of policy EP3 Countryside Around Towns (CAT) are drawn unreasonably tightly” and that this has resulted in an unreasonable result, and that this is likely to occur in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • believes that for such a policy to be implemented reasonably it is crucial that the boundaries of any settlement accurately reflect what is on the ground. Otherwise it becomes a blanket ban on development entirely dependent on an arbitrary view of a settlement’s boundaries. Submits that this is not reasonable and therefore not realistic • Moreover, to ignore existing building groups, even if they are outside a settlement, is to fly in the face of Policy D2 and is also said to be unreasonable and unrealistic • Cites example at Friarshall/Friarshaugh on eastern edge of Gattonside (104) | <p>we are aware it is a policy that needs to be monitored. The CAT policy will be reviewed as part of the LDP process and specific consideration will be given to the possibility of support of minor scale new build within appropriate locations. It is now the case that the cited example at Friarshall/Friarshaugh has been granted permission by the Council’s Local Review Body.</p> | <p>that the Council support the proposal to expand the CAT policy considerations to allow development appropriate under policy D2 Housing in the Countryside.</p> |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP4 - Coastline | <p>The respondents support the amendment of the 3rd criterion to include “quality of the natural environment”. (327)</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP4 - Coastline | The respondents state that it will be important in taking this policy forward for it to reflect the advice of paragraph 98 of the SPP which stresses the recreational importance of Scotland's coast and the need for development plans to protect such qualities. Paragraph 101 of the SPP stresses the importance of protecting valuable areas of open space on the coast and paragraph 102 stresses that locations of value for recreation on the coast may form a constraint on development. (202) | It is considered that the policy protects the coastline, particularly the undeveloped coastline. The policy goes on to state that this is important because of the status of the coast as a tourism asset. As the policy is reviewed in line with the production of the LDP a reference to recreational use at the coastline could be given. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP5 - Air Quality | The respondents agree with the advice of paragraph 103 of the SPP that development plans should promote public access to and along the coast. (202) | Comments noted. | No further action required. |
| Environmental Protection | Policy EP5 - Air Quality | Respondents assert consideration should also be given to air quality elsewhere, especially in town centres. (342) | Air quality is considered in the SESplan Environmental Report and the MIR Environmental Report and no concerns over air quality are found. | No further action required. |
| Economic Development | Policy ED1 - Protection of Employment Land | Contributor (342) agrees with the policy subject to employment land at Riverside, Selkirk, and that a defined line for Selkirk by-pass is included. SEPA recommends revised wording to include reference to the need to safeguard existing waste | Support noted. The line for Selkirk by-pass will not be altered in the Proposed Plan as the Council does not have any new information from Scottish Government/Transport Scotland confirming the line of the by-pass or time scales for the project. | It is recommended that policy justification for ED1 Protection of Employment Land will in its review include reference to safeguarding of |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | management sites, including ensuring adequate space surrounding existing waste facilities to allow for future expansion without being prejudiced or restricted by adjoining land uses. (357) | It is suggested that policy justification for ED1 makes reference to the safeguarding of existing waste facilities in Inf7 Waste Management Facilities. | existing waste facilities under policy Inf7. |
| Economic Development | Policy ED2 – Employment Uses outwith Employment Land | Rewrite with mixed use in mind. (364) | Mixed uses are promoted on some employment sites through policy ED1 and also through H3. | It is recommended that mixed use sites are taken forward as part of the employment land hierarchy in policy ED1 Protection of Employment Land. |
| Economic Development | Policy ED3 - Shopping Development | Contributor (236) supports retention of policy ED3 in principle, subject to detailed wording amendments required to incorporate the proposed network of centres which ASDA will be able to comment on at Proposed Plan stage. Contributor (342) states that the network must be supported by traders. | Support noted. It is recommended to merge policy ED3 and ED5 to create a policy on Town Centres and Shopping which includes the network of centres. The proposed town centre hierarchy includes Galashiels as a Strategic Centre. Traders, other organisations and the general public have had the opportunity to comment during the consultation on the Main Issues Report, and will have a further opportunity at Proposed Plan stage. | It is recommended to merge policy ED3 and ED5 to create a new policy on Town Centres and Shopping which includes the network of centres. |
| Economic Development | Policy ED4 – Prime Retail Frontage | Emphasis need for Prime Retail Frontage protection to be restored in Selkirk. (342) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the Prime Retail Frontage in |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | Selkirk is reinstated. Policy ED4 is proposed to include a wider range of uses in Prime Retail Frontage areas to increase footfall. |
| Economic Development | Policy ED5 – Town Centres | Note changes in focus of retail centres and changes in town centres, especially Galashiels and Hawick. (342) | Support noted. | It is recommended to merge policy ED3 and ED5 to create a new policy on Town Centres and Shopping which includes the network of centres. |
| Housing | Policy H1 – Affordable Housing | The contributor states the Council should be prepared to respond to eventual economic recovery and identify appropriate housing land for residents who are key to supporting the business, social and sustainable networks of the Borders. (342) | The plan identifies a more than adequate supply of land for housing development and will be able to meet any upturn in the market. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Housing | Policy H2 – Protection of Residential Amenity | The contributor agrees with the recommendations relating to policy H2. (342) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Housing | Policy H3 – Land Use Allocations | The contributor states an agreed line needs to be identified via a technical | Comments noted. The potential line for Selkirk by-pass is identified | It is recommended that the policy is |

| | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | study in relation to the Selkirk bypass. This will then identify a land corridor from which future housing land and employment land can be allocated for longer term development. (342) | in the current adopted Local Plan and this will be continued into the Proposed Plan. However, it should be noted that there is no commitment on behalf of either the Scottish Government or Transport Scotland to the delivery of the bypass, and it is only at that stage that an agreed line would be identified. | substantially retained. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF1 – Transport Safeguarding | The contributor expresses support for Selkirk bypass to improve access to Borders Railway at Galashiels (342) | Policy will continue to support protection of bypass route | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF1 – Transport Safeguarding | The contributor (Scottish Government) suggests that it be made clear which transport proposals are aspirational and without government support or funding. (339) | Amend policy and justification to make a clear distinction. | The plan will distinguish between programmed and aspirational transport proposals. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF2 – Protection of Access Routes | The contributor (Sport Scotland) supports the protection of core paths and other access routes and suggests that consideration be given to extending protection to include, for example, access to water and climbing crags. (202) | Support noted. The plan will continue to protect access routes including waterways. Policy NE5 (Development Affecting the Water Environment) protects water bodies from unacceptable impacts on recreation (amongst other things). | The plan will continue to protect access routes and recreational use of water from inappropriate development |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF2 – Protection of Access Routes | The contributor suggests a need to protect the ancient network of Green Roads from forestry destruction. (93) | Policy will continue to protect access routes from development. Forestry is permitted development | It is recommended that the policy is substantially |

| | | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | and outside the influence of the plan, but established public access right should remain. | retained. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF3 – Road Adoption Standards | The contributor suggests that the current limitation of private access roads to serve no more than 2 dwellings in settlements should be increased to 4 dwellings in line with neighbouring Lothian authorities. (350) | Give consideration to this issue as part of policy update. | Further consideration will be given to this matter prior to consideration of the Proposed Plan |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF4 – Parking Provisions & Standards | The contributor (Scottish Government) suggests reference is made to Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) for maximum parking standards for certain types of development. (339) | Policy will continue to take account of SPP. | The plan will continue to identify parking standards which take account of SPP. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF4 – Parking Provisions & Standards | The contributor suggests that the policies should acknowledge increased car ownership and ensure that town centre parking is managed to achieve appropriate turnover. (342) | Parking policy will continue to balance long and short stay parking; taking into account car ownership levels, the split between private and public transport and operational considerations | No change to the plan |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF5 - Waste Water Treatment Standards | The contributor supports the approach set out in Appendix C. (138) Contributor supports cross reference to Policies NE1 – International Nature Conservation Sites, and NE2 – National Nature Conservation Sites. (327) | Support noted. It is proposed to cross reference with policies NE1 and NE2 | Cross reference to policies NE1 and NE2 will be included in the proposed revision of policy INF5 |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF5 - Waste Water Treatment Standards | The contributor suggests that mention should be made that new treatment works must be properly integrated into | Noted. Proposed treatment works would be considered in the context of policy G1 (Quality Standards for | No change to the plan |

| | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | the landscape. (342) | New Development). INF5 is concerned with preferred methods of waste-water disposal. | |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF6 – Sustainable Urban Drainage | The contributor supports the approach set out in Appendix C. (138, 275, 276, 327) | Support noted. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF7 – Waste Management Facilities | The contributor (Scottish Natural Heritage) supports cross reference to policies NE1 – International Nature Conservation Sites, and NE2 – National Nature Conservation Sites. (327) | Support noted. | Policies will be cross referenced in the Proposed Plan |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF8 – Radio Telecommunications | The contributor objects to a policy limitation of masts in residential areas and near schools. Suggested revised policy wording. (328) | Note comments. Policy INF8 states a 'preference' for non-residential and school locations for masts, which is believed to be a sound approach. It does not rule out such locations altogether. | It is recommended that the policy is substantially retained. |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF8 – Radio Telecommunications | The contributor questions whether this policy relevant to anemometers? (342) | Not relevant to Policy INF8. Reference to anemometer masts is likely to be incorporated in the review of policy D4 (Renewable Energy) | No change to the plan. |
| Infrastructure | Policy Inf9 – Development within Exclusion Zones | No comments received. | | |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF10 – Transport Development | The contributor suggests that wording should ensure that access to future railway halts is facilitated. (342) | Agreed. Policy will make appropriate reference to railway stations. | It is recommended that the policy includes appropriate reference to |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | railway stations. |
| Infrastructure | INF11 – Developments that Generate Travel Demand | The contributor agrees with possibility of merging the policy, but suggests that wording should indicate that this is not just a roads issue. (342) | Support noted. It is agreed that any merged policy will continue to refer to other means of travel. | Continue to ensure that all modes of travel are referred to in future policy |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF12 – Public Infrastructure and Local Service Provision | No comments received. | | |
| Infrastructure | Policy INF12a – Crematorium Provision | No comments received. | | |
| Development in the Countryside | Policy D1 - Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside | Support the retention of the policy. (317, 202, 342) Examples of uses appropriate to rural character: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be useful to include examples of uses which are appropriate to rural character (327) • Giving examples of appropriate uses could be counter-productive as it depends on individual site and on degree of local needs for a particular use (364) • Encourage and support the expansion of water based tourism facilities (347) • Camping and caravan site should be included (317) | Support noted. Examples of uses appropriate to the rural character may be used as appropriate to clarify policy. Appropriateness is primarily dependant on the location and activity proposed. The introductory text may include examples, but the list will not be exhaustive. | It is recommended to substantially retain the policy, but reword and make minor changes to make the policy more user-friendly and integrate Structure Plan policy E2 and E3. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>General comments: Recommendation that policy D1 is strengthened to support the need and opportunities for rural retailing. Proposals for village services, diversification of rural businesses which may involve retail should be supported to support rural communities, businesses and employment. (300, 308, 309)</p> <p>Imminent threat of development for unsurveyed archaeological landscapes at Infinis windfarm site in the near environs of Hermitage Castle. (93)</p> | <p>General comments: Leisure retail, especially in rural areas, may be acceptable as long as there is no detrimental impact on the network of town centres.</p> <p>Development in the countryside should not create a threat to unsurveyed archaeology as there is a requirement for developers to report any findings to the Council.</p> <p>The policy needs to be reworded to integrate Structure Plan policy E2 Farm Diversification and E3 Timber Processing Facilities.</p> | |
| Development in the Countryside | Policy D2 - Housing in the Countryside | <p>The policy has received support from a number of contributors. (342, 276, 327, 338, 299, 300, 301, 304, 306, 307)</p> <p>Brownfield land: No reference to brownfield land or previously developed land. Amend the policy to encourage redevelopment of previously developed land associated with rural building groups. (299, 300,</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Brownfield land: The policy does not preclude the development of brownfield land where appropriate in relation to a building group. The policy specifically encourages brownfield</p> | It is recommended to substantially retain the policy, but to add a cross reference to Policy EP3 Countryside Around Town. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>301, 304, 306, 307)</p> <p>Connections between buildings: No proper reference to architectural and historical associations between buildings. Amend policy D2 to support development proposals that accentuate relationships between buildings that are architecturally or historically associated, notwithstanding that a perceived building group edge may intervene, for example, to emphasise the association between buildings on either side of a road, river, railway or where a suite of old estate buildings have architectural and/or historic links but otherwise considered to be too disparate to be members of a single building group. (299, 300, 301, 304, 306, 307)</p> <p>Cap on development: The contributor believe it is necessary to amend policy D2 to remove the cap or by allowing exceptions where a developer can demonstrate that a building group is</p> | <p>development in terms of redevelopment of steadings. Section D2(D) set out the requirements for rebuilding and restoration.</p> <p>Connections between buildings: Appropriate development in the countryside is determined by factors including context, identity and connection. This is important to achieve functional building groups that are well related to the surroundings.</p> <p>Cap on development: The policy was reviewed as part of the Local Plan Amendment and when considering the number of approvals for housing located in the countryside and number of</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>capable of expansion beyond the capped limit whilst meeting the policy's landscape, design and impact criteria. (299, 300, 301, 304, 306, 307)</p> <p>The 100% rule should be removed and determining development capacity on the potential of a site to accommodate change and not through an arbitrary 100% rule. (276, 275, 338)</p> <p>Rural activities and businesses: Particular note for support for individual houses within the countryside that relate to specific rural activities and businesses that require appropriate accommodation. Such individual properties should cover a range of uses including essential key workers properties through to country houses associated with sporting estate businesses (338)</p> <p>Anchor points:</p> | <p>completions the conclusion was made that there is a healthy supply of land for housing in the countryside. The recently adopted policy in relation to building groups sets a limit to 30% or 2 units whichever is the greater. This approach was recommended by the Reporter after the Examination into the Objections to the Local Plan Amendment. This precautionary approach is to ensure the Borders countryside is not overdeveloped and the policy is recently adopted and needs more time before evaluation.</p> <p>Rural activities and businesses: Support and comment noted. The policy includes a section on Economic Requirement which includes the requirements for accepting development proposals for development where location of residential development is essential for business needs. There is also support for rural activities and businesses in policy D1 Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside.</p> <p>Anchor points:</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>To encourage growth, sustainability and see Valley Communities thrive, make sure Etrick Anchor Points (Town and Village profiles) are supported and remain in the plan. (123, 284)</p> <p>Countryside around Town: D2 needs to be consistent with policy EP3. (104)</p> <p>Consultation: Consultation on the policy is vital in order to guide the preparation of the document. (276)</p> | <p>One of the aims of the policy is to promote appropriate rural housing development in dispersed communities in the Southern HMA. Although anchor points are not named in policy D2 the SPG on New Housing in the Countryside identify Etrick and Yarrow Feus. The Council has considered the potential for further anchor points but concluded that the main anchor points have already been identified.</p> <p>Anchor points have the same policy protection as other non-remote building groups (30% or 2 units whichever is the greater).</p> <p>Countryside Around Town: The policy needs to make reference to policy EP3 'Countryside Around Town' as that policy allow some appropriate development of existing building groups as long as they are in line with policy D2.</p> <p>Consultation: Further public consultation will take place on the Proposed Plan.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | Unsympathetic development: Indiscriminate single development in rural locations should be avoided. (342) | Unsympathetic development: The policy aim to promote appropriate rural housing development and prevent any development proposals that fail to meet the criteria of the policy. | |
| Development in the Countryside | Policy D3 - Advertisement in the Countryside | Noted and agreed but overt, isolated advertising in the countryside should ideally be avoided or at least strictly controlled. (342) Transport Scotland is in the process of preparing a policy on advertising adjacent to trunk roads. (339) | Consolidating policy D3 and BE5 would give clearer advice relating to advertisement in the countryside and within the settlements. The policy would set out restrictions to protect character, amenity and safety of an area. Policies will be reviewed as part of the LDP process and as the policy from Transport Scotland is not in place at the moment it will be considered in the next plan review. | It is recommended that the policy is consolidated with BE5 Advertisement. |
| Development in the Countryside | Policy D4 – Renewable Energy Development | Policy D4 should refer to support for the identified expansion of the strategic but stand alone employment site at Charlesfield through co-location of supporting renewable energy and lower carbon activities. Furthermore, policy should support the delivery of lower carbon development at Charlesfield including the decentralised and local generation of heat and power at the Combined Heat and Power plant and support of heat and power plant and the creation | The Council is supportive of renewable energy including combined heat and power. However, whilst the policy gives general support to the range of renewable energy types, it does not single out any particular sites for specific mention. Any applications for development of land in Charlesfield would be dealt with on a case by case basis in the same manner for any other, and the benefits of any combined heat | No action required. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | and operation of associated local and district heat networks. (271) | and power proposal would be weighed up along with any other material considerations to be addressed as part of a planning application. | |
| Development in the Countryside | Policy D4 – Renewable Energy Development | Policy D4 should reflect the distinction drawn between commercial and individual / small groups of turbines which are promoted for rural diversification and / or domestic consumption. Policy should be amended to presume in favour of local schemes for renewable energy where the risk and investment lie with Borders people and the economic benefits will stay within the Scottish Borders. (300, 305, 306) | <i>The SPG on wind energy does make reference to both commercial and small scale turbine proposal types. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |
| Development in the | Policy D4 – | Agree policy D4 in principle but | Policy D4 confirms the Council's | No action |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Countryside | Renewable Energy Development | suggest the inclusion of other forms of renewable energy – including hydro. Also note related problems regarding network distribution eg grid connections, overhead lines, substation capacities, MOD rulings. (342) | support for other forms of renewable energy. Hydro power is specifically referred to within the policy. Comments regarding network distribution are recognised within existing policy D4 and the SPG on wind energy. | required. |
| Development in the Countryside | Policy D4 – Renewable Energy Development | Welcome the update of policy D4, particularly in relation to development on peatland. It may be helpful if the policy considers the recommendations emerging from the on-going Berwickshire study on small scale turbine proposals. It may also be useful to explore the potential for a two tier policy approach by developing different policy approaches for large / commercial scale turbines and for smaller scale developments. (327) | <i>Comments noted. The MIR has received a large number of responses in relation to onshore wind energy. In view of the level of interest and concern in relation to the matter the Council commissioned further work to assess the potential impact of onshore wind energy proposals in respect of landscape capacity, economic impact and public perception. The output from the work undertaken informs the spatial approach to be taken in framing the policy for this issue. It identifies turbine sizes and groupings appropriate to different landscape character areas. This, along with other relevant considerations, should be used to inform the Council response to wind turbine development proposals.</i> | <i>It is recommended that the Council adopts a precautionary approach to wind energy that only accepts wind turbines where they can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts. In particular, this consideration will be informed by the landscape capacity studies undertaken to avoid unacceptable, including cumulative, impacts.</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| Rural Resources | Policy R1 – Protection of Prime Quality Agricultural Land | The contributor supports policy extension to include carbon rich soils, but need to define depth of peat. (327) | Support noted. Consideration will be given to this issue as part of policy review. | Include policy to protect carbon rich soils in the Proposed Plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R1 – Protection of Prime Quality Agricultural Land | The contributor suggests that areas of 'deep peat' should be more explicit. (342) | Consideration will be given to this issue as part of policy review. | Include policy to protect carbon rich soils in the Proposed Plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits | The contributor would like to be consulted when minerals supplementary planning guidance is prepared. (110) | Noted. | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits | The contributor would prefer areas of search for minerals to be set out in LDP rather than supplementary planning guidance. Minerals review should be done SDP wide (i.e. at SESplan level). (135) | The timescale for the minerals review is better suited to the supplementary planning guidance route. Consideration will be given as to how the review sits in the strategic context | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits | The contributor (Coal Authority) wants to see the retention of coal deposits through minerals safeguarding of coal deposits. (162) | Consideration will be given to this through the work on areas of search and minerals supplementary planning guidance. | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits | The contributor proposes a sand and gravel site at Tarphaugh. (165) | Areas of search within forthcoming supplementary planning guidance will provide guidance on suitable locations. Specific proposals should be taken through the Development Management process. | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of | The contributor supports the production of minerals supplementary | Support noted | No change to the plan |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| | Mineral Deposits | planning guidance (SPG). (327) | | |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits | The contributor supports minerals SPG/area of search, which should consider impact on historic environment and should direct extraction to areas with no environmental constraints. (339) | Support noted. The SPG work will address environmental issues, including potential impact on the historic environment. | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R2 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits | The contributor suggests that if ‘mineral reserves’ means shale deposits, building should not take place over them. (102) | Consideration will be given to this through the work on areas of search and minerals SPG | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R3 – Mineral and Coal Extraction | The contributor would prefer areas of search for minerals to be set out in LDP rather than supplementary planning guidance. Minerals review should be done SDP wide (ie. at SESplan level). (135) | The timescale for the minerals review is better suited to the supplementary planning guidance route. Consideration will be given as to how the review sits in the strategic context | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R3 – Mineral and Coal Extraction | The contributor (Coal Authority) wants to see the retention of coal deposits through minerals safeguarding of coal deposits. (162) | Consideration will be given to this through the work on areas of search and minerals supplementary planning guidance. | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R3 – Mineral and Coal Extraction | The contributor proposes a sand and gravel site at Tarhaugh. (165) | Areas of search within forthcoming supplementary planning guidance will provide guidance on suitable locations. Specific proposals should be taken through the Development Management process. | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R3 – Mineral and Coal Extraction | The contributor would like to be consulted when minerals SPG is prepared. (110) | Noted | No change to the plan |
| Rural Resources | Policy R3 – Mineral | The contributor supports production of | Support noted | No change to the |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | and Coal Extraction | minerals SPG. (327) | | plan |
| General Policy Comments | Transport | The contributor asserts a need to mitigate the dependency on cars in rural areas. (284) | Plan will continue to encourage and prioritise sustainable means of transport. | The plan will continue to promote sustainable forms of transport. |
| General Policy Comments | Employment Land | <p>Contributor (339) generally supports a move away from strict separations between different uses to the creation of more diverse and vibrant mixed use areas. The Proposed Plan could usefully also consider opportunities for introducing a mix of uses onto primarily residential sites.</p> <p>Contributor (364) asserts that mixed use should be required (rather than encourage) to achieve successful development.</p> <p>Contributor (202) supports promotion of activity tourism as a key sector. Important that policy allows for particular countryside and natural heritage locational needs.</p> | <p>Support noted. Mixed use will be promoted through the updated policy ED1 Protection of Employment Land which intends to promote mixed use through employment land hierarchy. Policy ED1 and H3 Land Use Allocations does not set out the exact use for employment and mixed use sites to give the market the flexibility to satisfy demand in different sectors.</p> <p>Tourism is one of the sectors considered to be of strategic importance and is promoted through policy D1 Business, tourism and leisure development in the countryside.</p> | It is recommended that mixed use sites are promoted on some employment sites identified in policy ED1. Tourism is promoted through policy D1. |
| General Policy Comments | Retail | Contributor (339) notes references to leakage of retail spend, but would comment that retail catchments needn't necessarily match administrative boundaries and an element of cross boundary flow may | Noted. However, the Council is committed to increase vitality and viability in its town centres and this requires consideration of spending leakage. | No change recommended. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | represent the normal operation of the regional retail hierarchy rather than a problem. | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

APPROVED SPG'S

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| Snackbars | Snackbar Operations Guidance Booklet | The contributor (Scottish Government) would like chance to comment when the guidance is being updated. (339) | Noted | No change to the plan |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | Consider the SPG on wind energy does not comply with national guidance in relation to there being no robust landscape capacity assessment undertaken, primary receptors / highly visible sensitive sites / tourist - recreation routes should not be identified as a stage 1 constraint, and buffer areas around roads / individual houses / path routes / viewpoints and other receptors should not be used. (346) | Disagree. It is considered the SPG has been prepared in accordance with national guidance and is indeed on the Scottish Government's web page as an example of good planning practice. Any extra mapping added is considered within the spirit of SPP and is most useful in practice to all users. The SPG has been subject to public consultation and is now formally adopted by the Council. | No action required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | The SPG does not clearly define terms such as "developing consensus" and "primary receptor". (346) | The term "developing consensus" within the SPG was used in relation to public concerns regarding the number of turbine proposals within the Scottish Borders. The term means "an emerging opinion", and it is very clear from the responses to the SPG on wind energy, current | No action required. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| | | | <p>planning applications and the MIR that this is undoubtedly the case. The term “primary receptor” within the SPG relates to road users and hill walkers. This is in relation to views within 2kms of A and B class roads and 7no selected strategic walking routes within the Scottish Borders.</p> | |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | <p>Consider the SPG on wind energy departs from the 3 stage spatial framework approach set out in SPP and therefore does not deliver the broad areas of search required. Extra layers of constraint are added to the mapping which are not in the spirit of SPP. (339)</p> | <p>Disagree. The SPG on wind energy does identify 3no key stages as required by national guidance. The SPG does split the second and third stages into 2no parts, giving weightings to the component halves. However, this does not deviate from the fact that the listed constraints fall within the correct identified stages. Any extra mapping added is considered within the spirit of SPP and is most useful in practice to all users. The SPG has been subject to public consultation and is now formally adopted by the Council.</p> | No action required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | <p>Retain concerns regarding the Council’s SPG on wind energy. (286)</p> | <p>The SPG on wind energy was put out for a 12 week public consultation and the respondent submitted comments at that point in time which were addressed. The SPG has now been approved and complies with national guidance.</p> | No action required. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | Wind Energy Ltd reserve the right to make further comments on the SPG in the future. Weight given to the SPG should be carefully considered. (210) | The draft SPG was put out to public consultation for 12 weeks and all comments received were noted and reported back to the Planning and Building Standards Committee. The respondent (SLR) commented on the draft SPG. If the SPG becomes part of the LDP in the future or is subject to review there will be an opportunity to make comment on it. | No action required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | The recent SPG on wind energy is helpful in ensuring developments are in appropriate locations. (343) | Support noted. | No action required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy | Concern regarding the spatial distribution of existing wind farms and current proposals, and the potential impacts piecemeal or scattered approach to the deployment of the technology. We query whether the SPG sets a clear enough spatial steer to identify areas of search, whether it presents a clear view on the cluster and space approach, and whether it clearly defines issues regarding cumulative impact. Consider that as the there has been much change in the number of approvals since it was first prepared, there could be a review of the SPG. The respondent (Scottish Natural Heritage) state they would be happy to engage in any | Scottish Natural Heritage were consulted on the draft SPG on wind energy and forwarded comments to it which were taken on board. The Council has frequent discussions with SNH on the major issue of wind turbines and it is therefore most disappointing that they raise some issues with the SPG at this stage after it has been adopted. The Council will continue to involve SNH on ongoing issues and projects relating to wind energy. | No further action, although the Council will involve SNH on any future reviews of the SPG and on any issues raised as part of the policy review on renewable energy. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | appraisal of it. (327) | | |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy -Spatial strategy | Carlops is designated as an area of moderate constraints (higher) and we welcome the SBC's policy of refusing planning applications for turbines which would have an adverse effect on the landscape. (240) | Comments noted. | No action required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy -Spatial strategy | The spatial strategy within the SPG is overly precautionous. (200) | Disagree. The preparation of the spatial strategy followed national guidance. | No action required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | SPG on Wind Energy -Spatial strategy | As required by Scott Govt there is nothing in the MIR which indicates whether SBC have undertaken monitoring and review of the spatial strategy to confirm if they require updating. (346) | The MIR is a high level document and its purpose was to highlight main issues to be addressed within the new plan. It is not considered reference to the undertaking of monitoring of the spatial strategy was necessary. However, the Council is aware that the SPG does need updating and monitoring to consider new and updated constraints to be fed into the spatial strategy. This includes, for example, identifying the newly designated Special Landscape Assessment. When being reviewed id there are any material changes proposed to the spatial strategy it will be subject to public consultation. | The monitoring of the spatial strategy is an ongoing process and will be subject to public consultation when required. |
| Wind Energy (2011) | Incorporation of SPG on wind energy into Dev | Recent letter by the Ministers for energy, Enterprise and Tourism, and Local Govt and Planning state spatial | The SPG on wind energy which incorporates the spatial strategy for wind turbines will have statutory | No action required at this stage. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Plan | frameworks for wind farms should henceforth be incorporated into the development plan rather than in interim supplementary guidance. We therefore expect this spatial framework to be included within the proposed Plan. (339) | status as part of the adopted Local Development Plan. Any future reviews of the SPG on wind energy will be subject to formal public consultation. | |
| Wind Energy (2011) | Incorporation of SPG on wind energy into Dev Plan | Scott Govt's wider planning policies on the preparation of LDP's requires them to be concise documents with supplementary guidance produced alongside. It is the case from other Examinations that for SBC to develop SG as wind energy guidance, the aims and objectives need to be set out in the LDP. As this is not done it is therefore assumed it is not SBC's intention to develop the SPG into SG. (346) | The SPG on wind energy will have statutory status as part of the adopted Local Development Plan. Any future reviews of the SPG on wind energy will be subject to formal public consultation. | No action required at this stage. |

SPG'S NOT YET ADOPTED

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Local Landscape Designations | SPGs not yet adopted | No comments received. | | |
| Provision for Play Areas | SPGs not yet adopted | No comments received. | | |

NEW SPG'S TO BE DRAFTED

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Proposed Response to Main Issues | Recommendation |
|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|

| | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|---------------|------------------------|
| | | | Raised | |
| Minerals | Production of SPG on Minerals | The contributor would like to see the minerals SPG produced quickly with consultation with all interested parties. (130) | Noted. | No change to the plan. |

OTHER ISSUES ARISING

| Main Issue | Sub Issue | Summary of Main Issues Raised | Recommendation |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| Kelso | DKELS001 and RKELS002 | <p><i>It is proposed to allocate DKELS001 within the Local Development Plan as a site for the relocation of Kelso High School. As a result of the school relocating, it is proposed to allocate the former High School, RKELS002 as a redevelopment opportunity within the Local Development Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The existing school has limited potential for expansion and is experiencing growing pressure. The proposed school site, DKELS001 has gone through extensive consultation and is well supported.</i></p> | <p><i>It is recommended that DKELS001 and RKELS002 are allocated within the Local Development Plan.</i></p> |

List of all Main Issues Report Contributors

| Reg ID | Contributor Name |
|--------|--|
| 90 | Jacqueline Whitelaw |
| 91 | D. M. Spawforth |
| 92 | Darnick Village Trust C/o Anthony C. H. Watson |
| 93 | FSA Scotland |
| 94 | T. Jarman |
| 95 | Chris Chapman |
| 96 | Rachel Boddy |
| 97 | Ondrej Roztomily |
| 98 | C. G. Lewin |
| 99 | Langdale Allotment Society |
| 100 | Malaiz Daud |
| 101 | Will Ramsay |
| 102 | Robb F. Fenton |
| 103 | The Reston & Berwick Farming Company |
| 104 | Elsbeth M D Cameron (Lady Abernethy) |
| 105 | John Henderson |
| 106 | Brenda & Jackie Squance |
| 107 | Joan G Martin |
| 108 | North Tweeddale Paths C/o Michael Pryor |
| 109 | W. D. Gill |
| 110 | Quarries Action Group |
| 111 | Lauderdale Community Council |
| 112 | M. Rennie |
| 113 | Euan & Mrs Lin Millar |
| 114 | Harris & Louise Sofokleous |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 115 | Cockburnspath & Cove Community Council |
| 116 | Sandra Davies |
| 117 | Henry Nixon |
| 118 | Susan Oakes |
| 119 | W. H. & L. Locker |
| 120 | Henrietta J, Matthews |
| 121 | Alastair Seaton & Karen Purves |
| 122 | The Theatres Trust |
| 123 | Daphne Jackson |
| 124 | Sandra McGregor |
| 125 | Malcolm McGregor |
| 126 | Vikki Pounder |
| 127 | Roger Mac Ginty |
| 128 | David Taylor & Shirley McLachlan |
| 129 | Ivo Hesmondhalgh |
| 130 | Roger Oakes |
| 131 | Jessamy Pears |
| 132 | Derek Stewart |
| 133 | Robert Atkinson |
| 134 | David Walmsley |
| 135 | Midlothian Council |
| 136 | Patricia Twite |
| 137 | Edwin Thompson |
| 138 | Scottish Water |
| 139 | The Chesters Wind Farm Action Group |
| 140 | P. Manning |
| 141 | Alison Macdonald |
| 142 | Alan J. Torrance |

| | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|
| 143 | Jon Logan |
| 144 | Richard Dennington |
| 145 | Jocelyn Dennington |
| 146 | George Russell |
| 147 | Dinah Illius |
| 148 | Alexander Baillie |
| 149 | N. A. Sperling |
| 150 | Philip Mercer |
| 151 | Margaret McDougall |
| 152 | David McDougall |
| 153 | Alan Clerk |
| 154 | Mr G & Mrs S Mathews |
| 155 | Robert Fraser |
| 156 | National Grid |
| 157 | Ian Walker |
| 158 | Arthur Hembling |
| 159 | Lowood Estates Ltd |
| 160 | Hutton & Paxton Community Council |
| 161 | Linda Royle |
| 162 | The Coal Authority |
| 163 | Derek Wilkinson |
| 164 | Carol Armstrong |
| 165 | AMS Associates Ltd |
| 166 | Jane Bower |
| 167 | Ian Thomson |
| 168 | Jacqueline Thomson |
| 169 | C. B. Strang Steel |
| 170 | A. J. Nicholson |

| | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|
| 171 | C. K. Queenan |
| 172 | Alastair Stavert |
| 173 | I. Yule |
| 174 | J. C. B. St George |
| 175 | Alan Thomson |
| 176 | Don Brownlow |
| 177 | Tweed Homes |
| 178 | Robin J. Matthews |
| 179 | Pearson Donaldson Properties |
| 180 | Logan Forrest |
| 181 | George Hogg |
| 182 | James G Hood |
| 183 | Hugh Hickman |
| 184 | Jane Cameron |
| 185 | Andrew Illius |
| 186 | Minto Hills Conservation Group |
| 187 | William Sinclair Horticulture Ltd |
| 188 | Greta Mordue |
| 189 | Alan Mordue |
| 190 | William Short |
| 191 | Duncan Wilson |
| 192 | Annabel Milne |
| 193 | Catherine Robinson |
| 194 | Mike Robinson |
| 195 | Angus Fernie |
| 196 | Clovenfords Community Council |
| 197 | Janet Forbes Walker |
| 198 | Chirnside Community Council |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|
| 199 | R H Miller Group Ltd |
| 200 | Scottish Power Renewables |
| 201 | Michael Kostoris |
| 202 | Sportscotland |
| 203 | E. Bernard |
| 204 | Johnny Watson |
| 205 | G. Hurst |
| 206 | David & Judith Hedges |
| 207 | Mark L Hutton |
| 208 | Carolyn Oliver |
| 209 | Hawick Community Council |
| 210 | SLR Consulting Ltd |
| 211 | Save Scott's Countryside |
| 212 | Belinda Jane Mitchell |
| 213 | H & CJ Usher |
| 214 | Patricia Glennie |
| 215 | CWP Property Development & Investment |
| 216 | Margaret Blacklock |
| 217 | M. A. Bowie |
| 218 | Judy Torrance |
| 219 | A. Richardson |
| 220 | Ann Smithson |
| 221 | Eileen Swan |
| 222 | Barbara & Michael Simmons |
| 223 | J. Kiloh |
| 224 | Shirley Allan |
| 225 | Robin Kent |
| 226 | John Wilson |

| | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 227 | J. Grierson |
| 228 | Frances Watson |
| 229 | Lawrie & Symington Ltd |
| 230 | Friends Of Jubilee Wood |
| 231 | Ian Ballantine |
| 232 | Jack W. Ponton |
| 233 | P. J. A. Leggate |
| 234 | Boyd Farming Ltd |
| 235 | CALA Management Ltd |
| 236 | ASDA Stores Limited |
| 237 | Margaret Shortreed |
| 238 | Paul Rooney |
| 239 | Lothian Estates |
| 240 | Carlops Community Council |
| 241 | Ruth Donaldson |
| 242 | L. A. C. Ashby |
| 243 | Jo Clough |
| 244 | Mark Clough |
| 245 | Ian Woollen |
| 246 | Robert Johnson |
| 247 | Borders Group of the John Muir Trust |
| 248 | Birks View Residents Association |
| 249 | Philip Kerr |
| 250 | Gillian Powell |
| 251 | Brian Macdonald |
| 252 | McGregor Family |
| 253 | Richard Gordon |
| 256 | Abbotsford Trustees |

| | |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| 257 | Fiona Perry |
| 258 | Malcolm Ouldcott |
| 259 | Angela Goldsbrough |
| 260 | George Miler |
| 261 | Laura Blackwood |
| 262 | Simon Blackwood |
| 263 | Anthony F Bolton |
| 264 | A. Bailey |
| 265 | Niel Redpath |
| 266 | Paul Priestman |
| 267 | Jane Nimmo |
| 268 | A. Bell |
| 269 | R. Home |
| 270 | A. A. Home |
| 271 | Charlesfield First LLP |
| 272 | Graham Thomas |
| 273 | Renwick Country Properties |
| 274 | Miller Family |
| 275 | Douglas & Angus Estates |
| 276 | Ladykirk Estates |
| 277 | Berwickshire Civic Society |
| 278 | Alasdair Drysdale |
| 279 | Adrian Bennet |
| 280 | D. Stott |
| 281 | Marion Oates |
| 282 | TCI Renewables Limited |
| 283 | Banks Renewables |
| 284 | Ettrick & Yarrow Community Council |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 285 | Mapeley Delta Acquaiation Co (1) Ltd |
| 286 | RES UK & Ireland |
| 287 | Scottish Wildlife Trust |
| 288 | Eyemouth Town Community Council |
| 289 | Royal Burgh Of Peebles & District Community Council |
| 290 | Selkirk Regeneration Group |
| 291 | Scott Bain & Rohan Banyard |
| 292 | Colette Burke |
| 293 | Richard Oates |
| 294 | B. L. Allan |
| 295 | Marion Livingston |
| 296 | Jedburgh Traders Association |
| 297 | Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd |
| 298 | Glen Estate |
| 299 | K. Booker |
| 300 | Smith & Garratt Rural Asset Management |
| 301 | T. Culham |
| 302 | David Wilson Homes (Barratt Developments Plc) |
| 304 | George H Millar (West Foulden) Ltd |
| 305 | R. Home Esq |
| 306 | Marchmont Farms Ltd |
| 307 | J. Rutherford Esq |
| 308 | J. Swinton Esq |
| 309 | S. Swan Esq |
| 310 | Trustees Of The Sir Ilay Campell Settlement |
| 311 | David Wilson Homes |
| 312 | AXA Real Estate |
| 313 | D. Cruickshank |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 314 | E. Finlayson |
| 315 | NFU Scotland |
| 316 | Buccleuch Property Group |
| 317 | Beatrice Forrest |
| 318 | William Hall |
| 319 | The Church Of Scotland General Trustees |
| 320 | Edwin Thompson |
| 321 | I. V. Renney |
| 322 | Israel Discount Bank |
| 323 | Gordon Milne |
| 324 | Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd |
| 325 | Emma Lambe |
| 326 | Nottinghamshire County Council Pension Fund |
| 327 | Scottish Natural Heritage |
| 328 | Mobile Operators Association |
| 329 | Laurie Macaskill |
| 330 | McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd |
| 331 | Lord Devonport |
| 332 | Lord Ralph Kerr, Ferniehirst Trust & Roxburgh Estates |
| 333 | Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & AWG Property Ltd |
| 334 | M & J Ballantyne |
| 335 | The Edinburgh Woollen Mill Group |
| 336 | John Mitchell |
| 337 | Mike Clay |
| 338 | Slipperfield Estate |
| 339 | Scottish Government (Historic Scotland) |
| 340 | Linda Rome & Bill Noble |
| 341 | Forestry Commission Scotland |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 342 | Royal Burgh Of Selkirk & District Community Council |
| 343 | RidgeWind Ltd |
| 344 | Northumberland County Council |
| 345 | Urban Animation |
| 346 | SSE |
| 347 | Lawson Wood |
| 348 | NHS Borders |
| 349 | Scottish Badgers |
| 350 | Homes For Scotland |
| 351 | Sidon Developments |
| 352 | Edward Hurst |
| 353 | RSPB Scotland |
| 354 | Heriot Community Council |
| 355 | Southern Uplands Partnership |
| 356 | Simon Sanderson |
| 357 | Scottish Environment Protection Agency |
| 358 | Rural Renaissance Ltd |
| 359 | JS Crawford |
| 360 | Scottish Enterprise |
| 361 | Anne Gallagher |
| 362 | Eddleston & District Community Council |
| 363 | Joyce Mclean |
| 364 | Cllr Nicholas Watson |
| 365 | Cllr Jim Brown |
| 366 | SEA Gateway |
| 367 | Elizabeth Benson Estate |
| 368 | Peebles Civic Society |